

3.2 Reviews-Evaluation of Senate Assistant Rank Academic Appointees

1. General

The following are academic review action proposals that departments may choose to recommend:

Policy References	
Assistant-level Academic Appointees:	Policy:
Professor series	PPM 230-220*
Teaching Professor Series (LPSOE/LSOE)	PPM 230-285
Professor in Residence series	PPM 230-270
Professor of Clinical X Series	PPM 230-275
*Applicable to Assistant Teaching Professors (Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment-LPSOE) to the extent provided by policy.	

2. Deferral

Policy Reference:	230-220-86
-------------------	----------------------------

With appropriate justification, an academic appointee may request that their regularly scheduled academic review be deferred. An academic appointee may request a maximum of two consecutive deferrals. Faculty on four-year review cycles may only be approved for one deferral in order to comply with APM 200-0, which requires that all faculty must be reviewed every five (5) years. Obtaining approval of a deferral request is the only alternative to recommending a no-change action.

An academic appointee may request a deferral of their academic review when:

- a. 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
- b. Circumstances beyond the academic appointee's control have impacted their productivity (i.e., illness, family member's illness, etc.).

The appropriate dean has the authority to approve the first deferral request. The Executive Vice Chancellor must approve a second consecutive deferral request. Deferral requests must be submitted to the academic appointee's department(s) no later than October 15 and are due to a candidate's Dean or Executive Vice Chancellor by date specified online [here](#).

3. Reappointment and/or No Change

Policy Reference:	230-220-87
-------------------	----------------------------

An academic review file must be prepared and submitted for review for an academic appointee serving in the final year of the normal period at step¹, even if the appointee is not recommended for advancement. However, in some situations, an appointee may request a deferral. See above for information on academic review deferrals.

About Deferral Review Files

If deferral of an academic review is approved, a review file must be prepared and submitted for appointees serving in the final year after deferral, not to exceed five years since their previous review, even if the appointee is not recommended for advancement.

A reappointment is required for continuation of a time-limited appointment. A reappointment may or may not be accompanied by a merit or promotion proposal.

A department should propose a no-change action if productivity is not sufficient to justify advancement, or if the academic 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. Departments should refer to [APM 137](#) for procedures on notifying non-senate appointees of non-reappointment.

If the academic appointee has an off-scale salary component, its disposition should be discussed in the departmental letter.

After a no-change action takes effect, the academic 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 academic appointee's normal review cycle, this action will not be considered an acceleration or off-cycle and grants candidates the opportunity to advance without penalty.

The appropriate dean has the authority to approve the first no-change action.

4. Consecutive No Change Actions

In cases where 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:

- a. Full Service at a Barrier Step

¹For appointees subject to [APM 137](#), this applies only if the appointee is to be reappointed.

This is the case where an academic appointee fails 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 academic 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.

Barrier steps are those steps that require the completion of a career review for appointees to advance (i.e. promotion, advancement to Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale).

b. Extenuating Circumstances

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

c. Insufficient Contributions

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

- i. When an academic 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.
- ii. In cases in which an academic 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 academic appointee is ineligible to defer a regularly scheduled review until deficiencies in the record are corrected and the academic appointee advances.

Proposals for consecutive no change actions require review by the applicable committee (i.e. CAP, AARP, or PSSRP).

5. Merit Advancement

Policy Reference:

[230-220-80](#)

If an academic appointee is serving in the final year of the normal period at step, they are eligible for a merit advancement (or promotion, if applicable and 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.

6. Promotion

Policy Reference:	230-220
-------------------	-------------------------

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

A promotion is an advancement from one rank to a higher rank within a series and requires a full career review.

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.

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.

7. Acceleration

Policy Reference:	230-220-88
-------------------	----------------------------

Accelerated advancement is early advancement to a higher step and/or rank.

An appointee whose performance is at an exceptional level over an established normal review period at rank and step 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 than would be required for normal merit advancement. Areas of review include research and other creative activities, teaching and mentoring, professional competence and activities, and university and public service. For a candidate to be considered for acceleration, they must meet established departmental standards for normal merit advancement in every area of review. Additional guidance on proposing accelerations may be found in the [Academic Senate's "Where CAP Stood"](#) reports.

