

### 3.3 Reviews-Evaluation of Non-Senate Assistant Rank Appointees

#### 1. General

Policy References	
Assistant-level Academic Appointees:	Policy:
Adjunct Professor series	<a href="#">PPM 230-280-00</a>
Health Sciences Clinical Professor series	<a href="#">PPM 230-278-00</a>
Professional Research (Research Scientist) series	<a href="#">PPM 230-310-00</a>
Project Scientist series	<a href="#">PPM 230-311-00</a>
Specialist series	<a href="#">PPM 230-330-00</a>

#### 2. Probationary Period

**Related Manual Sections:** [2.1](#) [2.1.2](#) [2.1.3](#) [3.2.14](#) [3.2.15](#) [3.2.23](#)

At UC San Diego, 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](#)).

#### 3. Terms of Service

**Related Manual Sections:** [2.1](#) [2.1.2](#) [2.1.3](#) [3.2.14](#) [3.2.15](#) [3.2.23](#)

Each appointment 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 appointment decisions are made in accordance with the UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#).

#### 4. Reappointment/Merit Review

When a non-Senate academic 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. Departments should refer to APM 137 for procedures on notifying non-senate appointees of non-reappointment.

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

- a. Reappointment with Merit Advancement

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

- b. Reappointment without Merit Advancement

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

## 5. Appraisal

### Related Manual Sections: [3.2.18](#)

An assistant-rank academic 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 their achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies academic appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for academic appointees.

Although not required, departments may conduct appraisals for academic 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 their 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 their 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.

An appraisal is not required if, prior to the normal occurrence of the appraisal, an academic 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 Considerations

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

- i. An academic appointee's published research and other completed creative activity and their potential for continued research and creative activity.
- ii. For series that require teaching, 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.
- iii. An academic appointee's departmental, University and community service contributions, as applicable.
- iv. Professional competence and activity (patient care).
- v. An academic appointee's self-evaluation (if any).

If the academic 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 academic 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

An appraisal vote is not required for non-Senate appointees; however, department and/or schools 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 departmental consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result of a vote, if taken.

The possible appraisal ratings are as follows:

<b>Favorable</b>	Indicates that promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining current trajectory of excellence on appropriate external validation.
<b>Favorable with Recommendations</b>	Indicates that the candidate is on track for promotion to the Associate rank, apart from recommendations to eliminate identified weaknesses or imbalances in the present record.
<b>Problematic</b>	Indicates that promotion is possible if substantial deficiencies in the present record are remedied.
<b>Unfavorable</b>	Indicates that substantial deficiencies are present, promotion is unlikely.

d. 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.

e. Result of second faculty vote:

iv. 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. 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.

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

vi. Promotion

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

In cases where a promotion is proposed at a time when a 4<sup>th</sup> year appraisal would normally be carried out, the promotion file should still include an appraisal.

vii. Campus Review

Campus Review Committee review of appraisals is in accordance with the Authority and Review Chart.

## 6. 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 academic appointee's third reappointment/merit review is the academic appointee's final reappointment/merit review at the assistant rank.

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

a. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an academic 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<sup>st</sup>.

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 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 academic appointee's academic record is strong and that they are making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- i. Should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- ii. 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 academic 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.

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.

i. Notice of Non-Reappointment

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible, as detailed in [APM 137](#).

## 7. Joint Appointees – Reviews

<b>Related Manual Sections:</b>	<a href="#">2.3.1</a>	<a href="#">2.4.5</a>	<a href="#">3.2.24</a>	<a href="#">3.4.8</a>
---------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

When an academic appointee holds joint appointments in two or more departments, all departments should be involved in the academic appointee's academic review, however, only one academic review file should be submitted. The home department should take the lead in preparing the file (e.g., gathering material from the appointee, soliciting external letters, gathering teaching evaluations, obtaining a completed and signed UC San Diego 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.

### About Joint Appointment Memorandums of Understanding (MOU)

An MOU is required to be included in the review file for all joint appointments in which a faculty member holds a salaried appointment in more than one department. MOUs for non-salaried secondary appointments are encouraged, but not required. The MOU shall include expectations as to teaching load, research expectations, academic reviews, and any other applicable conditions of employment.

The home department chair 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. If so desired and agreed to, departments may submit a joint letter with appropriate endorsement from each participating department.

In cases where one department includes an ad hoc committee review, the department should share the ad hoc report with the appointee prior to a departmental vote and recommendation in order to obtain the appropriate candidate certification and maintain procedural safeguards.