



UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

Section: 230-220

Effective: 07/01/2017

Supersedes: New

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 03/31/2020

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION PROFESSOR SERIES

PPM 230-220, Professor Series, relates to matters subject to [Academic Personnel Manual \(APM\) Section 220](#), Professor Series. For reference, subsections of PPM 230-220 include citations to associated subsections of the APM; in all cases, the APM is operative where referenced.

PPM 230-220-0 Policy

APM 220-0

PPM 230-220-4 Definition

APM 220-4. a

PPM 230-220-4. b

Persons appointed to titles in the Professor series form the “regular ranks” faculty of the University. This series is distinct from the following series:

- Acting Professor series
- Adjunct Professor series
- Professor of Practice series
- Health Sciences Clinical Professor series
- Professor In Residence series
- Visiting Professor series
- Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) series

PPM 230-220-8 Types

- APM 220-8. a - Titles and Ranks
- APM 220-8. b - Appointment
- APM 220-8. c - Promotion
- APM 220-8. d – Merit increase
- APM 220-8. e - Reappointment

PPM 230-220-8. f - Retention

A retention occurs when a department prepares an academic review file for a faculty member who is being recruited by another institution.

PPM 230-220-8. g - Deferral

A deferral occurs when an appointee delays the regularly scheduled academic review for one year by request.

PPM 230-220-8. h – No Change Action

A no change action occurs when, following an academic review, a faculty member does not advance because productivity is not sufficient to justify advancement, or if the appointee is unresponsive to departmental requests to submit updated file materials.

PPM 230-220-8. i – Accelerated Advancement

Accelerated advancement is early advancement to a higher step and/or rank. For series lacking established ranks and/or steps, accelerated advancement is an early increase in salary, or an increase greater than is expected based on the time since the appointee's last review.

PPM 230-220-8. j – Career Equity Review

A Career Equity Review (CER) is an evaluation to determine whether a faculty member's rank and step are correctly calibrated. 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 UC San Diego standards.

PPM 230-220-10 Criteria

APM 220-10

PPM 230-220-14 Eligibility

APM 220-14

PPM 230-220-16 Restrictions

The following restrictions apply to use of titles in this series:

APM 220-16. a
APM 220-16. b
APM 220-16. c
APM 220-16. d
APM 220-16. e

PPM 230-220-16. f

University of California graduate students may not be appointed to titles in the Professor series.

PPM 230-220-16. g

For UC San Diego faculty with a current, salaried Professor (Ladder-Rank) appointment, a 0% Professor appointment may be proposed to reflect a secondary department affiliation. If a 0% Professor appointment is proposed:

- the candidate will be afforded voting rights in the secondary department;
- eligible faculty in both departments must vote on the file; and
- the candidate is required to fulfill responsibilities for research, teaching, and service in both departments.

Such 0% Professor appointments will be limited to a term equal to one review cycle. Reappointments may only be proposed at the time of review.

No guarantee of future appointment or funding is accorded with a 0% Ladder-Rank appointment.

PPM 230-220-17 Terms of Service

APM 220-17. a
APM 220-17. b
APM 220-17. c

PPM 230-220-17. d

Effective Date and Beginning Date of Service

PPM 230-220-17. d (1)

The effective date of an appointment is the initial date of the new status for payroll or other recordkeeping purposes and indicates the first day on which salary or change in rate of salary commences.

- Academic-year appointments must be effective at the beginning of quarterly pay periods (i.e., July 1 for fall quarter; November 1 for winter quarter; March 1 for spring quarter).
- Fiscal-year appointments may be effective on any date, preferably the first day of a month.
- If an appointment that represents a series change coincides with an advancement, the advancement must be effective on July 1, regardless of the effective date of the proposed new appointment.

Whenever possible, appointments subject to the eight-year limit should be made effective July 1.

APM 220-17. d. (2)
APM 220-17. d. (3)

PPM 230-220-18 Salary

APM 220-18. a

PPM 230 220-18. b

The normal periods of service at rank and step in this series are shown in the published salary scales and are described below. Although these time periods indicate the usual intervals between advancements, they do not preclude more rapid advancement in the case of exceptional merit, or more gradual advancement when warranted. Personnel reviews that are deferred due to stopping the clock for reasons as defined in APM - 133-17-g-i or a family accommodation as defined in APM - 760 should be treated procedurally in the same manner as personnel reviews conducted at the usual intervals. All evidence produced during the probationary period, including the period of the extension, counts in the evaluation of the candidate's review file. The file shall be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal period of service and so stated in the department chair's letter.

