

Effective: 9/1/08

Supersedes: 3/1/2003

Issuing Office: Academic Personnel

ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS

I.	REFERENCES AND RELATED POLICIES	1
II.	INTRODUCTION	1
III.	GLOSSARY OF TERMS	1
IV.	GENERAL ADVANCEMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT POLICIES	1
	A. Department Chair Responsibilities	1
	B. External Referee Letters	3
	C. Academic Appointee Responsibilities	4
	D. Potential Conflict of Interest	5
	E. Retentions	5
	F. Joint Appointments	6
	G. Interdisciplinary Programs/Units	6
V.	EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE	6
	Chart: Performance Review Criteria at UCSD	7
	A. Professor (Ladder-Rank) Series and Professor In Residence Series	8
	B. Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) Series	12
	C. Adjunct Professor Series	14
	D. Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series	14
	E. Clinical Professor, Voluntary Series	14
	F. Lecturer with Security of Employment Series	15
	G. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Series (Unit 18)	16
	H. Professional Research (Research Scientist) Series	16
	I. Project Scientist Series	16
	J. Specialist Series	17
	K. Other Series	17
	1. Academic Administrator Series	17
	2. Academic Coordinator Series	18
	3. Librarian Series	19
	4. Continuing Educator Series and Coordinator of Public Programs Series	19
	5. Student Academic Series	19
	L. Acting Titles	20
	M. Visiting Titles	20
	N. Recall Titles	20
	O. Non-salaried Instructional Titles	20
	1. For individuals whose primary employment is not at the University	20
	2. For individuals with full-time salaried positions at the University	20
VI.	PREPARING THE ACADEMIC REVIEW FILE	21
VII.	DETERMINING DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS	22
	A. Computation of Rank and Step to Determine Eligibility for Advancement	22
	1. Normal Periods of Service	22
	2. Special Considerations	24
	B. Formal Recommendation	24
	1. Deferral	24
	2. Appointee Not Recommended for Advancement (No Change)	24
	3. Appointee Recommended for Merit Advancement or Promotion	25
	4. Appointee Recommended for Accelerated Merit Advancement or Accelerated Promotion	25
	5. Appointee Recommended for an Off-Scale Salary Component	26

C.	Career Equity Review	27
D.	Evaluation of Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees	28
E.	Evaluation of Non-Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees	36
VIII.	VOTING AND CONSULTATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT	40
A.	Faculty Consultation and Voting	40
B.	Proposed Actions Not Covered by Senate Bylaw 55	41
IX.	SUBMISSION OF ADVANCEMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT FILES	41
A.	Timely Submission	41
X.	ACADEMIC FILE REVIEW AND FINAL AUTHORITY	42
A.	The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)	42
B.	Other Reviewers	42

[Supplement I, Guidelines for the Professor of Clinical X \(e.g., Medicine\) Series](#)

[Supplement II, Guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series](#)

ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS

I. REFERENCES AND RELATED POLICIES

Academic Personnel Manual (APM)

UCSD Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM), 230-20, Academic Appointments

[UCSD Policy and Procedure Manual \(PPM\), 230-29, Policies and Procedures to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Review Process](#)

[UCSD Policy and Procedure Manual \(PPM\), 230-11, Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of Academic Personnel Records](#)

[Memorandum of Understanding, University of California and University Federation of Librarians University Council – American Federation of Teachers, Professional Librarian Unit](#)

[Memorandum of Understanding, University of California and University Council – American Federation of Teachers, Non-Senate Instructional Unit](#)

II. INTRODUCTION

This section of the Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) contains the campus policies and procedures pertaining to academic advancement actions and the reappointment of academic personnel at the University of California, San Diego.

This PPM section incorporates and implements provisions of the University of California Academic Personnel Manual (APM). For additional information, contact the appropriate divisional dean's office, or refer directly to the [Academic Personnel Manual](#).

This PPM section is not applicable to appointees in series covered by a Memorandum of Understanding with an exclusive bargaining agreement, except when the Memorandum of Understanding specifically states that certain section(s) of the PPM apply.

III. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

A complete glossary of academic personnel terms is available at:
<http://academicaffairs.ucsd.edu/offices/apo/Glossary.pdf>

IV. GENERAL ADVANCEMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT POLICIES

A. Department Chair Responsibilities

1. Annual Informal Assessment

The department chair (or equivalent officer) is responsible for making certain that there is an annual informal assessment of the status and performance of each academic appointee in the department, unit, program, or division (hereafter referred to as department), including those who are not eligible for advancement. This annual assessment may include an interview with the academic appointee.

2. Submission of Academic Review Files

The department chair should ensure that an academic review file is prepared and forwarded for review and approval for each appointee who is due for advancement consideration, and for each appointee with a specified ending date if reappointment with or without advancement is recommended by the department. Academic review files may also be submitted for appointees who are judged by the department as deserving of accelerated advancement.

If an appointee does not provide updated material for the academic review file, the department chair should proceed with the review based upon the information that is available to the department. In this case, the academic review file submitted should document the department's efforts to obtain file materials from the appointee (e.g., copies of written requests/reminders).

3. Deadlines

The department chair may establish departmental deadlines for submission of academic review file materials as early as necessary to enable the department to submit files by the campus deadlines (set forth in the [Campus Deadlines Schedule](#)). Departmental deadlines may not be later than October 15. An appointee may not add bibliographic or other documentation reflecting activities or accomplishments beyond October 15.

4. Policy to Ensure Fairness in the Academic Review Process

Policy and Procedure Manual Section 230-29 sets forth the University's policies to ensure fairness in the academic review process. The department chair is responsible for ensuring compliance with the provisions of PPM 230-29 for each academic review file prepared.

5. Departmental Recommendation Letter

The department chair is responsible for drafting the departmental recommendation letter, which is a presentation of the department's advancement and/or reappointment recommendation based upon an evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department.

The letter should include:

- a. The proposed action, title, rank, step, salary, and proposed effective date.
- b. A statement specifying the degree of departmental consultation and any dissenting opinion. Academic Senate Bylaw 55 must be observed for all applicable cases.
- c. A statement regarding any conflicts of interest in the file.
- d. An evaluation of the appointee's performance and achievements in each area of responsibility to the University, as specified by the series criteria.

SECTION: 230-28 Page 3

Effective: 9/1/08

Supersedes: 3/1/2003

Issuing Office: Academic Personnel

- e. A statement regarding the disposition of the appointee's off-scale salary (if any), i.e., maintained, tapered, reset, etc.
- f. Justification for the award of, or policy exceptions for, bonus or market off-scale salary components. It is particularly important to provide justification for continuation of market off-scale components beyond the six-year limit (see Section VII, B.5., Appointee Recommended for an Off-Scale Salary Component).
- g. A statement regarding external referees' recommendations. External referee letters should be referenced by code only. Comments that might identify external referees must not appear in the department letter; excessive quotations from external referee letters are discouraged.

The department chair may also write a separate, confidential letter setting forth his or her personal recommendation, if desired.

B. External Referee Letters

External referee letters are required as follows:

1. Five (5) external referee letters are required for promotion to the Associate level.
2. Three (3) external referee letters are required for promotion to the Full level and for actions involving career reviews.

In all other cases, external referee letters should not be solicited unless there is no department faculty member with sufficient expertise to evaluate the appointee.

[Sample solicitation letters](#) are provided on the Academic Personnel Web site.

External referees should be individuals who are independent of the appointee, who are expert in the appointee's field, and who are able to provide an objective appraisal of the appointee's work. Referees should be urged to provide an objective and analytical evaluation with specific comments about the appointee's abilities and accomplishments, rather than uncritical praise.

Use of external referees whom the reviewers may not regard as objective or independent evaluators, either because they are too close to the appointee professionally (e.g., collaborators, thesis supervisors, etc.) or because they have a personal relationship with the appointee, may be included if they shed light on collaborations. Non-independent letters do not count toward the minimum number of required external letters.

For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, external evaluation letters may be solicited from individuals who are not professionally independent from the appointee; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if possible.

External referee letters should be solicited from senior scholars who are at the same rank as that proposed for the appointee, or higher.

If external referees are not senior scholars and/or are not sufficiently independent of the appointee, the department should explain why they were selected as the best-qualified referees. *This information should only appear on the Referee I.D. form.*

External referee letters may be solicited from academic appointees at other University of California campuses. Under special circumstances, evaluations by other department members may be appropriate, but in general, external referee letters should not be solicited within the appointee's department. For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, evaluation letters may be solicited from within UCSD; however the majority of required letters should be obtained from individuals external to UCSD.

The department chair must give the appointee the opportunity to suggest names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation. Other names should be added to this list by the department chair in consultation with a departmental review committee. Normally, no more than one out of three external letters (when three are required for the file) or two out of five (when five are required for the file) should be from referees selected solely by the appointee. This number may be exceeded if the appointee's list includes all of the recognized experts in the field. Appointees may not solicit their own evaluation letters.

Solicitation letters must include appropriate wording describing the proposed action and explaining to external referees the nature of the proposed advancement. For advancement to any level for which external letters are required, the department chair should explain in the solicitation letter the significance of the advancement and note the degree of acceleration, if applicable, so that the referees may evaluate the appointee's achievements in relation to the University's criteria for advancement.

Solicitation letters must include the University's confidentiality statement.

External letters may be solicited and received electronically, but they must be submitted with an electronic cover letter from the referee as evidence of their authenticity.

All external referee letters received must be included in the file, regardless of the action ultimately proposed by the department.

Unsolicited Letters of Evaluation

Unsolicited letters of evaluation that are added to the file by the appointee are not considered confidential.