Proposals for acceleration must address department standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the academic appointee's performance is exceptional and exceeds what is otherwise required for normal merit advancement.

About Department Standards and Accelerations

Department standards should be included in all academic review files regardless of whether a candidate is proposed for normal or accelerated advancement. If not included as a separate document, departments standards should be thoroughly discussed in a department's recommendation letter.

8. Bonus Off-Scale Salary Components (BOS)

Policy Reference:	230-620-00
-------------------	----------------------------

A bonus off-scale is a temporary increase in salary which is generally awarded in recognition of outstanding achievements exceeding what is required for normal merit advancement, but insufficient to support accelerated advancement. In limited circumstances, a bonus off-scale may be awarded in conjunction with a no change action, when an academic appointee's achievements in the review period demonstrate both full service to the University and progress in all series criteria, but fall short of what is required for advancement.

A Bonus off-scale salary component is equivalent to half the difference between an approved salary step and the next higher salary step on the applicable salary scale (or equivalent in series without formal steps).

Proposals for a Bonus off-scale salary component must address the department's standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the appointee's achievements warrant the award of a bonus off-scale salary component.

About Calculating Bonus Off Scale Salary Components

$$\frac{(\text{Next Higher Salary Step}) - (\text{Approved Salary Step})}{2} = \text{BOS}^*$$

*Bonus off-scale salary components are rounded to the nearest \$100 if the scale rates for the applicable academic series is given in \$100 increments.

In scenarios where the next higher step shares a like-time service requirement with a higher rank and step, use the higher rank and step to calculate the BOS.

If Next Highest Step Is	Calculate BOS Using
Assistant V	Associate I
Assistant VI	Associate II
Associate IV	Full I
Associate V	Full II

Bonus off-scale salary components are paid over a single review period. Payments occur monthly for each year of the review period, and end on the effective date of the next review.

If an academic appointee is not proposed and approved for a new bonus off-scale salary component at the time of their next review, the bonus off-scale salary component will end as scheduled, which may result in a reduction in salary.

For academic appointees who defer their academic review by one (1) year, the deferral will only impact the appointee's review schedule but does not impact their rank, step, or salary components. Candidates advancing to or further Above Scale are not eligible to receive a BOS.

9. Market Off-Scale Salary Components (MOS)

Policy Reference:	230-620
-------------------	-------------------------

A market off-scale salary may be proposed for an existing academic appointee when marketplace conditions necessitate such measures to keep UC San Diego salaries competitive.

- a. Departments may propose a market off-scale salary when an academic appointee receives a competing offer from a peer academic institution for appointment in a similar position. Departments should specifically address how the competing institution compares to UC San Diego and take this information into consideration when determining the proposed value of a

market off-scale salary component. Whenever possible, departments should discuss the ranking of the department of the competing institution relative to their own ranking.

- b. 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.

Market off-scale salary components are typically maintained indefinitely and do not require re-justification following the initial award; however, when there is evidence that an academic appointee with a market off-scale salary component has failed to sustain their career trajectory or stature in the field, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose reduction or elimination of the market off-scale salary component.

When an academic appointee whose salary includes a market off-scale salary component advances to Above Scale, the market off-scale salary component is folded into the new above-scale salary.

An off-scale salary must be in multiples of \$100 when the scale salaries of the relevant title series are multiples of \$100. A market off-scale salary may not be the same as any salary on the published salary scale for the particular title or series.

10. Advancement to Step VI

Policy Reference:	230-220-18 b.
-------------------	-------------------------------

Full Professor/Professor in Residence/Professor of Clinical X/Adjunct Professor/Research Scientist 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 categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching. Service at Professor, step V may be of indefinite duration however, faculty are required to undergo regular academic review with no more than 5 years between review.

About Professional Competence and Activity Criteria

As per [APM 210](#), in certain positions in the professional schools and colleges, such as architecture, business administration, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for advancement. A candidate'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 the individuals in underrepresented groups in the candidate's field.

For advancement to Step VI, external referee letters are not required, but may be solicited at the department's discretion when helpful for demonstrating national or international prominence, highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, or excellent teaching.