APM 220-18. b. (1)
APM 220-18. b. (2)
APM 220-18. b. (3)

PPM 230-220-18. b. (4)

Professor: The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V. This involves an overall career review and will be granted on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching. Service at Professor, Step VI or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not

occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

Those Professors who are on the special Law School scale that has nine steps for the range are subject to the same criteria as Professors as outlined above.

Advancement to an above-scale rank involves an overall career review and is reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact; (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. 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 an 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 increase 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 (i.e., 50% or 100% of the salary increase between Steps VIII and IX for the Professor and Research Scientist 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.

PPM 230-220-20 Conditions of Employment

APM 230-20

PPM 230-220-24 Authority to Approve Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions

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

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

PPM 230-220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures

PPM 230-220-80. a

The statements in this section set forth general procedures applicable in circumstances described in each of the five following sections (PPM 230-220-81 through 230-220-89).

Formal considerations of appointments and reappointments, merit increases, appraisals, non-reappointments, and promotions are normally initiated by the department chair, after appropriate consultation with members of the departmental faculty. For actions affecting the chair, the vice chair, the Dean or Provost, or an appropriate officer may take the initiative.

If the department chair and the candidate proposed for appointment are close collaborators, the department chair should not participate in the preparation of the appointment file. The vice chair or another independent senior faculty member should oversee the process and prepare the departmental recommendation letter.

If the department chair or any faculty member contributing to the file has a financial interest in a company employing a potential faculty member, that information should be included in the file, and

such individuals should recuse themselves from contributing to the appointment file.

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.

Each department should act independently in arriving at its recommendation for inclusion in the academic review file.

APM 220-80. b

PPM 230-220-80. c¹

Early in the course of a personnel review, before departmental consideration of a case, the chair shall notify the candidate of the impending review and in one or more conferences with the candidate make certain that the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is given the appropriate opportunity to ask questions, to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review, and, where relevant, to suggest names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation.

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.

If eligible, appointees may initiate a Career Equity Review (CER). An appointee is responsible for requesting a CER at the time of their regular, on-cycle academic review (see PPM 230-220-89, Professor Series/Procedures for Career Equity Review.)

Department chairs should establish in writing a deadline (no later than the established campus deadline) for the submission by candidates of all materials for their Review Files. Departments may establish an earlier deadline, but, in these cases, candidates must have a reasonable period of time to gather and submit the material. Departmental deadlines may not be later than the established campus deadline. For equity reasons, an appointee may not add bibliographic or other documentation reflecting activities or accomplishments beyond the established campus deadline. If material is received after the departmental meeting and vote, the chair shall determine whether or not the added material is of such significance that it should be reviewed by all voting members and whether a new departmental meeting should be scheduled to reconsider the case. If the chair determines that the new material is not of such substance as to require a new departmental meeting and/or vote, the chair should take steps to include the material in the File and describe the degree of departmental review of the material. The candidate also should be informed of the degree of departmental review and asked to sign Certification C as an indication of their awareness that the material has been added to the File.

The chair has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards.

The candidate should be made aware of APM - 210-1 and 220, of the University's policies about academic personnel records (APM - 160), and of the candidate's rights to make any desired addition to the personnel review file. The chair should be helpful in responding to the candidate's questions and in considering whether additions to the file by the candidate are needed. In accordance with established policy applicable to the personnel action under consideration, the chair shall solicit letters

¹ The provisions of APM - 220-80-c, 220-80-d, 220-80-e, 220-80-h, 220-80-i, 220-80-j, and 220-84-b, modified as appropriate, apply to the following series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), Professor of Practice, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Supervisor of Teacher Education, Teacher of Special Programs, Professional Research (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, Specialist, Postgraduate Research, Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator, Coordinator of Public Programs, Continuing Educator, Cooperative Extension Specialist (Advisor), Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian. For appointees covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), this policy applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.

of evaluation of the candidate from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons nominated by the candidate.