Unsolicited letters received by the department but NOT added to the file by the appointee may be included in the file at the department chair's discretion. Before including an unsolicited letter in the appointment file, the department chair must send the University's confidentiality statement to the letter writer and obtain a signed or electronic authorization to use the unsolicited letter in the file. The authorization, the unsolicited letter, and the department chair's letter transmitting the confidentiality statement should be included in the file.

C. Academic Appointee Responsibilities

Academic appointees must provide evidence of achievement in each of the criteria specified for their series. Appointees are also responsible for meeting the department's deadlines for submission of academic review file materials.

Appointees are expected to submit (if applicable):

- An updated and signed UCSD Academic Biography and Bibliography Form (also referred to as the biobib form)

- Evidence of teaching effectiveness (syllabi, evaluations, testimonials, thank-you letters, etc.)
- Copies of publications from the review period
- Other items that the department chair may request

Appointees are encouraged to provide a personal statement describing their research and creative activity, teaching, and service within the review period (which may include more detail than the biobib form). They may explain any extraordinary responsibilities and accomplishments and the significance of their research and creative activity and its impact on their field.

Appointees undergoing career reviews should include scholarly accomplishments since their last career review, as well as a description of significant work produced earlier in their academic careers.

Appointees with teaching responsibilities should provide information on the courses they have taught and graduate student mentoring. If the teaching involved the establishment of a new course, major revision of a course, new innovations in teaching, or other extraordinary efforts, these should be described. Appointees should also describe their service contributions, indicating whether they chaired any committees and detailing their committee responsibilities and workloads.

If eligible, appointees may initiate a Career Equity Review (CER). An appointee is responsible for requesting a CER at the time of his or her regular, on-cycle academic review (see section VIII.C.).

D. Potential Conflict of Interest

If the department chair and the appointee under review are close collaborators, the department chair should not prepare the academic review. The vice chair or another independent senior faculty member should oversee the academic review and prepare the departmental recommendation letter.

An academic appointee may not participate in any academic review affecting a near relative. (For the definition of "near relative," refer to [APM 520, Appointment of Near Relatives](#).) If an academic appointee would have participated in the review if the reviewee were not a near relative, the departmental recommendation letter should state that the academic appointee did not participate in the review.

If the department chair or any academic appointee in the department has a financial interest in a company employing an appointee under review, that information should be included in the academic review file, and such individuals should recuse themselves from participating in the academic review.

E. Retentions

A department may need to prepare a retention file for a faculty member who is being recruited by another institution. Retention files typically are urgent and may be submitted any time of year. Departments are encouraged to contact their divisional dean's office as soon as the need to submit a retention file arises to ensure its rapid review. The department must include a copy of the outside offer letter in the retention file.

F. Joint Appointments

When an appointee holds joint appointments in two or more departments, all departments should be involved in the appointee's academic review; however, only one academic review file should be submitted. One department should take the lead in preparing the file (i.e., gathering material from the appointee, soliciting external letters, gathering teaching evaluations, obtaining a completed and signed UCSD Academic Biography and Bibliography Form, gathering publications, etc.). Each department, however, should act independently in arriving at its recommendation for inclusion in the academic review file.

The determination as to which department takes the lead in preparing the academic review file is made as follows:

- If the appointee holds an appointment in a salaried instructional title in one department and in a salaried research title in another, the department in which the teaching title is held should prepare the file.
- If the appointee holds salaried appointments in two departments, the department in which he or she has the greater percentage of appointment should prepare the file.
- If the appointee holds a salaried appointment in one department and a non-salaried appointment in another, the department in which the appointee is salaried should prepare the file.
- If the joint appointments are split equally between the departments, the "home" department should prepare the file. This designation should be agreed upon by the academic units and appointee involved when the appointment is being proposed, and the home department should be reflected in the Payroll Personnel System.

Once it is determined which department will prepare the file, the chair of the preparing department initiates the secondary department's participation by soliciting from the other department chair the department's evaluation, recommendation, and, if applicable, faculty vote. The department preparing the academic review file should send the secondary department the basic file materials. After each department has made its decision, copies of the departmental recommendations should be exchanged by the departments.

G. Interdisciplinary Programs/Units

If an appointee has significant research, teaching, and/or service obligations in an interdisciplinary program or organized research unit (ORU), the chair of his or her department should ask the program coordinator or ORU director to evaluate the appointee's contributions in these areas. If the appointee is eligible for promotion and his or her primary research and creative activity falls within the interdisciplinary area, the department chair should also ask the program coordinator to suggest appropriate external referees. However, the department chair will make the final selection of referees.

V. EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

Advancement is contingent upon demonstration of achievement in each of the criteria specified for the appointee's series. A thorough assessment of the appointee's performance is required when formulating the departmental recommendation and must be documented in the departmental letter of recommendation.

SECTION: 230-28 Page 7

Effective: 9/1/08

Supersedes: 3/1/2003

Issuing Office: Academic Personnel

Advancement of a part-time appointee in the Professor series will depend on the quality of performance, which should be at a level of distinction comparable to that expected of a full-time appointee, although, when circumstances warrant it, a lesser rate of scholarly accomplishment will be acceptable. Teaching assignments and departmental, committee, and other service are to be kept in proportion to the percentage of time of the appointment, but the same quality of performance is expected as for full-time appointees.

The four main performance criteria at UCSD are research and creative activity, teaching, professional competence and activity, and University and public service. The chart below indicates the specific criteria required for each series used at UCSD. Accomplishments in each of these areas, as well as other performance-related information, must be discussed in the departmental recommendation letter.

In addition to the information presented in this section, departments are encouraged to review [APM 210, Review and Appraisal Committees](#). This APM section sets forth the criteria and standards used by review committees when advising on actions concerning a number of academic series.

The policies for evaluating Senate and non-Senate assistant-rank appointees are set forth in section VII. D. (Senate appointees), and E. (Non-Senate appointees).

PERFORMANCE REVIEW CRITERIA AT UCSD				
	Research & Creative Activity	Teaching	Professional Competence & Activity	University & Public Service
Professor (Ladder-Rank) Series	X	X	X	X
Professor In Residence Series	X	X	X	X
Professor of Clinical X Series	X	X	X	X
Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series	X(a)	X	X	X
Adjunct Professor Series	X	X(b)	X	X
Lecturers with Security of Employment (SOE) Series		X	X	X
Professional Research (Research Scientist) Series	X		X	X(c)
Project Scientist Series	X		X	
Specialist Series	X		X	
Academic Administrator Series and Academic Coordinator Series	(d)		X	X
Librarian Series	X		X	X
Continuing Educator Series & Program Coordinator Series			X	X

- (a) Appointees in this series are expected to engage in *some* scholarly or creative activity appropriate to the clinical discipline.
- (b) Equivalent to at least one course per year.
- (c) Appointees at the Associate and Full level are expected to engage in University and/or public service.
- (d) Although an Academic Administrator or Coordinator may oversee a program involving research, responsibility for engaging in research, while desirable, is not required for this series.

A. Professor (Ladder-Rank) Series and Professor In Residence Series

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for minimum standards in judging the appointee, not to set boundaries to exclude other elements of performance that may be considered.

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Teaching, research, and professional and public service contributions that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the appointee's qualifications. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms, including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students or new faculty members are to be encouraged and given recognition in the teaching or service categories of academic personnel actions.

1. Research and Other Creative Activity

Research publications and other creative accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the appointee is continuously and effectively engaged in research and creative activity of high quality and significance.

- When published work of joint authorship (or any other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, the department should describe the appointee's role in the joint effort. This is crucial for work judged most significant to the case, or when much of the work submitted is multi-authored.
- The type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field should be specified.
- Textbooks, reports, and similar publications normally are considered evidence of teaching ability or public service. However, contributions by faculty members to the professional literature or to the advancement of professional practice or professional education, including contributions to the advancement of equitable access and diversity in education, should be regarded as creative work when they present new ideas or original scholarly research.
- In certain fields, such as art, dance, music, literature, and theater, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in research. In evaluating artistic creativity, the appointee's merit should be defined in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. It should be recognized that in music, theater, and dance, distinguished performance, including conducting and directing, is evidence of an appointee's creativity.
- Special cases of collaboration occur in the performing arts, and the contribution of a particular collaborator may not be readily discernible by those viewing the finished work. It is the responsibility of the department chair to provide an evaluation of the appointee's contribution to the work and to obtain outside opinions based on observation of the work while in progress.

- The departmental recommendation letter should indicate the standing of the journals in which publications have appeared; in particular, the letter should state whether the journals are refereed.
- Indices of the stature of journals (e.g., journal ratings by professional societies, acceptance/rejection rates, etc.) should be provided for key pieces of work, particularly if they are published in journals that are not likely to be familiar to campus reviewers.
- The appointee's success in obtaining support for research and other creative activity, including support for graduate students, should be addressed. The appointee's role on grants should be indicated (e.g., Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, or Co-Investigator, with the number of other co-investigators specified).

If the department chair is not able to evaluate the appointee's research and other creative accomplishments, assistance should be secured from someone within the department or University, or from experts outside the University.

A mere listing of publications is inadequate; the work must be analyzed with regard to its nature, quality, importance, and impact on the appointee's field. Departmental recommendation letters for School of Medicine faculty should make clear whether clinical case reports are merely historical or whether they contain new ideas or results.

