

October 27, 2011

DEPARTMENT AND PROGRAM CHAIRS
DEPARTMENT AND PROGRAM MANAGERS

Re: Ladder-rank Personnel Reviews: Reminders and Updates

Dear Colleagues:

As we launch a new academic year and you work on ladder-rank personnel reviews, I write to provide some clarification on these academic personnel review files, including the number of copies needed, review periods, use of overlapping steps, and how to treat review materials that are added to a file subsequent to the department review.

Copies of Review Files

I am happy to tell you that we have reduced the number of copies you will need to submit for major actions (i.e., appointment to tenure or Security of Employment, mid-career appraisals, promotions, and advancement to Step 6 or Above Scale). Effective immediately, you only need to submit the original file for the approving authority. If the approving authority is the Chancellor or the CP/EVC, you must still submit one copy for the division. The relevant Document Inventories will be updated accordingly.

Review Periods

General

The review period for an academic personnel action begins with the date the candidate's review materials were due for their previous action that resulted in advancement (some departments have mistakenly considered the review period to begin with the effective date of the last action). As you know, faculty submit their materials in the summer or fall prior to the effective date; to insure that all work is considered, it is important to include work done during the review year for the previous action.

Example

A Professor advanced to Step 1 effective July 1, 2009 will normally be eligible for review in 2011-12, and the review period would be 2008-09 through 2010-11. The exact dates are based on the deadlines set by the department. For a department that uses the campus deadline, the review period would be from the first day of fall quarter in 2008 through the day before the first day of fall quarter in 2011.

For the first review conducted after appointment, work done since the faculty member submitted their application may be considered in the initial advancement review; however, greater weight will be given to work done since appointment at UCSC.

For major actions, the review periods are extended as described below. As a reminder, departments must consider all teaching done during the entire review period, but only need to

forward those teaching evaluations obtained since the last approved action (evaluations previously not considered in a review).

Mid-career Appraisal

The review period for this action starts with appointment at UCSC. However, work done since the faculty member submitted their application may be included to provide context.

Promotion to Associate Professor

The review period for promotion to tenure includes the faculty member's entire academic career, with emphasis on work done since appointment to UCSC.

Promotion to Professor

The review period for promotion to Professor includes all work done since promotion to Associate Professor, including the review year of that action.

Merit to Step 6

Advancement to Step 6 may involve an overall career review, however, on the Santa Cruz campus, emphasis should be given to work done since advancement to or appointment at the rank of Professor, including the review year of that action.

Merit to Above Scale

Advancement to Above Scale may involve an overall career review, however, on the Santa Cruz campus, emphasis should be given to work done since advancement to or appointment at a step above Professor, Step 6, including the review year of that action.

Reviews at Overlapping Steps

The two common overlapping steps – Assistant Professor, Step 5/Associate Professor, Step 1 and Associate Professor, Step 4/Professor, Step 1 – add a layer of some complexity when considering advancement actions to and from these steps, which I want to address generally here. I also encourage you to review [CAPM 407.690](#), the campus policy on the use of overlapping steps, and to contact your divisional academic personnel coordinator and/or APO liaison to discuss specific situations should you have questions.

Typically, faculty who advance to one of these overlapping steps will have satisfied time at rank and step requirements to be eligible for promotion to the next rank (i.e., two years of service at Assistant Professor, Step 4 or two years of service at Associate Professor, Step 3). However, for myriad reasons, some faculty may not be ready for promotion at these specific junctures, however, their record of accomplishments may be sufficient to warrant a merit increase. In these cases, merit advancement to an overlapping step may be appropriate, and the new annual salary rate awarded for such advancement is generally only \$100 less than the salary rate that would be awarded for promotion.

The expectation for faculty that advance to an overlapping step is that they will serve the standard interval at the overlapping step before being reviewed for promotion, and in fact, they will not be put on the CALL for promotion until this time is served. Because time served in an

overlapping step may count in lieu of service at Step 1 of the next rank, faculty who serve the standard interval at the overlapping step are normally advanced to Step 2 of the next higher rank as a result of a promotion review.

Faculty who have not served the standard interval at the overlapping step (e.g., three years at Associate Professor, Step 4) may request review for promotion but need to consider the consequences of the timing of such advancement. To be clear, the promotion review itself may not be considered an accelerated action because the faculty member typically has served the time at *rank* to be eligible for promotion; however, movement to any step *except Step 1* would be considered an acceleration if the faculty member did not serve the requisite time at the overlapping step. The annual salary increase associated with such a promotion to Step 1 is generally only \$100, since they received the equivalent salary at the time of advancement to the overlapping step. Further, the faculty member would be put on the CALL for a merit review during their first year of service at Associate, Step 1 or their second year of service at Professor, Step 1 since time at the overlapping step counts towards the merit eligibility. It is not uncommon for faculty in this position to have an insufficient record to warrant a merit increase since there would only be one or two years of new material instead of the standard two or three years of material, respectively.

Example

Here is the typical review scenario for such advancement involving Associate Professor, Step 4:

- Faculty member reviewed in 2010-11 for merit and advanced to Step 4, effective July 1, 2011 (normal merit results in \$4500 increase to annual salary rate);
- Faculty member requests review for promotion in 2011-12 (with only one year of service at Step 4);
- Normal promotion approved, faculty member advances to Professor, Step 1 effective July 1, 2012 (promotion generally results in only \$100 increase to annual salary rate since they would have received the salary equivalent to the promotion at time of advancement to Associate, Step 4);
- Faculty member placed on the 2013-14 CALL for merit review (with only two years of new material—materials from 2011-12 and 2012-13; the materials from 2010-11 would have been considered in the promotion review in 2011-12.) This would be the third review in four years.

Given the potential for multiple reviews (e.g., three reviews in four years), the minimal salary increase involved with normal promotion as described above, and having less new material for the subsequent merit review, it is important for faculty who are considering advancement to or from an overlapping step to understand the impact.

Documents Added to the Review File Subsequent to Department Review

As you know, candidates under review have access to materials in their file up to and including the departmental recommendation, as outlined on the Checklist to Assure Fairness. Subsequent to the department review, materials are added to the file and may include a confidential chair letter, the decanal review letter for actions not delegated to the dean, the Committee on


Ladder-rank Personnel Reviews: Reminders and Updates
October 27, 2011

Academic Personnel recommendation, and when convened, an ad hoc personnel review committee report. The candidate may request access to these additional materials at the conclusion of their review. If the candidate requests access, the department chair and dean also receive copies of the materials. These additional materials, including the final decision letter, should not be shared with others in the department beyond the recipients because the information is considered confidential to the candidate. The chair and dean are provided copies because they have a business need to know, which includes being able to provide informed feedback to the candidate about the review process and the decision.

A best practice for the final decision letter, and copies of access materials if any, is that they be kept separate from the department copy of the review file in order to maintain the confidentiality of these materials. If candidates wish to include any of the materials provided in an access request in a subsequent review, they may submit a copy to the department at certain prescribed stages of the review process.

If you have any questions about this information, please contact Nancy Furber in the Academic Personnel Office at furber@ucsc.edu, ext. 9-4779.

Sincerely,



Pamela G. Peterson
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Personnel

cc: Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Lee
Committee on Academic Personnel Chair Takagi
Academic Personnel Office Analysts
Divisional Academic Personnel Coordinators
Divisional Deans