External Referee Letters

The department chair should solicit evaluations from individuals who are independent of the candidate, who are expert in the candidate's field, and who are able to provide an objective appraisal of the candidate's work. External referees should be senior scholars who are at the same rank as that proposed for the appointee, or higher.

All such letters received shall be included in the file; 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. In soliciting or receiving unsolicited letters of evaluation, the chair should include, attach or send a statement regarding the confidentiality of such letters. This statement must include the following (or its equivalent):

“Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.”

Sample solicitation letters are provided on the Academic Personnel Services Web site. External referee letters are required as follows:

Appointment:

For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step I or II, external letters of evaluation from the candidate's mentors and others at the home institution are acceptable; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if available.

For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step III or higher, and for all appointments at the Associate or Full level, letters should be from external referees who are senior scholars (Associate level or higher) and who are independent of the candidate.

Advancement:

- For advancement to Step VI, external referee letters are not required, but may be solicited at the department's discretion when they are needed to demonstrate evidence of nationally or internationally recognized and highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, or excellent teaching.
- For advancement in the LPSOE/LSOE series, external evaluation letters must be solicited from individuals who are professionally independent from the appointee; however, additional evaluation letters may be solicited from referees from within UC San Diego as a tool to assist the effective evaluation of an appointee's contributions to pedagogy on campus.
- For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, evaluation letters may be solicited from within UC San Diego; however, the majority of required letters should be obtained from individuals external to UC San Diego.
- 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.

Depending on the discipline of the appointee under review, additional evidence provided in lieu of external letters may include, but is not limited to: published reviews of the candidate's work; Readers'

Reports from publishers; or presentations of the research in competitive and prestigious venues.

In cases in which the department chooses not to solicit letters from external referees, campus reviewers may later recommend that the department do so. 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.

The candidate may provide in writing to the chair names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the personnel review file.

Based upon the above, candidates occasionally have asked that the department chair, Deans, Provosts, members of the Committee on Academic Personnel, and other individuals within and outside the department be excluded from participation in their academic personnel review. CAP does not consider it appropriate to honor requests to exclude particular members of CAP from participation in the review of any file. CAP members routinely exclude themselves from review of candidates at the departmental level, and to exclude them at the CAP level would essentially disenfranchise them. It would, in general, be inappropriate to exclude them from consideration of any cases involving candidates from their own or other departments because their expertise is needed by CAP. Any member of CAP can, however, on their own initiative, voluntarily withdraw from a review.

Candidates occasionally name reviewers, inside and outside the University, who, for reasons stated in writing, might not provide an objective evaluation of the candidate's work. The department chair, in consultation with the voting members of the department, should decide whether or not to solicit letters from those named. If a named reviewer is used, the chair should explain the reasons for consulting the named individual so that the file will show not only the candidate's reasons for the exclusion, but also the reason for the department's decision to seek the opinion of the named person.

On rare occasions, candidates ask that the department chair not prepare the review file. Such requests will be decided by the Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs following consultation with CAP. In instances where someone other than the department chair is asked to prepare the review file, the department chair will participate in the review as a voting member of the department.

Members of the candidate's department, Deans, Provosts, and members of the Committee on Academic Personnel cannot be barred from participation in the personnel process on the basis of a challenge to their objectivity. To do so would infringe on rights granted to faculty by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(c) and rights granted to the Academic Senate by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(d). Individuals may voluntarily withdraw from participation in the review process.

PPM 230-220-80. d

Before the departmental recommendation is determined, the chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents in the personnel review file other than confidential academic review records (as defined in APM – 160-20-b (1)), and shall provide to the candidate upon request a redacted copy (as defined in APM - 160-20-c (4)) of the confidential academic review records in the file. Within seven days of receiving redacted copies, the candidate may submit for inclusion in the personnel review file a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file. The candidate's response must be made available to the faculty prior to the meeting at which the departmental recommendation is determined. The candidate's signature on Certification A (Exhibit A) certifies that these procedures have been followed. Certification A should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs and must be included in each Personnel Review File.

The chair has the responsibility of making the complete Review File available for inspection by the voting members of the department before the departmental vote is taken. Copies of the files or portions thereof should not be distributed to members of the faculty.