2. Teaching

Clear evidence of high-quality teaching is required for advancement and promotion in the Professor and Professor in Residence series. Departments should develop appropriate procedures for evaluating the teaching performance of faculty at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels.

a. Definition of Teaching

By its broadest definition, teaching is the transmission of knowledge. This embraces a wide range of activities, including classroom and laboratory training, mentoring students outside the classroom, directing or participating in graduate student dissertation work, directing reading groups, and overseeing clinical apprenticeships in the School of Medicine. It also includes studio teaching, seminar and symposium presentations, tutorials, supervision and training of teaching assistants, and independent study endeavors, as well as the writing of textbooks and software.

b. Assessing Quality of Teaching

In assessing the effectiveness of teaching, consideration should be given to the appointee's:

- (1) Command of the subject
- (2) Continuous growth in the subject field
- (3) Ability to effectively organize and present material

- (4) Capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge
- (5) Ability to foster student independence and capacity to reason
- (6) Spirit and enthusiasm, which vitalize the appointee's teaching
- (7) Ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students
- (8) Ability to encourage high standards
- (9) Ability to stimulate superior students to pursue graduate work
- (10) Personal attributes as they affect teaching and students
- (11) Quality of participation in the general guidance, mentoring and advising of students
- (12) Effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups.

The departmental recommendation letter should include a meaningful assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at both the undergraduate and graduate levels of instruction, accompanied by a concise statement of the amount and type of undergraduate and graduate teaching done during each year of the review period, and a statement of whether this is a normal pattern of teaching for someone at that rank and step in that department. Any extraordinary effort or extenuating circumstances, such as the newness, difficulty, or popularity of the course or its content, also should be evaluated. If the teaching assignment appears unusually heavy or light, the letter should explain why. In the School of Medicine, the departmental recommendation letter should indicate the number of students for each elective course offered by the appointee.

c. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

At least one kind of evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate teaching, such as Course and Professor Evaluations (CAPE) reports, is required in each academic review file. More than one form of evaluation is encouraged and may be particularly critical in career reviews. In addition to evaluations, other significant evidence of teaching effectiveness includes:

- (1) Opinions of other faculty members knowledgeable in the appointee's field, particularly if based on class visits, on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the appointee, or on the performance of students taught by the appointee in courses that are prerequisite to those of the assessor.
- (2) Opinions of current graduate and undergraduate students (non-CAPE evaluations).

- (3) Opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the University.
- (4) Creation of new and effective techniques of instruction, including techniques that meet the needs of students from groups that are underrepresented in the field of instruction.
- (5) Course materials such as the syllabus and reading lists, a description of the course and its goals, and a self-evaluation statement on the achievement of these goals by the appointee. The input of colleagues in team-teaching situations also would be valuable.
- (6) Documentation of any teaching awards received during the review period.

Note: Those who provide opinions on teaching should first be solicited and provided with the University's confidentiality statement.

In addition to an evaluation of regularly scheduled undergraduate and graduate classes, the departmental recommendation letter should include an assessment of the appointee's non-structured activities, which the appointee has documented on the biobib form, including discussion of:

- undergraduate research students, master's and doctoral candidates, postdoctoral or medical fellows, interns and residents, and any other students mentored outside of the structured classroom setting; and
- the appointee's role (e.g., thesis adviser, research adviser) for each student.

3. Professional Competence and Activity

In the professional schools, such as Engineering, Health Sciences, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for advancement. The appointee's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems, including those that specifically address the professional advancement of individuals in underrepresented groups in the appointee's field. It is the responsibility of the department chair to provide evidence of the appointee's achievements in this area.

In the Health Sciences, faculty at the Associate rank or above who have clinical responsibilities should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.

4. University and Public Service

Academic appointees play an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty government, University committees, and the formulation of departmental, college, divisional, school, and University policies.

L. Acting Titles

An academic review file must be submitted in order to reappoint an individual to a new term under an Acting title.

Since the Acting prefix may be used only in the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series, the departmental recommendation letter should discuss the individual's performance based on the criteria for the Professor series.

M. Visiting Titles

An academic review file must be submitted to reappoint an individual to a new term under a Visiting title.

Although no steps are assigned to Visiting appointees, the departmental recommendation letter must justify the salary level recommended. Visiting appointments may be made for a period of up to one year; total service is limited to two consecutive years.

The criteria for evaluation of an appointee for reappointment in a Visiting title are the same as for the corresponding regular title. Because the appointment is temporary, reasonable flexibility may be employed in the application of these criteria.

The departmental recommendation letter should describe clearly the special expertise that the visitor brings to the campus and should clearly state that the individual will be returning to the home institution upon completion of the visiting appointment.

N. Recall Titles

The policies and procedures for recall appointments are set forth in [PPM 230-20, Appointment of Academic Personnel](#).

O. Non-salaried Instructional Titles

1. For individuals whose primary employment is not at the University:
 - Reappointment may be made for a period of two or three years, depending on the appointee's rank (e.g., two years for the Assistant rank).
 - Reappointment files should include the same documentation required for salaried appointees in the title or series.

2. For individuals with full-time salaried positions at the University:

Reappointment may be made for two to three years, corresponding to the appointment period in the appointee's salaried title. In such instances, only one academic review file should be submitted for both the reappointment in the non-salaried instructional title and the recommendation for action in the salaried title. The departmental recommendation letter must evaluate the service in each area and clearly outline the type and amount of teaching the appointee will do.

VI. PREPARING THE ACADEMIC REVIEW FILE

An academic review file is first prepared by the candidate and the department for departmental review. Once a decision regarding the departmental recommendation is reached, the file, with the department recommendation letter, is submitted for campus review and decision. The department is responsible for preparing the academic review file for department consideration, and for submitting the file for campus review. If the academic review file is not submitted for

SECTION: 230-28 Page 21

Effective: 9/1/08

Supersedes: 3/1/2003

Issuing Office: Academic Personnel

campus review by the established deadline, the academic review file will not be considered until the next academic review cycle.

The department chair is responsible for ensuring compliance with [PPM 230-29, Policies and Procedures to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Review Process](#).

The required documentation (which varies depending upon the proposed action) is set forth in the chart below.

Detailed [instructions on preparing academic advancement and reappointment review files](#) are available on the Academic Personnel Web site.

FILE DOCUMENTS	REAPPOINTMENT	MERIT	ACCELERATED MERIT	PROMOTION/ CAREER REVIEW
Academic Recommendation Summary	X	X	X	X
UC Academic Employment History	X	X	X	X
Departmental Recommendation Letter	X	X	X	X
Certification A/ Certification B	X	X	X	X
Departmental Ad Hoc Report	To be submitted whenever a departmental ad hoc is convened			
Appointee's Personal Statement (if any)	Optional	Optional	Optional	Optional
External Referee Solicitation Letter (1 copy)				X**
Identification and Qualifications of External referees				X
Number of External Referee Letters				5 for promotion to Associate 3 for promotion to Full and other career reviews
Course Load/ Case Load Form	X *	X	X	X
Teaching Evaluations	Required for all instructional titles			
Level of Administrative Responsibility (LAR) Form	Required for Academic Administrators and Academic Coordinators			
Updated Biography and Bibliography Form	X	X	X	X
Sabbatical Leave Report, if applicable	X *	X	X	X
Publications/ Reviews/Creative Work	X *	X	X	X

*Not required for temporary files

** External referee letters are not required if the departmental recommendation is termination.

VII. DETERMINING DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Computation of Rank and Step to Determine Eligibility for Advancement

Normal periods of service are assigned to the various steps in the published academic salary schedules. When reviewing each academic appointee within a department, the department chair is responsible for computing the number of years the appointee has served at rank and step in order to determine whether he or she is eligible for normal advancement.

Every academic appointee must be reviewed at least every five years.

1. Normal Periods of Service

The normal period of service at each step in the Assistant Professor rank is two years, although it may be one year at steps V and VI. The first four steps are for normal use. Crossover steps V and VI may be used in exceptional situations and with proper justification. In case of subsequent promotion to Associate Professor, previous service at crossover steps V or VI and the conclusions of a career review are used to determine the entry step in the Associate rank. Service at Assistant, Step V, may be in lieu of service at Associate, Step I; service at Assistant, Step VI, may be in lieu of service at Associate, Step II.

Advancement to a crossover step is recommended when a file contains evidence demonstrating that the appointee is making timely progress on the kind of substantial research and creative projects that are likely, when completed, to justify promotion.

The normal total period of service at the Associate rank is six years. The normal period of service at any of the first three steps in the Associate rank is two years. Crossover Steps IV and V may be used in exceptional situations and with proper justification. The normal period of service at Steps IV and V is three years. In case of subsequent promotion to the Full level, previous service at Crossover Steps IV or V and the conclusions of a career review determine the entry step in the Full rank. Service at Associate, Step IV, may be in lieu of service at the Full level, Step I; service at Associate, Step V, may be in lieu of service at the Full level, Step II.

For the Full rank, the normal period of service is three years in each of the first eight steps. A career review is required for advancement beyond Step V. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration, though a review must be conducted every three years. 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 excellent University teaching. There must be evidence of continuing achievement in all areas at the prescribed level. Continuing great distinction in scholarly and creative achievement should be recognized nationally or internationally.

Advancement to Steps VII, VIII, and IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the previous step and only will be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

SECTION: 230-28 Page 23

Effective: 9/1/08

Supersedes: 3/1/2003

Issuing Office: Academic Personnel

Advancement to Above Scale is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance and service are excellent. (The honorary title of Distinguished Professor will be conferred on those who advance to Above Scale in the Professor [Ladder-Rank] Series.) 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 are not a justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. The academic review file must reflect a critical career review.

A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

The normal salary increase for a person in the Above Scale category is either 50% or 100% of the difference between the top two steps of the salary scale for the Professor series. Files proposing 100% of the difference between the top two steps must demonstrate exemplary performance in all areas (research and creative activity, teaching, service, and professional competence and activity). Files proposing more than 100% of the difference between the top two steps will be considered acceleration files.