Please note external referee letters are optional for advancement to Step VI outside of a Career Equity Review (CER).

11. Advancement to Above Scale

Policy Reference:	230-220-18 b.
-------------------	-------------------------------

Advancement to an above-scale rank involves an overall career review. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at step IX.

The normal salary increase for an academic appointee 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 as applicable²). In accordance with [APM 210](#), a further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by continuing evidence of accomplishment consistent with this level. Continued good performance in all areas of applicable review criteria 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 an increase greater than 100% be approved, such cases will be considered accelerations.

² The evaluation of professional competence and activity generally focuses on clinical expertise or achievement and the quality of patient care. See [APM 210](#)

The honorary title of “Distinguished Professor/X/In-Residence” will be conferred on Ladder Rank and Health Sciences Faculty who advance to Above Scale; the title “Distinguished Research Scientist” will be conferred on those who advance to Above Scale in the Research Scientist series; and the title “Distinguished Teaching Professor” is conferred to those who advance to Above-Scale.

12. Career Equity Review

Related Manual Sections: [1.3.6](#)

Policy Reference:

[230-220-89](#)

A Career Equity Review (CER) is available to Senate faculty members (excluding those at the Assistant or Above Scale level). 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 their regularly on-cycle academic review by submitting a written request to the department chair or to the appropriate dean. CER may be requested only once while the faculty member is at the Associate Professor rank, once while at the Full Professor rank prior to advancement to Professor, Step VI, and once after advancement to Professor, Step VI, prior to advancement to Above Scale. If the request is submitted to the department chair, a copy should also be submitted to the dean by the department chair.

The 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 they believe should be reevaluated. The faculty member may submit selected publications from earlier review periods that they consider 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 academic 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. Please note external referee letters are optional for advancement to Step VI outside of a CER. The academic review file must include the faculty member’s request for the CER. The number of applicable independent referee letters is listed below in section [3.4.16](#).

The department should assess the academic 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 the eligible faculty. This recommendation should be based upon the academic 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. Proposals for a specific rank and step can be further justified by providing comparison data against those in the department already appointed at the requested rank and step including years since PhD, publications, funding, etc. 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 recommendations, both review processes should be discussed in the departmental recommendation letter, and the vote(s) should be recorded on the Academic Recommendation Summary Form. 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.

Upon concluding an initial review or reconsideration request, the applicable final authority, as detailed UC San Diego's [Authority and Review Chart](#), will render a final decision on the CER proposal, depending on the final action. This decision is not subject to appeal and is not retroactive.

13. Probationary Period

Related Manual Sections:	2.1	2.1.2	2.1.3	3.2.23
---------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

At UC San Diego, promotion consideration typically occurs in the sixth year of appointment at the Assistant rank. Please note this should not be interpreted to mean a candidate must serve six years of service at the Assistant rank. Promotion can occur at any time, from one to eight years, within a candidate's eight-year probationary period without consideration of acceleration. See Normal Time at Step chart in [Section 3.1.1](#) of this manual. 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. Note that 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).

14. Terms of Service

Related Manual Sections:	2.1	2.1.2	2.1.3	3.2.23
---------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

[Table of Contents](#) [1.0 Introduction](#) [2.0 Academic Reviews & Appointments](#) [3.0 Academic Reviews](#)
[4.0 Appendix](#) [5.0 Revision History](#)

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 only under the following circumstances:

- a. An appointment or reappointment with an effective date other than July 1st must end on the second June 30th 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 30th 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. This also applies to candidates in an Acting or Visiting Assistant Teaching Professor title who transition to a regular Assistant Teaching Professor title.
- 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 below).

There is no assurance of reappointment, merit advancement, or eventual promotion. Decisions about reappointment and advancement are based upon careful reviews of an academic appointee's achievements and promise for continued growth in accordance with campus and University policy.