"Complete Review File" refers to the review file prepared for the proposed personnel action and generally does not include previous review files or other material which are not relevant for the

proposed personnel action. The department or the candidate can, of course, make material in a previous review file a part of the current file.

PPM 230-220-80. e.

The departmental recommendation is made in accordance with the procedural regulations of the Academic Senate and established governance practices of the department, and is based upon the evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department.

Department chairs are responsible for ensuring compliance with the provisions of Bylaw 55 and should review them carefully prior to initiating departmental votes.

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.

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.

Departments should develop their own rules, when necessary, for consultation or voting on academic personnel actions not covered by Academic Senate Bylaw 55.

The chair initiates a personnel action for an appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, or terminal appointment by addressing a letter setting forth the departmental recommendation to the approval authority.

This departmental letter shall:

1. Discuss the proposed personnel action in the light of the criteria set forth in APM - 220-10 and shall be accompanied by supporting evidence.
 - a. For appointments, the letter should provide a thorough evaluation of the candidate's qualifications in accordance with the specific criteria established for the proposed series. This includes a full and detailed evaluation of the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements, a description and evaluation of the candidate's teaching experience and effectiveness, and assessment of their professional reputation in the academic community.

Utilizing information from the candidate's previous institution, the departmental recommendation letter should include a meaningful assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at both the undergraduate and graduate levels of instruction.
 - b. For all actions but appointments, the appointee's performance in each area should be evaluated in terms of the department's established performance norms and expectations, using established departmental evaluation methods.
2. Report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department (including any vote taken) and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a contrary opinion.
3. Discuss the proposed title, rank, step, salary, effective appointment date(s).

4. Justify the recommended rank, step, and salary based on the criteria specified for the series, including justification for an off-scale salary, if applicable.
5. Include verification that a complete file was presented for voting members' consideration.
6. Provide information about the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department, including the results of any vote taken and the reasons (if known) for any negative votes.
7. Include a statement regarding external referees' recommendations, ensuring that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified in the departmental letter except by code.
8. Include a statement from the chair regarding any conflicts of interest.

For appointments, the letter should include:

- The proposed title, rank, step, salary, effective appointment date(s), and discussion of any funding contingencies.
- A brief description of the open recruitment conducted by the department for the position and how the candidate was selected. (Other applicants should not be identified in this description.)
- Documentation of the participation and membership of the departmental ad hoc committee
- A description of the candidate's expected role in the department: research to be conducted and/or classes the candidate will teach; the candidate's anticipated contribution to the department's instructional mission at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; and a description of the department's teaching requirements and how the candidate's teaching load meets those requirements (for applicable titles).

For Visiting titles, 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.

The department shall adopt procedures under which the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation shall be available, before being forwarded, for inspection by all those members of the department eligible to vote on the matter or by a designated committee or other group of such members. The operating word is inspection, not approval; dissenting faculty may add dissenting letters into the File. Dissenting letters are considered non-confidential and will be available to the candidate. Pursuant to campus procedures, the chair may also, in a separate letter, make an independent evaluation and recommendation, which may differ from the departmental recommendation. This letter should be shown to all voting members of the department, and will be accessible to the candidate, upon request, in redacted form.

Before or at the time of forwarding the departmental letter and the personnel review file, the candidate shall be informed orally or, upon request, in writing of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of departmental evaluations under each of the applicable University criteria (teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and University and public service).

If the chair provides this information to the candidate in writing, a copy of the written statement is to be included in the personnel review file. Upon request, the chair shall provide to the candidate a copy of the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation. As stated above, the identities of persons who were the sources of confidential documents are not to be disclosed in this letter. The candidate has the right to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation. The candidate should in such a case request a written statement from the chair as described above, and the candidate's

comment shall be transmitted, at the option of the candidate, either to the chair, Dean, or Provost. This should be done within a time limit prescribed by the Chancellor. This written comment shall become part of the personnel review file as the review proceeds.