Assistant Professor:	
Assistant Professor I Assistant Professor II Assistant Professor III Assistant Professor IV	Two years at each step
<i>Crossover Steps:</i>	
Assistant Professor V Assistant Professor VI	1 or 2 years
Associate Professor:	
Associate Professor I Associate Professor II Associate Professor III	Two years at each step
<i>Crossover Steps:</i>	
Associate Professor IV Associate Professor V	1, 2 or 3 years
Professor:	
Professor I Professor II Professor III Professor IV	Three years at step
Professor V Professor VI Professor VII Professor VIII	3 years or indefinite
Professor IX	4 years or indefinite
Professor, Above Scale	4 years at each salary level or indefinite

2. Special Considerations

- a. Academic year: An academic-year appointee who has served at least two full quarters in any fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) will receive credit for one year of service at rank and step. An academic-year appointee who has served just one quarter in any fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) will not receive credit for that year's service at rank and step.
- b. Fiscal year: A fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period July 1 through January 1 will receive credit for one year of service at rank and step. A fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period January 2 through June 30 will not receive credit for that year's service at rank and step.

Refer to [PPM 230-20](#) for additional information on calculating years at rank and step.

B. Formal Recommendation

After determining the years at rank and step and complying with the requirement for consultation with other members of the faculty or with the principal investigator, etc., a department chair may recommend one of the following actions:

1. Deferral

With appropriate justification, an appointee may request that his or her regularly scheduled academic review be deferred. An appointee may request a maximum of two consecutive deferrals. Obtaining approval of a deferral request is the only alternative to recommending a no-change action.

An appointee may request a deferral of his or her academic review when:

- 1) there is evidence that work in progress will come to fruition within the year and that having the additional year will make a difference in the result of the next review; or
- 2) circumstances beyond the appointee's control have impacted his or her productivity (i.e., illness, family member's illness, etc.).

The appropriate dean has the authority to approve the first deferral request. The Senior Vice Chancellor must approve a second consecutive deferral request. In general, the following appointees are not eligible to defer academic reviews: Assistant-rank appointees (except when approved as a family accommodation; see [PPM 230-15, Family Accommodations](#)), non-salaried Adjunct Professors, and appointees with established ending dates (term appointments).

Deferral requests must be submitted to the appointee's department(s) no later than October 15.

2. Appointee Not Recommended for Advancement (No Change)

An academic review file must be prepared and submitted for review for an appointee serving in the final year of the normal period at step¹, even if the appointee is not recommended for advancement. A department should propose a

¹ For appointees subject to APM 137, this applies only if the appointee is to be reappointed.

no-change action if productivity is not sufficient to justify advancement, or if the appointee is unresponsive to departmental requests to submit updated file materials. For appointees subject to APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the department may allow the appointment to expire instead of recommending a no-change action.

If the appointee has an off-scale salary, its disposition should be discussed in the departmental letter. For instance, if a market off-scale salary is due to be rejustified at the time of a no-change action, and no argument is included in the file to reset the market off-scale salary, the letter should state that the market off-scale salary will be tapered in accordance with PPM 230-28 VII.B.5.

After a no-change action takes effect, the appointee's review cycle will be reset for the normal two-, three-, or four-year cycle. Should the department propose advancement prior to the end of the appointee's normal review cycle, this action will not be considered an acceleration.

3. Appointee Recommended for Merit Advancement or Promotion

If an appointee is serving in the final year of the normal period at step, he or she is eligible for a merit advancement (or promotion, if applicable and if the appointee has met the criteria) on the following July 1.

A merit advancement is an advancement in step and salary rate (or advancement to a further-above-scale salary) without a change in title or rank. Normal years at rank and step are outlined above and in the Academic Salary Scales ([PPM 230-40](#)). A promotion is an advancement from one rank to a higher rank within a series and requires a full career review. Other advancements that require career reviews include advancement to and through Professor, Step VI (and comparable titles), and to Above Scale.

4. Appointee Recommended for Accelerated Merit Advancement or Accelerated Promotion

Acceleration occurs when an individual receives a merit advancement or promotion after serving fewer years at a given step than is normal for that step. It also occurs when, through advancement, an entire step is skipped.

Promotion from the Assistant level to the Associate level, regardless of when proposed, is not considered an acceleration. Assistant-level appointees should be proposed for promotion whenever they are deemed ready for such advancement. However, a promotion to a higher-than-normal step at the Associate level is considered an acceleration.

For Assistant-level and Acting Assistant-level appointees, a proposed merit advancement within the Assistant rank is an acceleration if it becomes effective after the individual has spent less than two years at the current salary step. When an Acting Assistant Professor serves one year, for example, at Step I on the "Acting" scale, and then is regularized and spends one year as Assistant Professor, Step I, a merit advancement to Step II after these two years is not an acceleration.

If an Associate Professor is promoted to Professor after two years at Step III, it is considered a normal promotion even if the individual has not spent six years as Associate Professor.

For Professors at Step I through VIII, a merit advancement is an acceleration if it becomes effective after the individual has spent less than three years at the current salary step. For Professors at Step IX and Above Scale, a merit advancement is an acceleration if it becomes effective after the individual has spent less than four years at the current step. There must be rare and compelling reasons for accelerated advancement to or as Professor, Above Scale, and departments must address the rare and compelling reasons when proposing such advancement.

Accelerations should be used to reward extraordinary contributions in research and creative activity, teaching, or other scholarly and educational contributions, or for recalibration purposes at career reviews. The Senate Committee on Academic Personnel discourages one-year accelerations unless there are extraordinary reasons for them. Further, acceleration cases should not be proposed if there is a weakness in the appointee's performance in any area of responsibility specified in the review criteria.

It should be noted that acceleration requires demonstration of unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth. The degree of achievement required for acceleration is greater than that expected for normal advancement; the character of achievement required for acceleration is identical to that expected for normal advancement. The departmental recommendation letter should state that the advancement is accelerated, and the academic review file must be documented accordingly. A departmental recommendation letter proposing accelerated advancement must include a statement describing the department standards for a normal advancement to the same rank and step.

The departmental recommendation letter must specifically describe the impact on the discipline of the work that is being used as a justification for acceleration. Acceleration proposed on the grounds of unpublished work or work that has not yet been evaluated by a scholarly public is not appropriate. An acceleration proposal based primarily on the quality and quantity of contributions other than research and other creative activity must contain documentation and evidence of these extraordinary achievements.

5. Appointee Recommended for an Off-Scale Salary Component

An appointee may also be recommended for an off-scale salary component. A *bonus off-scale* salary component (one-half step increment) may be proposed to reward achievements in lieu of a merit (step) advancement, or to reward achievements in excess of those required for a merit advancement, but less than those needed for a step acceleration. A *market off-scale* component may be proposed when retention is an issue or to reflect disciplinary or subfield conditions.

Effective July 1, 2003, bonus off-scale awards are made in one-half step increments and are paid over a single review period. Payments occur monthly for each year of the review period, ending at the time of the next review. If an appointee receives an off-cycle advancement during the bonus award period, the bonus award will end immediately prior to the effective date of the advancement. For appointees who are not advanced at the next review following the award of a bonus, the bonus will be reduced at the time of annual salary range adjustments and/or future advancements, so that there is no reduction in salary.

Market off-scale salary components must be re-evaluated six years after they are established. To re-establish an individual's "market worth," the department is required to:

- Show that the individual has sustained a high level of performance over the six-year period
- Provide evidence that the individual has maintained his or her position as a leader in the field of research
- Describe the importance to the department and the campus of retaining the individual at UCSD

Market considerations within a specific discipline may also justify an off-scale salary. Supporting information may include salary data from academic institutions of comparable stature and/or discipline-based salary studies by national organizations.

If a market off-scale component can no longer be justified, the individual's salary must be tapered back to scale. Note that tapering should not cause a decrease in salary. Thus, tapering can only be done at the time of an advancement in step and/or a cost-of-living adjustment to the salary scales.

For an appointee who advances to Above Scale and whose market off-scale salary component is not yet due for rejustification, the market off-scale salary component will be folded into the new above-scale salary.

C. Career Equity Review

A Career Equity Review (CER) is an evaluation to determine whether a faculty member is correctly calibrated in rank and step. It is not a means of appeal for or expression of disagreement with a single personnel decision. The CER process examines cases in which normal personnel actions, from the initial hiring onward, may have resulted in an inaccurate rank and/or step designation. When warranted, a CER review may result in the recalibration of the faculty member to a higher rank and step consistent with prevailing UCSD standards.

A CER is available to Senate faculty members (excluding those at the LPSOE, Assistant, or Above Scale levels). A CER may be requested only once while the faculty member is at the Associate Professor level, once while at the Full Professor level prior to advancement to Professor, Step VI, and once after advancement to Professor, Step VI, prior to advancement to Above Scale.

The decision to initiate a CER rests solely with the faculty member. A CER may be initiated by a faculty member only at the time of his or her regular on-cycle academic review by submitting a written request to the department chair or to the appropriate dean. If the request is submitted to the department chair, a copy should also be submitted to the dean.

A request for a CER must contain the specific rank and step desired and justification for the recalibration. Possible justification may include, but is not limited to, the following assessments: 1) the cumulative record warrants an acceleration, even though no one review period did; 2) the rank/step was low at the time of initial appointment; 3) particular work and contributions should be reevaluated by the department and/or other reviewing bodies.

