

## UC Davis Academic Personnel Manual

### Appointment and Promotion

#### Section UCD 220AF, Academic Federation Review and Advancement

Date: July 14, 2020

Supersedes: August 15, 2019

Responsible Department: Academic Affairs

Source Document: APM 220 and APM UCD 220

---

## I. Purpose

This section summarizes the principles, policies, and procedures at UC Davis that govern the evaluation and review of academic performance of members of the Academic Federation.

These procedures should be used for each personnel action, taking into account relevant variations for the specific title series outlined in Sections APM 220 and APM UCD 220 for the specific title series of the candidate.

### A. Applicable Academic Federation title series:

- Academic Administrator (APM 370, APM UCD 370)
- Academic Coordinator (APM 375)
- Agronomist (\_\_\_ in the Agricultural Experiment Station) (APM 320, APM UCD 320)
- Assistant, Associate University Librarian (APM 365)
- Continuing Educator (APM 340)
- Librarians (non-represented) (APM 360)
- Professional Research (APM 310)
- Project (e.g., Scientist) (APM 311)
- Specialists (APM 330, APM UCD 330)
- Specialist in Cooperative Extension (APM 334, APM UCD 334)
- Supervisor of Physical Education (APM 300)
- University Extension Teacher (APM UCD 340B)

### B. For titles administered under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), refer to the appropriate contract and relevant APM UCD policy sections that implement the contracts.

- Librarians (Unit 17)  
<http://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/labor/bargaining-units/lx/contract.html>
- Lecturers, Supervisors of Teacher Education, Nursery School Teachers (Unit 18)  
<http://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/labor/bargaining-units/ix/contract.html>
- Academic Researchers: Professional Researchers, Project Scientists, Specialists (RA Unit)  
<https://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/labor/bargaining-units/ra/contract.html>

## II. Access to Review Records

For Academic Federation actions, a single peer review group letter should not have identifying names in the body, and if a department summarizes the peer review group's comments or if individual letters

or comments along with votes are submitted, then these should be treated as confidential and be redacted, if necessary.

See APM 160 and APM UCD 220 II for more information regarding access to review records.

### III. Appointment

An appointment is the initial employment of an individual in an academic position, employment into an academic title from any other academic title (appointment via change in title), the addition of an academic title in the same or different department, or an appointment via change in department of an academic appointment into a different title series.

### IV. Advancement and review

#### A. Eligibility for Advancement

There are established periods of service at each rank and step that indicate the normative intervals for advancement to the next step. Refer to the specific title series policy listed in Section I for detailed information and Section APM UCD 220AF IV. F. for deferral request requirements. Note that although these time periods indicate the standard intervals between advancements, they do not preclude more gradual advancement, or more rapid promotion.

Departments should maintain accurate records for eligibility for advancement for their academic appointees. The Vice Provost's office provides access to an eligibility list for all academic appointees that should be reviewed by deans' offices and departments to determine the advancement actions or reviews that should occur in the next review cycle.

#### B. Special notes: Academic Senate processes for specific Academic Federation title series

##### 1. Overlapping steps

See APM UCD 220 IV. B. 1. This policy applies to only the following Federation title series:

- Agronomist (\_\_\_ in the AES) (APM 320),
- Professional Research (APM 310),
- Specialist in Cooperative Extension (APM 334)
- Project (e.g., *Scientist*) (APM 311)

Steps 5 through 6.5 of the Assistant rank are normally used only when initial appointment has been at Step 2 or higher, and only if promotion to Associate rank can reasonably be expected by the following review cycle. The salary levels for these steps overlap those of Associate rank, Steps 1 through 2.5. When and if promotion is ultimately achieved, the level of the promotion is normally such as to avoid loss of salary. Advancements to Assistant rank, Steps 5 through 6.5 are not to be considered decelerations.