APM 220-80. f
APM 220-80. g

PPM 230-220-80. h

If, during Academic Senate or administrative review of a departmental recommendation, the personnel review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, additional information shall be solicited from the chair through the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor- Academic Affairs or the applicable Dean/Director in cases where the Dean/Director is the approving authority. Such new material shall be added to the personnel review file, and the department shall be invited to comment on the new material. The candidate shall be informed by the chair of the new material which has been added to the personnel review file (without disclosing the identities of sources of confidential academic review records), and may be provided access to the new material in accord with APM - 220-80-d. The candidate shall be provided the opportunity to make a written statement for inclusion in the personnel review file. The candidate's statement should be received by the department within seven days of the candidate being informed of the new material. The candidate's signature on Certification C (Exhibit C) certifies that these procedures have been followed. The review shall then be based upon the personnel review file as augmented.

APM 220-80.i

PPM 230-220-80. j

If the Administrative Authority's preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department, or of reviewers, the Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs (or applicable dean, where appropriate) shall notify the candidate, chair or applicable reviewers, indicating the reasons and asking for any further information which might support a different decision. The chair or applicable reviewers will have an opportunity to accept the preliminary decision or to respond to it, within fourteen days, before a final decision is made. When additional information is furnished, appropriate reviewers will be given opportunity to comment on the augmented file before a final decision is made. If the candidate chooses to comment, such comments should be received by the department chair within seven days from the date the candidate was informed of the preliminary decision. Any response to the preliminary decision and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C.

Procedural guidelines are available in the [Academic Personnel Process Manual](#).

PPM 230-220-81 Procedure for Appointment, Reappointment, or and Non-Reappointment of Instructor

APM 220-81

PPM 230-220-82 Procedure for Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion to the Rank of Assistant Professor

The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:

APM 220-82. a
APM 220-82. b
APM 220-82. c

PPM 230-220-82. D

1. First Reappointment/Merit Review

The first reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs during the second year of appointment. The department may propose:

- A. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*
If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.
- B. *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.
- C. *Non-Reappointment*
If an appointee is not making acceptable progress, the eligible department faculty may vote to recommend non-reappointment at the end of the first two-year appointment period in accordance with APM 220-20. c., and APM PPM 230-220-84.

2. Second Reappointment/Merit Review

The second reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the fourth year of appointment, and is usually combined with an appraisal in accordance with PPM-220-83. The department may propose:

- A. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*
If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.
- B. *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.
- C. *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 in accordance with PPM 230-220-82.

3. Final Reappointment/Merit Review

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review of a Senate Faculty Member, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

- 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 is Recommended*

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 they are 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.

PPM 230-220-82. e

Reconsideration

An appointee who has received notice of termination may be reconsidered for promotion. Reconsideration is appropriate only 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.

A reconsideration file must be received in the Academic Personnel office no later than February 15 of the terminal year. Neither submission of a reconsideration file nor a failure to meet the file deadline will postpone a terminal appointment ending date.

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.

Procedural guidelines are available in the [Academic Personnel Process Manual](#).

PPM 230-220-83 Procedure for the Formal Appraisal of an Assistant Professor

Formal appraisals of Assistant Professors shall be made in order to arrive at preliminary assessments of the prospects of candidates for eventual promotion to tenure rank as well as to identify appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence desired for continued membership in the faculty.

The general rules of PPM 230-220-80 apply here. In addition:

a.1. Normally each Assistant Professor shall be appraised well in advance of possible promotion to tenure rank (at least two and one-half years before the anticipated effective date of the promotion). A case of initial appointment from outside the University, with anticipation of promotion within two or three years after appointment, obviously calls for an exception to the general rule. Each Assistant Professor shall be appraised no later than the first half of the appointee's sixth year of service in the University with the title Assistant Professor or with this title in combination with other titles as defined in APM - 133-0-a and 133-0-

Earlier appraisals are permissible. Subject to these guidelines and restrictions, each Chancellor shall establish general schedules and rules for the timing of formal appraisals on the respective campus.

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 formal appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of an appraisal, the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.

a.2. The following factors should be evaluated when conducting an appraisal:

- Published research and other completed creative activity, and potential for continued research and creative activity.
- teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and graduate levels Departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee’s self-evaluation (if any)

In cases in which the appointee has significant teaching and/or research contributions in a secondary department or academic unit, contributions from the additional units should be evaluated.

a.3. Appraisal Vote

The eligible department faculty should vote on an appraisal rating, 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, 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 in accordance with PPM 230-220-85.