The faculty member must identify the specific area(s) of the record that he or she believes should be reevaluated. The faculty member may submit selected publications from earlier review periods that he or she considers relevant to the CER request.

The CER is conducted in parallel with the regularly scheduled academic review. The department chair should compile an academic review file that addresses the appointee's entire academic record for the purposes of the CER, as well as the regular action for the current review period. If the CER request involves advancement to or through a "barrier" step (promotion to Full Professor or advancement to Professor, Step VI, or to Professor, Above Scale), the department must seek external referee letters addressing the barrier step advancement for inclusion in the file. The academic review file must include the faculty member's request for the CER.

The department should assess the appointee's accomplishments during the review period and determine its recommendation regarding the regular action (e.g., merit advancement). This should be done by a vote of the eligible faculty, if this is the normal department practice. The department should then determine its recommendation regarding recalibration on the basis of a CER, and this must be determined by a vote of eligible faculty. This recommendation should be based upon the appointee's overall record and the University's established criteria for the requested rank and step, with one exception: If a significantly higher rank or step is requested, the case will not require demonstration of the basis for an accelerated advancement. The purpose of the CER is to assess rank and step, and therefore recommendation of a bonus off-scale salary award in lieu of recalibration is not appropriate.

Regardless of the department's recommendation, both review processes should be discussed in the departmental recommendation letter, and the vote(s) should be recorded on the Academic Recommendation Summary. The letter should also state what materials were evaluated in order to arrive at the recommendation regarding the CER. The summary should clearly indicate that the file is both a review for the regular action for the current review period and a career equity review.

If recalibration is approved, the effective date will be the same as that which would have applied to the regular action.

CERs are intended to supplement regular academic reviews, and they neither replace nor affect existing procedures for regular reviews.

The Senior Vice Chancellor's decision on the CER is not subject to appeal and is not retroactive.

D. Evaluation of Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees

This section applies to appointees in the Professor (Ladder-Rank), Professor In Residence, and Professor of Clinical X series.

1. Probationary Period

At UCSD, promotion consideration typically occurs in the sixth year of appointment at the Assistant rank. The period of time prior to consideration for promotion is referred to as the probationary period. During the probationary period, Assistant-rank appointees are expected to produce work sufficient to justify promotion.

There are limited circumstances in which the probationary period may be extended, most commonly as a family accommodation (see [PPM 230-15, Family Accommodations Policy](#)).

2. Procedural Safeguards

PPM 230-29, Policies and Procedures to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Review Process, sets forth procedural safeguards to ensure the academic review process is fair and consistent. When conducting an evaluation of a Senate Assistant-rank appointee, particular attention should be paid to PPM 230-29 Section III. D. (procedural safeguards) and Section III. E. (additional safeguards for Assistant-level appointees).

3. Terms of Service

Each reappointment at the Assistant rank is limited to a maximum term of two years. Reappointment may be for a period of less than two years only under the following circumstances:

- a. An appointment or reappointment with an effective date other than July 1 must end on the second June 30 following the appointment date.
- b. A promotion or merit advancement may become effective before the end of a two-year term and will mark the beginning of a new term of appointment.
- c. When the status of an Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor is changed to Assistant Professor, the new appointment will normally end on the second June 30 following the effective date of the Acting or Visiting appointment. The combined initial period of service in the Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor title and the Assistant Professor title should not exceed two years.
- d. A reappointment to a terminal period of service may be for a term of less than two years, provided adequate notice is provided (see Section 9 below).

There is no assurance of reappointment, merit advancement, or eventual promotion. Decisions about reappointment and advancement are based upon careful reviews of an appointee's achievements and promise for continued progress, in accordance with the [UCSD Authority and Review Chart](#).

4. First Reappointment/Merit Review

The first reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs during the second year of appointment. As a result of the first reappointment/merit review, the department should submit one of the following recommendations:

Reappointment with Merit Advancement

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

Reappointment without Merit Advancement

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

Non-Reappointment

If an appointee is not making acceptable progress, the eligible department faculty² may vote to recommend non-reappointment at the end of the first two-year appointment period.

When appointment at the Assistant rank is not to be renewed, an appointee must receive written notice from the Senior Vice Chancellor in advance of the expiration date in accordance with the following schedule:

- (1) An appointee who will have accrued less than one year of University service by the end of the current appointment must receive four months' notice.
- (2) An appointee who will have accrued at least one complete year but not more than two years of University service by the end of the current appointment period must receive six months' notice.

The Committee on Academic Personnel must review a recommendation of non-reappointment for Senate faculty. The Senior Vice Chancellor has final authority to approve a recommendation of non-reappointment.

5. Second Reappointment/Merit Review

The second reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the fourth year of appointment. The second reappointment/merit review is usually combined with an appraisal (see Section 6 below).

As a result of the second reappointment/merit review, the department should submit one of the following recommendations:

Reappointment with Merit Advancement

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

Reappointment without Merit Advancement

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

Termination

If an appointee's performance is unacceptable, the department may consider termination. A recommendation to terminate an assistant-rank appointee requires a vote of the eligible department faculty and may only be recommended after the department has conducted an appraisal (see Section 6 below).

6. Appraisal

An Assistant-rank appointee must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of his or her achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for faculty.

² Department faculty voting rights are set forth in University of California Academic Senate Bylaw 55.

An appraisal should provide an appointee with a careful, considered, analytical evaluation of his or her performance to date in the areas of research and creative work, teaching, professional competence and activity, and University and public service, as well as a candid assessment of his or her potential for promotion, based upon the evidence.

a. Timing

The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with the second reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.

No appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of the appraisal, an appointee is recommended for a promotion that will take effect within a year, or has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.

b. Department Consideration

The following factors should be evaluated when conducting an appraisal:

- An appointee's published research and other completed creative activity and his or her potential for continued research and creative activity.
- At least one type of student or faculty evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate-level instruction, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as course syllabi, reading lists, and statements of course goals.
- An appointee's departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

If the appointee has made significant scholarly contributions (such as research or teaching) in another academic unit, the department should solicit input from the unit on the appointee's contributions.

External letters are not required for an appraisal.

If an appointee has been advised at any time of departmental concerns or reservations about continuation of appointment, this should be considered and stated in the departmental letter of recommendation. If the appointee has been advised in writing, a copy of such correspondence should be included in the academic review file.

c. Appraisal Vote

After evaluating and discussing an appointee's achievements and prospects for promotion, the eligible department faculty should vote on an appraisal rating. The possible appraisal ratings are as follows:

FAVORABLE	Indicates that promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining the current trajectory of excellence and on appropriate external validation.
FAVORABLE WITH RESERVATIONS	Indicates that promotion is likely, if identified weaknesses or imbalances in the record are corrected.
PROBLEMATIC	Indicates that promotion is possible if substantial deficiencies in the present record are remedied.
UNFAVORABLE	Indicates that substantial deficiencies are present; promotion is unlikely.

If the vote results in an Unfavorable rating:

If the majority of eligible department faculty vote for an appraisal rating of "unfavorable," a second vote of the faculty should be taken to determine whether the department wishes to continue the appointment or recommend termination.

(1) Result of second faculty vote: Continuation of Appointment is Recommended

When the appraisal is combined with a reappointment/merit review, the department must make a recommendation regarding reappointment and merit advancement (see Section 5 above).

Reappointment with merit advancement indicates that sufficient work has been completed during the review period to justify merit advancement, and the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.

Reappointment without merit advancement indicates there has not been sufficient work completed in the review period to justify merit advancement, but the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.

(2) Result of second faculty vote: Termination of Appointment is Recommended

Termination should be considered if the majority of voting faculty are convinced the substantial deficiencies cannot be corrected in time for consideration for promotion and therefore further effort will not result in promotion.

The departmental letter should discuss the justification for the recommendation to terminate, as well as the details of the vote.

d. Promotion

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees.

e. Campus Review

The Committee on Academic Personnel must review appraisals. An ad hoc review committee may be appointed if deemed necessary by the Senior Vice Chancellor or the Committee on Academic Personnel.

The Senior Vice Chancellor has authority to determine the final outcome of appraisals.

At the conclusion of the campus review process, the Senior Vice Chancellor will inform the department of the final outcome of the appraisal, as well as any information or advice resulting from the appraisal. The department chair must discuss the results of the appraisal with the appointee and provide the appointee a copy of the Senior Vice Chancellor's letter.

7. Readiness Assessment

A readiness assessment is a department-level evaluation of an appointee's career achievements and readiness for promotion.

If it has not already occurred, a readiness assessment must take place at the time of an appointee's final merit/reappointment review.

The eligible department faculty must vote on whether an appointee should be recommended for promotion, whether the promotion review should be postponed, or whether the appointee should be terminated.

a. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

b. Postponement of Promotion Review

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong, and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

c. Termination is Recommended

If the department believes an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, the department may vote to recommend termination with notice.

External letters of reference are not required if the department recommendation is termination. However, the departmental recommendation letter must include information on the appraisal rating and should indicate how an appointee failed to improve sufficiently or declined in performance such that promotion is not justified.

d. Campus Review

Once the departmental recommendation is determined, the department must prepare the academic review file for campus review and submit it in accordance with established campus deadlines.

8. Tenure or Security of Employment

For an appointee to be promoted to a title that accords tenure or security of employment, the appointee must hold a title eligible for tenure or security of employment, and the Senior Vice Chancellor must provide in writing an affirmative decision to grant tenure or security of employment following a review process that involves consultation with the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP).

9. Notice of Termination

A Senate Assistant-rank appointee with more than two years of University service must be provided 12 months' notice of termination. Only the Senior Vice Chancellor may provide an appointee with written notice of termination.