Similarly, Steps 4 through 5.5 of the Associate rank are normally used only when initial appointment or promotion has been at Associate rank, Step 2 or higher, and only if promotion to Full rank can reasonably be expected by the following review cycle. The salary levels for these steps overlap with Full rank, Steps 1 through 2.5 of the full Professor rank. When and if promotion is ultimately achieved, the level of the promotion is normally such as to avoid loss of salary. Advancements to Associate rank, Steps 4 through 5.5 are not to be considered decelerations.

##### 2. While employees holding an appointment in the Adjunct Professor series (APM 280) or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series (APM 278) are members of the Academic

Federation, policies and guidelines administering Academic Senate appointees govern this series (APM UCD 220).

3. Appointees in the Agronomist (\_\_\_ in the AES) series (APM 320) and the Professional Research series (APM 310) who jointly hold an Academic Senate title are administered fully under the Academic Senate policies governing academic personnel review and advancement (APM UCD 220).
  4. See APM UCD 220 IV. B. for Special Notes on the following topics:
    - Advancement of Joint Appointments (APM UCD 220 IV. B. 2.).
    - Mid-year appointments and the effect on the review cycle (APM UCD 220 IV. B. 3.).
    - Retroactive Actions ((APM UCD 220 IV. B. 4.).
- C. Merit Advancement (APM UCD 220 IV C.)
1. The period covered by the review for merit is as follows:
    - a. For merit advancement to Assistant rank, Step 2 through Full rank, Step 5.5: The review period includes all achievements and activities subsequent to those counted for advancement to the current step. The normative time between merit reviews is 2 years for all candidates below Associate rank, Step 4. Subsequently, the normative time between merits reviews is 3 years.
    - b. For advancement to Full rank, Step 6: The review period includes all achievements and activities since advancement to the Full rank. This includes periods when the candidate was a full rank or equivalent at another institution. Review does not occur before three years at current step.
    - c. For advancement from Full rank, Step 6, through Full rank, Step 9.5: The review period includes all achievements and activities subsequent to those counted for advancement to the current step. Review for advancement does not occur before three years at the current step.
    - d. For advancement to above-scale: The review period includes all achievements and activities since advancement to the Full rank. This includes periods when the candidate was a full rank or equivalent at another institution. Review for advancement does not occur before normative time at the current step (i.e., three years at Step 8 or 8.5, or four years at Step 9 or 9.5).
    - e. For advancement further above-scale: The review period includes all achievements and activities since advancement to the current above-scale salary level. Review does not occur before four years at the current above-scale salary level.
    - f. Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator, and Continuing Educator to higher level: the period since last advancement.
- D. Appraisals (see APM UCD 220 IV. D. for additional information).

An appraisal is a detailed analysis and evaluation of an academic appointee's past achievement and normally occurs in the fourth year at the rank of assistant (or in combination with other eligible titles; see APM 133). The appraisal is intended to provide frank and candid assessments of the appointee's performance and collegial recommendations for further career development. This procedure applies only to Academic Federation appointees in the following titles:

- Assistant Agronomist (\_\_\_ in the AES)

- Assistant Specialist in Cooperative Extension

E. Promotions (APM UCD 220 IV. E.)

The period of service covered by a review for promotion is as follows:

1. To Associate level: since appointment to Assistant rank.
2. To Full title: since promotion or appointment to Associate rank.
3. Academic Administrator, to higher level: since promotion or appointment to current rank.

See the procedure and checklist for promotions.