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 in accordance with PPM 230-220-84.

a.4. When the appraisal is combined with a reappointment/merit review, the department must make a recommendation regarding reappointment and merit advancement. The department may propose:

– *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.

– *Termination:*

Termination should be considered in accordance with PPM 230-220-84 if the majority of voting faculty are convinced that substantial deficiencies in the record cannot be corrected in time for consideration for promotion and therefore further effort will not result in promotion.

APM 220-83. b.

PPM 230 220-83.c

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

APM 220-83. d

APM 220-83. e

Procedural guidelines are available in the [Academic Personnel Process Manual](#).

PPM 230-220-84 Procedure for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor
The general rules of APM - 220-80 apply here. In addition:

a. A proposal not to reappoint an Assistant Professor may originate with the department chair as a result of departmental review during consideration of reappointment. Also, during a formal appraisal of an Assistant Professor/Supervisor/Research Scientist/Scholar, a department may recommend that a candidate be notified of a terminal appointment. In either event, the case shall be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of APM Sections 220-82, 220-83, and 220-84.

b. During a review of a formal appraisal, or consideration of reappointment or promotion of an Assistant Professor (or other appointee of equivalent rank), , there is a recommendation to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint by a Dean, Provost, campus ad hoc review committee, and/or the Committee on Academic Personnel; and-if the Academic Vice Chancellor's (or designee's) preliminary assessment is to make a terminal appointment, is not to reappoint or promote, or is contrary to the departmental shall be notified of this in writing (including a statement of reasons)-by the Academic Vice Chancellor (or applicable dean, where appropriate). The candidate also shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to the records placed in the personnel review file subsequent to the departmental review in accordance with APM - 160-20-c. When the candidate is provided copies of such records, the department chair also shall be provided with copies of the extradepartmental records. The candidate and the chair, after appropriate consultation within the department, shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing within fourteen days and to provide additional information and documentation. The candidate may respond either through the department chair or directly to the Academic Vice Chancellor within seven days of being informed of the preliminary decision (or within seven days of receipt of the extra- departmental records as outlined above). The personnel review file, as augmented by the added material, shall then be considered in any stage of the review process as designated by the Academic Vice Chancellor before a final decision by the Chancellor is reached. The departmental response and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C. The Chancellor's final decision

to make a terminal appointment, or not to reappoint or promote, shall not be made without the appropriate preliminary assessment notification process and opportunity to respond being provided to the candidate as specified herein.

Procedural guidelines are available in the [Academic Personnel Process Manual](#).

PPM 230-220-86 Procedure for Deferral of the Academic Review

A. deferral occurs when an appointee delays the regularly scheduled academic review for one year by request. An appointee may request a deferral of their 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 their productivity (i.e., illness, family member's illness, etc.).

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 Policy); 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.

An appointee may request a maximum of two consecutive deferrals.

Procedural guidelines are available in the [Academic Personnel Process Manual](#).

PPM 230-220-87 Procedure for No Change Action

The general Rules of PPM 230-220-80/APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:

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

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.

Consecutive No Change Actions

In cases in which an appointee is proposed for a consecutive no change action, the department must discuss the reasons for the no change action in the departmental letter. Potential reasons include:

1. Full Service at a Barrier Step

An appointee's failure to advance resulting from insufficient career accomplishments to pass through a barrier step, while continuing to provide full service to the University. For example, an appointee may continue to be productive in research and/or creative activities, teaching, and service at a level that would support normal merit advancement, but may not be sufficiently productive at a level that would support promotion, advancement to Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale.

2. Extenuating Circumstances

An appointee's failure to advance resulting from extenuating circumstances, such as the appointee's own illness, the illness of a family member, or other significant event outside of their control that

impacted productivity and/or performance.

3. Insufficient Contributions

In the absence of extenuating circumstances, an appointee's failure to advance resulting from contributions which are insufficient in quality and/or quantity to support normal advancement.

When an appointee is proposed for a consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose the reduction or elimination of a market off-scale salary component at the time of future range adjustment actions. See PPM 230-620.