If adequate notice of termination cannot be provided due to error or oversight, the Senior Vice Chancellor may authorize an extension of the appointment for a period not to exceed one year.

Neither the failure to provide the required notice nor extension of the appointment will afford tenure, security of employment, or promotion.

10. Reconsideration

An appointee who has received notice of termination resulting from a readiness assessment may ask to be reconsidered for promotion. Reconsideration will only be permitted when there is substantial evidence of significant improvement in the appointee's record of scholarly achievement since the termination decision was reached, particularly with respect to those elements of the record previously identified as areas of weakness.

Pre-approval from the Senior Vice Chancellor is required prior to preparing and submitting a reconsideration file.

An appointee must submit a request memo to his or her department chair detailing the evidence of improvements in his or her academic record. The department chair, after consultation with the department faculty if necessary, will draft a departmental letter of support or disagreement and forward the request memo and the departmental letter to the Senior Vice Chancellor via the dean. The request should be submitted to the Senior Vice Chancellor as soon as possible, but no later than October 15 of the terminal year.

The request memo does not constitute an academic review and therefore a complete file is not required. However, the memo should provide enough information on the substantial evidence of significant improvement to justify reconsideration of the termination decision.

The Senior Vice Chancellor, in consultation with CAP, will consider the request, the departmental letter, and the evidence presented to determine whether reconsideration is appropriate.

The Senior Vice Chancellor will communicate to the department chair whether a reconsideration file will be accepted.

Approval of a request to prepare a reconsideration file does not indicate that a different outcome is guaranteed or appropriate, only that sufficient new evidence exists that it is appropriate to request reconsideration of the termination decision.

A reconsideration file, if approved for submission, must be received in the Academic Personnel office no later than February 15 of the terminal year. All reconsideration files are submitted to CAP for review. Neither submission of a reconsideration file nor a failure to meet the file deadline will postpone a terminal appointment ending date.

A reconsideration file is typically prepared and considered during an appointee's 12 months' notice period. If a final decision has not been made by the ending date of the terminal period of service, the appointment will end as scheduled. If reconsideration results in a decision to promote, the promotion action becomes effective retroactive to July 1, regardless of when the decision is reached.

11. Five-Year Prohibition of Appointment

When there has been an academic review of an Assistant Professor, an Assistant Professor in Residence, an Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine), or a Lecturer PSOE or Senior Lecturer PSOE appointed at more than 50% time, and the review has resulted in a decision not to continue the individual's appointment in that series (non-reappointment or termination), the individual may not be appointed for a period of five years at any campus of the University of California to the following academic series and titles:

- Professor series
- Acting titles
- Visiting titles
- Professor In Residence series
- Adjunct Professor series

- Professor of Clinical (*e.g., Medicine*) series
- Health Sciences Clinical Professor series
- Research Scientist series
- Supervisor of Physical Education series
- Supervisor of Teacher Education
- Lecturer
- Senior Lecturer
- Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment
- Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment
- Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Coordinator of Field Work
- Field Work Supervisor
- Field Work Consultant

Note: The title Lecturer in Summer Session and the Clinical Professor, Voluntary series are not included in this list.

E. Evaluation of Non-Senate Assistant-Rank Appointees

This section applies to assistant-rank appointees in non-Senate series, including the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, Professional Research (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, and Specialist series.

1. Probationary Period

At UCSD, promotion consideration typically occurs in the sixth year of appointment at the Assistant rank. The period of time prior to consideration for promotion is referred to as the probationary period. During the probationary period, Assistant-rank appointees are expected to produce work sufficient to justify promotion.

There are limited circumstances in which the probationary period may be extended, most commonly as a family accommodation (see [PPM 230-15, Family Accommodations Policy](#)).

2. Procedural Safeguards

PPM 230-29, Policies and Procedures to Assure Fairness in the Academic Personnel Review Process, sets forth procedural safeguards to ensure the academic review process is fair and consistent. When conducting an evaluation of a non-Senate Assistant-rank appointee, particular attention should be paid to PPM 230-29 Section III. D. (procedural safeguards) and Section III. E. (additional safeguards for Assistant-level appointees).

3. Terms of Service

Each reappointment at the Assistant rank is limited to a maximum term of two years. Reappointment may be for a period of less than two years.

There is no assurance of reappointment, merit advancement, or eventual promotion. The University has the discretion to appoint and reappoint non-Senate academic appointees with term appointments; reappointment is not automatic. Advancement and reappointment decisions are made in accordance with the [UCSD Authority and Review Chart](#).

4. Reappointment/Merit Review

When a non-Senate appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

Reappointment with Merit Advancement

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend reappointment with merit advancement.

Reappointment without Merit Advancement

If an appointee's performance does not justify a merit, the department may recommend reappointment with no merit advancement.

5. Appraisal

An assistant-rank appointee in the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, or Professional Research (Research Scientist) series must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of his or her achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for academic appointees.

Departments may conduct appraisals for appointees in other non-Senate series if the department believes such an assessment would be valuable to the department and/or appointee.

An appraisal should provide an appointee with a careful, considered, analytical evaluation of his or her performance to date in the applicable areas of research and creative work, teaching, professional competence and activity, and University and public service, as well as a candid assessment of his or her potential for promotion, based upon the evidence.

a. Timing

The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with a reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.

An appraisal is not required if, prior to the normal occurrence of the appraisal, an appointee is recommended for a promotion that will take effect within a year, or has given written notice of resignation, or the department has not prepared a reappointment file and the appointment will therefore expire on the established ending date.

b. Department Consideration

The following factors should be evaluated, if appropriate for the series, when conducting an appraisal:

- An appointee's published research and other completed creative activity and his or her potential for continued research and creative activity.
- At least one type of student or faculty evaluation each for undergraduate and graduate-level instruction, and other evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as course syllabi, reading lists, and statements of course goals, as applicable.
- An appointee's departmental, University, community or professional service contributions, as applicable.
- Professional (clinical) competence and activity (patient care)
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

If the appointee has made significant scholarly contributions (such as research or teaching) in another academic unit, the department should solicit input from the unit on the appointee's contributions.

External letters are not required for an appraisal.

If an appointee has been advised at any time of departmental concerns or reservations about continuation of appointment, this should be considered and stated in the departmental letter of recommendation. If the appointee has been advised in writing, a copy of such correspondence should be included in the appraisal review file.

c. Appraisal Vote

An appraisal vote is not required for non-Senate appointees; however, departments and/or divisions may choose to establish voting procedures for non-Senate appraisals.

A department may form a departmental ad hoc committee in order to assess the appointee's achievements and activities.

The departmental recommendation letter should discuss the nature and extent of department consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result of a vote, if taken.

d. Promotion

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees.

6. Readiness Assessment

A readiness assessment is a department-level evaluation of an appointee's career achievements and readiness for promotion.

If it has not already occurred, a readiness assessment must take place at the time of an appointee's final merit/reappointment review.

The department must determine whether an appointee should be recommended for promotion, whether the promotion review should be postponed, or whether the appointee should not be reappointed.

a. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

b. Postponement of Promotion Review

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed within the reappointment period (either one or two years) and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong, and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

c. Non-reappointment

If the department believes that an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

d. Campus Review

If the department recommends promotion, an academic review file must be prepared for campus review and submitted in accordance with established campus deadlines.

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

7. Notice of Non-Reappointment

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required³, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

VIII. VOTING AND CONSULTATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT

A. Faculty Consultation and Voting

Certain actions require a faculty vote, as described in [Academic Senate Bylaw 55](#).

Once the department has compiled the academic review file and the appointee has been provided the opportunity to contribute to and view the file as stipulated in PPM 230-29, Section D (before the departmental recommendation is determined), a vote should be solicited in accordance with Bylaw 55 and the following guidelines:

Except in unusual circumstances, whenever University or departmental policy requires a vote on a proposed action, the action must be supported by at least 50% of the members eligible to vote and in residence on campus in the quarter when the vote is taken. Unusual circumstances may make it impossible to comply with this rule. In such cases, it is incumbent upon the department chair to explain the circumstances in the departmental recommendation letter.

Mail ballots are permissible at any time and may be necessary to ensure a sufficient number of votes on the proposed action.

Ideally, the faculty voting should be familiar with the case through attendance at a department meeting. If this is not possible, faculty should familiarize themselves with the appointee's academic file in order to render an informed vote.

³ In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, notice is not required for appointees who have served fewer than eight consecutive years in the same academic title or title series on a campus. If an appointee has served more than eight consecutive years, notice is required as specified in APM 137.

Faculty should be notified that the file is available for review and that voting will be conducted for a designated period of time. Ballots should be prepared and the complete file should be placed in a location convenient to faculty. The file should be available for review in a location where its integrity and confidentiality will be preserved.

After reviewing the file, each faculty member should mark a ballot and place it in a ballot box or return it via mail. Alternatively, voting may be conducted via e-mail, if the department faculty agree and understand e-mail does not provide complete confidentiality. The votes should be counted at the end of the voting period and the results recorded on the Academic Recommendation Summary and discussed in the departmental recommendation letter.

Except for appraisals, votes should be “for,” “against,” “abstain,” or “absent,” as defined below:

FOR	The voter is in favor of the proposed action.
AGAINST	The voter is not in favor of the proposed action.
ABSTAIN	The voter is available, but has elected to refrain from voting.
ABSENT	The voter is unavailable for voting due to an approved leave or other absence from campus.

B. Proposed Actions Not Covered by Senate Bylaw 55

Departments may develop their own rules, if necessary, for consultation or voting on academic personnel actions not covered by Academic Senate Bylaw 55. The department chair must make clear in the departmental recommendation letter the degree of consultation with faculty.

