

## Early Review Files: Examples

Rank/Step	Effective	Advanced to	Effective	Next Review	Notes
Professor, Step 3	7/1/05	Professor, Step 4	7/1/08	2010-11	Received Merit Increase, resets normative time, review prior to 2010-11 would be acceleration in time <sup>1</sup> .
Professor, Step 3	7/1/05	Professor, Step 3 o/s	7/1/08	2010-11	Received Salary Increase, resets normative time, review prior to 2010-11 would be acceleration in time <sup>2</sup> .
Professor, Step 3	7/1/05	Professor, Step 3	7/1/08	2010-11	Denied Merit Increase, resets normative time, however, per policy, review prior to 2010-11 would not be acceleration in time <sup>3</sup> .

### Policy Reference: [CAPM 400.220](#)

<sup>1</sup>. Normal Merit Increase: All faculty completing the requisite number of years of service by June 30 in the indicated steps of this series are eligible for review for normal merit increase to the indicated steps effective July 1

CURRENT STATUS	YEARS AT STEP	NORMAL MERIT INCREASE
Assistant Professor 1,2,3,4	2	Next higher step
Associate Professor 1,2,3	2	Next higher step
Professor 1-8	3	Next higher step
Professor 9	4	Professor Above Scale

<sup>2</sup>. Salary increase in lieu of merit or promotion : When, following a review for merit increase or promotion, the proposed advancement is denied and a salary increase is granted instead, faculty members will not be placed on the CALL again until another interval of the standard years at step has been served. Should candidates choose to put themselves forward for review before this interval has passed, the action would be considered an acceleration in time because the prior review resulted in some positive advancement action (albeit a salary increase only instead of step or rank advancement) and the candidate would not have completed another interval at step before being reviewed again.

<sup>3</sup>. Denial of advancement : If a review for normal merit increase or promotion results in denial of advancement of any type (e.g., rank, step or salary), the faculty member will not be placed on the CALL again until another interval of the standard years at step has been served. Should candidates choose to put themselves forward for the same review (i.e., normal merit or promotion) before this interval has passed, that action in and of itself would not constitute an acceleration since the normal time at step has already been served and the material submitted in the prior review was not previously rewarded with any type of advancement. In either event, the subsequent review period would commence with the last positive advancement in rank, step or salary (e.g., for a full professor who served another standard interval, the review period would be six years instead of three years).

NOTE: Assistant Professor, Step 5, and Associate Professor, Step 4, are overlapping steps. Advancement from overlapping steps include specific guidelines. See [CAPM 407.690](#).