In cases in which an appointee receives a second consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions:

- The department chair, in consultation with the dean, must meet with the appointee to develop a plan to correct the deficiencies in the record contributing to the lack of advancement. This plan must be included in the next academic review file.
- The appointee is ineligible to defer a regularly scheduled review until deficiencies in the record are corrected and the appointee advances.

Procedural guidelines are available in the [Academic Personnel Process Manual](#).

PPM 230-220-88 - Procedure for Accelerated Advancement

The general Rules of PPM 230-220-80/APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:

a. Criteria for Accelerated Advancement.

An appointee whose performance is at an exceptional level over a period may be considered for accelerated advancement. Exceptional performance is defined as work that significantly exceeds the normal departmental expectations in one or more of the areas of review: research and other creative activities, teaching, professional competence and activities, and university and public service. The candidate for acceleration must also meet the departmental criteria for advancement in every area of review. Acceleration proposals should not be made if there is any evident weakness in the case.

Acceleration proposals must address the department standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the candidate's performance is exceptional. In parallel with normal merit advancement progress, the criteria for both good and exceptional performance become more rigorous with rank and step.

1. Series requiring research and/or creative activity:
For series in which research and/or creative activity is among the performance criteria, above-average research and/or creative activity is a prerequisite to accelerated advancement.
2. Evidence that a candidate's productivity is double that which is expected for normal advancement in the review period is typically sufficient to demonstrate a candidate's performance is exceptional for purposes of a one-step acceleration. In cases in which research productivity is greater than that required for normal advancement, but falls short of twice the expected rate, extraordinary achievements in additional performance criteria are necessary to justify accelerated advancement.

An acceleration case based on exceptional productivity in research must be documented with evidence of the appointee's contributions and their impact using norms appropriate to the research field. The department recommendation should articulate the grounds for acceleration beyond simple numerical tabulation of papers and citations; for example, demonstration of the special impact of research, the quality of publications, the awarding of prizes or election to national or international learned academies.

b. Other series:

An acceleration proposal based primarily on the quality and quantity of contributions other than research and/or creative activity must contain documentation and evidence of these extraordinary achievements and of their impact characterizing their exceptional nature of effort and outcomes. Documentation substantiating the significant and extraordinary nature of the achievements and their impact is needed; for example, the awarding of prizes, exceptional service of significant duration and/or importance (not otherwise rewarded or compensated), or professional recognition of contributions.

c. Timing of Accelerated Advancement

Except in remarkable circumstances (such as in the case of the appointee's receipt of an extraordinary award during the review period, or in the case of a parallel retention review) accelerated advancement should be proposed only at the time of the regularly scheduled review.

Normally, the activities considered for acceleration pertain to the complete review period only. Acceleration proposals occurring before the normal time for a merit review are discouraged unless extraordinary circumstances, such as the awarding of a major prize or an off-cycle review due to retention, warrant their consideration.

Accelerations may also be proposed as part of a case for recalibration of rank and step at the time of career review; e.g., tenure, promotion, or advancement to Step VI. Such a case requires documentation of activity and impact spanning the expanded review period and must contain evidence supporting the case for acceleration.

Normally, either the candidate or the department will propose accelerated advancement. When a candidate requests to be considered for acceleration, this must be stated in the departmental recommendation letter. In addition, any campus reviewer may propose acceleration and all subsequent campus reviewers must provide comment on this proposal with regard to these acceleration criteria.

d. General Considerations

- i. The previous award of bonus off-scale salary is immaterial to the consideration of any acceleration proposal.
- ii. Acceleration proposals based on unpublished work or work yet to be evaluated by scholarly review are inappropriate.
- iii. Acceleration is an inappropriate mechanism to address purely salary-related issues.
- iv. 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.
- v. 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.
- vi. 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.

Procedural guidelines are available in the [Academic Personnel Process Manual](#)

PPM 230-220-89 Procedure for Career Equity Review

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, and may be initiated by the faculty member only at the time of their regular on-cycle academic review. 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 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.

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

Procedural guidelines are available in the [Academic Personnel Process Manual](#).

PPM 230-220-96 Reports

APM 230-96

REVISION HISTORY

July 01, 2017	This policy was made effective.
April 18, 2018	Minor technical edits to update names and policy hyperlinks.
March 31, 2020	Technical edits to remove gendered language.