Note: Though Bylaw 55 does not require it, full faculty voting (by those eligible to vote) on advancements to Step VI and Above Scale is recommended to ensure a clear departmental mandate for such actions, rather than leaving the determination to a departmental ad hoc committee or the department chair, as is sometimes done. Departmental votes are also helpful in evaluating proposals for step advances, including accelerations, and bonus off-scale salary components. For example, a proposed acceleration backed by a unanimous departmental vote carries more weight than one without a vote recorded.

IX. SUBMISSION OF ADVANCEMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT FILES

A. Timely Submission

All academic review files must be submitted to the appropriate dean’s office by the dean’s established deadline.

All academic review files are due in the UCSD Academic Personnel office on or before the due dates set forth in [Campus File Deadlines](#) on the Academic Personnel Web site.

Files received after the stipulated deadline will be returned to the department for submission the following year.

[Instructions for preparing and submitting academic review files](#) are available on the Academic Personnel Web site.

X. ACADEMIC FILE REVIEW AND FINAL AUTHORITY

No advancement or reappointment is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the advancement or reappointment.

The UCSD [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

A. The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

The Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) reviews the following proposed actions for appointees in the Professor, Professor In Residence, Professor of Clinical X, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Lecturer–Continuing Appointment, Adjunct Professor⁴, and Professional Research (Research Scientist) series:

- Appraisals
- Merits as Professor, Above Scale
- Accelerations
- New bonus or reset market off-scale salary components
- Career reviews (promotions and advancements to Step VI and Above Scale)
- Career equity reviews
- Crossover merit advancements to Assistant Professor, Steps V and VI, and Associate Professor, Steps IV and V
- Terminations
- Reconsideration of termination decisions
- Initial Continuing Appointments (Unit 18)

Merit proposals and no change actions for appointees in these series will be reviewed by CAP at the request of any concerned party, or if any reviewer disagrees with the proposed action.

CAP reviews all actions proposed for department chairs, deans, and provosts.

B. Other Reviewers

Promotions, career reviews, appraisals, accelerations, crossover merit advancements, and no change actions of appointees in the Project Scientist and Specialist series are reviewed by the Project Scientist/Specialist Review Panel (PSSRP).

Promotions, career reviews, and accelerations of appointees in the Academic Administrator/Coordinator series are reviewed by the Academic Administrator/Coordinator Review Panel (AARP).

Appointments, promotions, career reviews, and accelerations of appointees in the Professor of Clinical X and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series in the School of Medicine are reviewed by SOM CAP

Temporary instructional appointees with appointments of one year or less will be reviewed by the Provost/Council of Provosts (General Campus).

⁴ For appointees who hold only non-salaried Adjunct Professor appointments at UCSD, CAP will only review files at the time of appointment, change in rank, and/or every six years within rank. CAP does not review non-salaried Adjunct Professor appointment files for UCSD faculty holding concurrent salaried appointments.

3) Full Professor: recognition at the institutional and national level.

Method of Evaluation:

The following methods are not all-inclusive and should be used only where appropriate.

- 1) Documentation of the types of teaching carried out, the time involved, the primary teaching role (e.g., clinic or ward attending, lecturer, or mentor), the average number and type of students per year, and the average number of contacts per year. Descriptions of the teaching environment and workload are important.
- 2) Documentation of special courses taught, including the type and setting. These could include, e.g., the physiology section of OPP, a dog laboratory on the use of pulmonary artery catheters or transesophageal echocardiography, the American Heart Association ACLS Course, or a postgraduate course for community physicians on laparoscopic cholecystectomy or management of diabetes. The course could be for medical or allied health students, house officers, or postgraduate physicians. Also documented should be the continuity of the course (year-to-year, for example). Attendance, growth of attendance, and participant evaluations of the course should be included.
- 3) Letters or standardized teaching evaluations from students who have been taught at the individual, group, and conference levels. Students may be required to submit evaluations of their teachers for completion of a course of studies. There must be more than one kind of teaching assessment.
- 4) Recommendations and critical reviews from fellow educators at the parent institution or from other institutions, outside physicians and other health care personnel, including unsolicited commendations. These should be based on personal observation of the candidate's teaching (including peer review). Letters from patients may be included, but would receive less weight if not critically written.
- 5) Documentation of teaching leadership in the department, medical centers or Health Sciences; in some cases may be indicated by title (e.g., Director of Training Program), in all cases by extent of responsibility and recognition.
- 6) Description of teaching awards received and the basis for the recognition.
- 7) Documentation of the number of invitations to participate in conferences and CME courses. The type of conference and sponsoring institution should be recorded. Teaching ratings and comments from the participants should be included. If available, ratings of other lecturers (with identity undisclosed) should be included with this information for comparison.
- 8) Roles in educational organizations (e.g., offices, committees, or boards of directors). The duties performed and the innovations accomplished should be outlined. Leadership contributions to the organization of educational activities in Health Sciences may also be considered and evaluated here, beyond ordinary participation as university service.
- 9) Documentation of a role in running a scientific or clinical meeting locally, nationally, or internationally. This should include factual and evaluative documentation as above. It is also recommended that candidates review their objective evaluations from the sources indicated when consulting with the department chair.

B) Professional Competence and Clinical Activity

These criteria concern the extent and quality of the candidate's clinical performance.

1) The Assistant Professor level:

The candidate must demonstrate an understanding of the subject of his or her clinical activity, as well as an appropriate quality and volume of activity as judged using the methods described below. This evaluation may be based on activity at the UCSD Medical Center or the Veterans Administration San Diego Healthcare System (VASDHS). Clinical services beyond our own institutions, such as at regional or national levels, can serve as further evidence of the candidate's standing. In addition to routine individual patient care, clinical activity may take the form of developing or sustaining specific clinical care programs or programs involving applications of new techniques or new uses of existing therapeutic modalities. These could include, but are not limited to, developing a model program for a diagnostic or therapeutic procedure or a successful clinical program that could be implemented in a new setting. It is important that the candidate demonstrate promise and a desire to progress in the acquisition and application of clinical expertise.

2) The Associate Professor Level:

For appointment or promotion to the associate level, the candidate must be clinically active in the local institution and, in applicable disciplines, at the community or regional levels. The latter are more likely to involve program development, supervision, or consultation, rather than individual patient care, although a regional referral record would certainly qualify. Activities at the national level are desirable but not required. A demonstration of creativity is important in documenting superior clinical achievement.

3) The Professor Level:

For appointment or promotion to full professor, the candidate's clinical influence must be recognized beyond the parent institution and, in applicable disciplines, at the regional and national levels. Activities at the international level are desirable, but not required. A clear demonstration of creativity is important in evaluating clinical achievement, to afford proper recognition and reward.

Methods of Evaluation:

The following list is not all-inclusive. Each method should be used only where appropriate. In each case, the goal is to document excellence, and the data should be evaluated accordingly.

- 1) Testimony from peers and faculty of higher rank. It is important to obtain such testimony from practitioners of the same and related disciplines. This is solicited by the department chair, who would send to prospective evaluators forms that address the quality of critical aspects of practice in that clinical discipline, as explained below. These forms may be similar to ones used to evaluate residents. Also important for perspective are evaluations from outside the department. For example, radiologists could evaluate internists, and vice versa; surgeons could evaluate anesthesiologists, and vice versa.
- 2) Documentation of the pattern of referral, e.g., the extent and number of referrals, as well as the area from which they are drawn--hospital, community, regional, national, or international. A summary of referrals, with names of referring physicians, the number of patients referred by each physician, and a description of the areas of San Diego city and county, California, the nation, and other countries from which they are drawn would be especially useful. A clinician who treats patients from all over the world is probably excellent.

- 3) In specialties that entail the performance of procedures, such as surgery or radiology, documentation of the quality of the candidate's practice (e.g., the number of difficult cases performed or the complication rates) would provide a measure of excellence. In anesthesia, for example, huge databases are being accumulated that can provide a detailed profile of the excellence of a clinician's practice.
- 4) In specialties that render consultations, documentation of the helpfulness or the frequency of error in the rendering of expert opinion would also provide a measure of clinical excellence. These evaluations would usually be obtained outside the candidate's specialty. In particular, primary care physicians may evaluate the quality of consultations by specialists, while specialists can evaluate the quality of referrals by primary care physicians.
- 5) In the case of primary care physicians, documentation of the thoroughness of patient workup and the appropriateness of the requests for consultation by specialists and consultants would serve as a measure of clinical excellence. Chart reviews are also commonly useful in this assessment.
- 6) Establishing or running a clinical service, either inpatient or outpatient. This could include, e.g., trauma, intensive care, ECG, cardiac catheterization, diabetes, child abuse, or drug abuse. The pattern of referral should be documented, as described below.

The success of a service in attracting referrals from outside the University system is an important factor in measuring excellence. Documentation of excellence when the candidate establishes or runs a clinical service should be relatively straightforward. A successful clinical service that attracts a large patient population denotes excellence; after all, one of the reasons for this series is to reward clinicians who can help the medical school, and hence the University.

We realize that evaluating, quantifying, and establishing clinical excellence can be difficult, but several mechanisms exist whereby this is possible. Some data will be more appropriate for procedural specialties than for consulting specialties. To use the example of anesthesia again, in analyzing procedural data, there are certain "flags" that trigger an entry into the anesthesiologist's database. If the anesthesiologist is significantly below the norm — currently only a local norm — counseling is advised. If the candidate is strikingly above that norm, this could serve as one criterion to help establish excellence.