15. First Reappointment/Merit Review

The first reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank academic appointee normally occurs during the second year of appointment. ([PPM 230-220-82](#) d.; [APM 220-82](#)) The department may propose:

a. Reappointment with Merit Advancement

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

Please note, an accelerated merit advancement may be proposed in place of a normal merit advancement if the appointee's file and performance support such a proposal.

b. Reappointment without Merit Advancement

If an academic appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment without advancement.

c. Non-Reappointment

Policy Reference:	PPM 230-220-82 d APM 220-82
-------------------	--

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. When appointment at the Assistant rank is not to be renewed, an appointee will receive written notice from the Chancellor/Executive Vice Chancellor in advance of the expiration date.

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

16. Second Reappointment/Merit Review

The second reappointment review of an Assistant-rank academic appointee normally occurs in the fourth year of appointment. ([PPM 230-220-83.](#)) The second reappointment/merit review is usually combined with an appraisal (see below).

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

a. Reappointment with Merit Advancement

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

Please note, an accelerated merit advancement may be proposed in place of a normal merit advancement if the appointee's file and performance support such a proposal.

b. Reappointment without Merit Advancement

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

c. Non-Reappointment

Policy Reference:	PPM 230-220-82 d APM 220-82
-------------------	--

If an academic 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 below).

17. Appraisal

An assistant-rank academic appointee must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of their achievements and progress toward promotion. ([PPM 230-220-83](#); [APM 220-80](#).)

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.

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.

a. Timing

[Per PPM 230-220-83](#), 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.

b. Appraisal Vote

After evaluating and discussing an academic 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 current trajectory of excellence on appropriate external validation.
Favorable with Recommendations	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.
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.

c. 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.

d. Result of Second Faculty Vote:

i. 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.

ii. 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.

18. 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. In cases where a promotion is proposed at a time when a 4th year appraisal would normally be carried out; the promotion file should still include an appraisal.

19. Campus Review

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) reviews appraisals for academic series they are charged with reviewing. An ad hoc review committee may be appointed if deemed necessary by the EVC or CAP.

Please note, instances where the final appraisal outcome differs from CAP’s recommendation are not considered CAP overrides. At the conclusion of the campus review process, the department will receive the final appraisal outcome, as well as any information or advice resulting from the appraisal. The department chair must discuss the result of the appraisal with the academic appointee and provide the academic appointee with a copy of the decision letter.

The final appraisal outcome will be issued by the applicable final authority as detailed in UC San Diego's [Authority and Review Chart](#).

20. Final Reappointment/Merit Review

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. ([PPM 230-220-82 d.](#)) 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 a promotion effective the following July 1.

i. Tenure or Security of Employment

For an academic appointee to be promoted to a title that accords tenure or security of employment, the academic appointee must hold a title eligible for tenure or security of employment, and the 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).

ii. Automatic Extension of the File Cut-off Date

In scenarios where a candidate is proposed for promotion to tenure or security of employment (SOE) and a recommendation is made by reviewers or the applicable final authority for denial of tenure/SOE, candidates will be allowed a one-time file update through April 30th. Acceptable updates for these cases include inclusion of significant service commitments, additional teaching evaluations, updates to grant awards and publications, and previously solicited extramural letters that arrived late.

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

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 (recommending a one or 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 academic appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, the department may vote to recommend terminations 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.

i. Notice of Termination

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

If adequate notice of termination cannot be provided due to error or oversight, the 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.

21. Reconsideration of Promotion

An academic appointee who has received notice of termination may be reconsidered for promotion. ([PPM 230-220-82 e.](#)) Reconsideration is appropriate only when there is substantial evidence of significant improvement in the academic 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 15th 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 established reconsideration file submission deadline will postpone a terminal appointment end date.

A reconsideration file is typically prepared and reviewed during an academic appointee's 12-month 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.

22. Five-year Prohibition of Appointment

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

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 an Assistant Teaching Professor (Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment-LPSOE) 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 ([APM 133, Appendix A](#)):

- Professor series
- Acting titles
- Visiting titles
- Professor in Residence series
- Adjunct Professor series
- Professor of Clinical X (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 for Security of Employment
- Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment
- Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Coordinator of Field Work
- Field Work Supervisor
- Field Work Consultant

About Excluded Titles

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

23. Joint Appointees – Reviews

Related Manual Sections: [2.3.1](#) [2.4.5](#) [3.4.9](#)

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.