Outcome data, especially a particularly low rate of complications, could also indicate excellence. Evidence that physicians are continually sending their difficult cases to the candidate is an outstanding endorsement of his or her clinical excellence.

As mentioned above, another possibility for establishing excellence is evaluation forms. The following gives examples of evaluation forms that can be used. Note that there are short forms and long forms. The use of the short form is encouraged, since it is more likely to be filled out by the large number of people required to make any evaluation credible. If the short form is used, the department should carefully define each category for the evaluator. Each department should develop its own set of evaluation forms, since the problems and characteristics for each department are different. Similarly, each department should develop different forms for each set of evaluators: students, house officers, members of the department, members of other departments, physicians outside UC, any physician who consults with the candidate, nurses, patients, etc.

Nurses can make excellent evaluators. They pick up subtle factors in clinical performance that most others cannot. For example, they are often the first to spot a decrement in performance in an impaired physician.

The following should be regarded as an example only:

Example of an evaluation form

Rate each of the following according to your experience with the candidate.

Use the appropriate descriptor (extremely effective, very effective, moderately effective, moderately ineffective, totally ineffective, NA).

Communication skills
Accessibility/availability
Clinical skills
Clinical judgment
Creativity
Leadership initiative
Personal qualities

Would you want yourself or a member of your family to be treated by this physician?

C) Creative Work

Many faculty in the health sciences devote a large proportion of their time to the inseparable activities of teaching and clinical service and therefore have less time for formal creative work than most other scholars in the University. Some clinical faculty devote this limited time to academic research activities; others utilize their clinical experience as the basis of their creative work. Nevertheless, an appointee to the Professor of Clinical X series is expected to participate in scholarly pursuits in applied clinical sciences. This includes activities which may be independent or collaborative, and may focus on formal clinical or laboratory research, scholarly publications, or creative educational work.

1) The Assistant Level:

For advancement at the Assistant level, a candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should include at a minimum active participation in such pursuits.

2) The Associate Level:

For appointment or promotion to Associate rank, a candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should have resulted in a significant contribution to knowledge or clinical or educational practice. Independence or leadership in some of these creative activities must also be demonstrated.

3) The Professor Level:

For appointment or promotion to the Professor rank, a candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should manifest continued involvement and leadership in activities such as those described above.

Method of Evaluation:

The candidate's creative work must have been disseminated, e.g., in a body of publications, in teaching materials used in other institutions, or in improvements or innovations in professional practice. For appointment or promotion to higher levels, there should be evidence that these have been adopted or had an influence elsewhere.

- 1) Evidence of achievement may include clinical case reports. Clinical observations are an important contribution to the advancement of practice and knowledge in the health sciences and should be judged by their accuracy, scholarship, and utility.
- 2) The development and evaluation of techniques and procedures by clinical investigators constitute significant and valuable pursuits in the clinical sciences. These activities are necessary for improvement in the practice of health care. Creative achievement may be demonstrated by the development of innovative programs in health care or in transmitting knowledge associated with new fields or other professional activity.
- 3) Textbooks and reference publications, or contributions by candidates to the literature for the advancement of professional education or practice, should be judged as creative when they contain original scholarly work, manifest an innovative approach, or include new information such as research results.
- 4) The development of new or better ways of teaching the basic knowledge and skills required by students in the health sciences may be considered evidence of creative work. This may be demonstrated in written materials, novel approaches to teaching, or, for example, the development of computer methods that can be used for teaching, clinical care, or research.
- 5) Acquisition of extramural resources for clinical or educational programs, including research or practice, is usually an indication of successful creative effort.

The significance of the quantitative productivity level achieved by a candidate should be assessed realistically, with knowledge of the time and institutional resources available to the individual for creative work, and the nature of the individual's professional discipline.

D University and Public Service

Service is an important component of the activity of faculty in the Professor of Clinical X series. In many cases, this service will have a direct bearing on the education and clinical care missions of the University, and will therefore be best listed and evaluated under the categories of teaching and professional or clinical activity, which take precedence as criteria for advancement. For example, invited service on QA boards would be useful in evaluating a candidate's clinical expertise.

With increasing rank, greater participation and leadership in service are expected, although formal criteria are not specified. The extent and significance of service at the department, school, campus, University, community, and national or profession-wide level should be evaluated.

GUIDELINES FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES CLINICAL PROFESSOR SERIES

These guidelines are intended to provide additional, detailed information on the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series at UCSD to assist in the evaluation of the appropriateness of appointment to and advancement within this series.

The guidelines also are intended to provide information on the distinctions between this series and the Professor of Clinical X series.

It should be noted that the diversity of talents and accomplishments required in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series are such that the criteria for appointments and advancement must be applied with some degree of flexibility. These guidelines create a better understanding of the series at UCSD and the flexible application of the series criteria.

The four criteria for appointment and advancement in the regular professorial series at UCSD are:

1. Performance in teaching
2. Scholarly and creative accomplishments (research)
3. Professional (clinical) competence and activity (patient care)
4. University and public service

However, the combined demands of teaching, research, patient care and community service are such that it is unrealistic to expect that all faculty members in a clinical department can excel in each of these endeavors.

Faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series are appointed for the primary purpose of filling roles in patient care services and in the clinical teaching programs. These functions should be identified and documented by the department in preparing the candidate's file for review.

The criteria and the frequency of review in judging candidates for appointment or advancement in this series are the same as those specified for the regular professorial series, except that each of the criteria must be appropriately weighted to take into account the primary emphasis on direct patient care services and clinical teaching activities.

Documentation should be compiled as for other academic series, including documentation of teaching and clinical performance as described in the Professor of Clinical X series criteria.

The Health Sciences Clinical Professor series should not be regarded as an escape or contingency appointment for faculty in other series who fail to receive promotion.

Professional Competence and Activity

Professional competence and activity generally focus on the quality of patient care. A doctoral degree in a clinical discipline, as well as a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities, is a criterion for appointment. The candidate should also demonstrate evidence of achievement, leadership, or progress in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems.

Although it need not be as extensive as that required for the other professorial series (e.g., Clinical X), some evidence of scholarly or creative activity appropriate to the clinical discipline, as determined by the individual department, is expected in this series at UCSD. Scholarly activities such as participation in collaborative research, publications in the medical literature (e.g. case reports, book chapters, reviews, letters to the editor), published articles for the lay population (e.g. newsletters, newspapers, magazines) presentations at scholarly meetings or continuing education courses are desirable and should be encouraged. Development of innovative clinical procedures, teaching methods, new courses, clinical guidelines, and instructional materials for teaching patients should also be recognized as creative accomplishment.

1. Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor.

For an initial appointment to the rank of Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor, the departmental recommendation letter should describe the candidate's present position and the likelihood that the candidate will be a competent teacher and develop an excellent professional practice.

For appointment as Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor, Step I or II, the candidate should:

- have high-quality postgraduate clinical training providing eligibility for one of the medical specialty boards (a minimum of three years post-M.D.);
- demonstrate teaching ability or have a clear potential as a clinical teacher; and
- demonstrate clinical ability of high quality commensurate with his or her experience in a branch of medicine.

For appointment at a Step III or above, the candidate must also:

- be board eligible in the specialty appropriate to the clinical care and teaching activities, or have appropriate equivalent recognition;
- demonstrate ability as a clinical teacher; and
- demonstrate continuing achievement in clinical care and teaching.

2. Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor

In addition to proven competence in teaching, a candidate for appointment to the rank of Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor should demonstrate evidence of excellence in professional practice. Such evidence may include, but is not limited to, evaluations that demonstrate:

- a. provision of high-quality patient care;
- b. a high level of competence in a clinical specialty;
- c. expanded breadth of clinical responsibilities;
- d. significant participation in the activities of clinical and/or professional groups;
- e. effective development, expansion, or administration of a clinical service;
- f. recognition or certification by a professional group; or
- g. evidence of scholarly or creative activities appropriate to this series.

Further, the candidate must:

- h. be certified by one of the medical specialty boards, or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition;

- i. be recognized as a consistently effective clinical teacher by undergraduate, graduate, or postgraduate students and by faculty;
- j. have excellent clinical skills and abilities and apply them in the management of clinical problems, as evidenced by the opinion of the faculty, house staff and appropriate professional groups;
- k. serve effectively as a clinical consultant to house staff, faculty, and members of the community; and
- l. actively and effectively participate in the affairs of professional organizations, UCSD Medical Center or VASDHS committees, School of Medicine committees, University and administrative committees, and community programs.

3. Health Sciences Clinical Professor

A candidate for appointment to the rank of Health Sciences Clinical Professor should satisfy the above qualifications for Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor. In addition, the candidate must:

- a. demonstrate superior clinical teaching;
- b. demonstrate superior clinical skills and abilities;
- c. provide documentation that his or her clinical service and/or teaching are of great importance to the academic or healthcare missions of the University; and
- d. demonstrate appropriate scholarly or creative activities.

Transfer of faculty from one series to another, especially from the regular professorial series to the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, should occur only in exceptional cases. Requests for such transfers must carefully document the specific achievements and future responsibilities in clinical care and teaching that qualify the candidate for such a transfer.

Faculty who demonstrate sustained, substantial scholarship that has an impact beyond UCSD should be considered for transfer to the Professor of Clinical X series. Examples of sustained, substantial scholarship include, but are not limited to development of new diagnostic or therapeutic approaches and procedures that have been adopted regionally or nationally, publication of clinical case studies, creative design of teaching materials or textbooks used regionally or nationally, active participation in collaborative and joint research programs, or demonstrated effectiveness in establishing and supervising major teaching or clinical service programs, development of innovative health care programs that have had regional or national impact, or development of innovative computer software.

September 1, 2008