F. Deferrals (APM UCD 220 IV. F. and APM UCD 220 Procedure 3, Postponement and Deferral). A deferral must be requested for certain academic title series when the individual is eligible but is not to be considered for normal advancement. This procedure applies only to appointees in the following title series in the Academic Federation:

- Academic Administrator (if non-State funded)
- Academic Coordinator (if non-State funded)
- Agronomist (\_\_\_ in the AES)
- Continuing Educator
- Librarians
- Professional Researcher
- Project Scientist
- Specialist
- Specialist in Cooperative Extension
- Specialist (in the AES)
- University Extension Teacher

G. Five-year review (APM UCD 220 IV. H. and APM UCD 220 Procedure 4, Five-Year Review).

These policies and procedures apply only to the following title series:

- Agronomist (\_\_\_ in the AES)
- Professional Research
- Project Scientist
- Specialist
- Specialist in Cooperative Extension
- Specialist (in the AES)
- Supervisor of Physical Education

H. Appeals (APM UCD 220 IV. J.)

An appeal must provide evidence of failure to follow established procedure or of reviewers' failure to apply established standards of merit. Administrative reviews (e.g., endowed chair and department chair appointments/reappointments) may not be appealed. Appeals are considered by the appropriate Academic Federation committee for the title series. An appeal must be received in the Vice Provost's office for non-redelegated actions, or in the dean's office for redelegated actions, within 30 calendar days of written notification of said decision. A new Candidate's Disclosure Certificate is required with the appeal. Intramural and unsolicited letters of support cannot be included in the dossier.

See the APM UCD Procedure 5 for appeal.

After the final administrative decision has been communicated to the candidate, the candidate shall have the right, upon written request, to receive from the Chancellor or other designated administrative officer a written statement of the reasons for that decision, including a copy of non-confidential documents and a redacted copy of the confidential academic review records (as defined in APM-160-20-b(1)) in the personnel review file.

## V. Conducting review for appointment or advancement

- A. Confidentiality during the review process (APM UCD 220 V. A.).
- B. Review process (APM UCD 220 V. B.).
  1. The department chairperson responsibility (APM UCD 220 V. B. 1.).
  2. Candidate's statement (optional) (APM UCD 220 V. B. 2.).
  3. Statement of Contributions to Diversity (APM UCD 220 V. B. 3. And APM 210-1 d.).
  4. Letters of evaluation (APM UCD 220 V. B. 4.).

Solicitation of extramural letters (see APM UCD 220AF Exhibit B for sample formats).

Clientele letters may be solicited (but are not required) for merit actions for candidates in the following title series:

- Specialist in Cooperative Extension
- Continuing Educator
- University Extension Teacher

In addition to extramural letters, clientele letters may be solicited in promotion actions for the following title series:

- Academic Administrator
5. Peer review, voting requirements, and consultation with department faculty (APM UCD 220 V. B. 5.).

The department's recommendation is made in accordance with the procedural regulations of the Academic Federation and established governance practices for Academic Federation members of the department.

The department's consultation process must include input from a designated peer group and a vote of the designated voting group for the candidate. The composition of both the peer group and the voting group for a candidate must be identified within a written plan approved in advance by the Vice Provost--Academic Affairs in consultation with input from the appropriate Academic Federation personnel committee. The plan must also

include details of the consultation process to be used. Refer to [UCD Directive 01-110](#) for guidelines on peer and voting group procedures.

6. Structure of the department letter (APM UCD 220 V. B. 6.).

For Academic Federation titles, this letter should address only those areas applicable to the title series. In addition to or in place of teaching, research, and University and public service, certain Academic Federation titles should be reviewed for performance in administration (APM UCD 220AF Exhibit A). For evaluating performance in administration, the department letter should summarize the candidate's administrative responsibilities during the review period. The letter should remark on the intellectual leadership and scholarship in:

1. Quality of the planning, developing, and evaluation of programs.
2. Direction and supervision of staff.
3. Management of program resources.
4. Administration of a program/department in relation to its mission including complexity of department and level of independence.

7. Chair's confidential letter (optional) (APM UCD 220 V. B. 7.).

8. Candidate's access to file prior to department vote (APM UCD 220 V. B. 8.).

Prior to the review by peers and/or department, the chair shall provide the candidate with an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential documents in the personnel review file (APM 160-20 b. (2)) and shall provide a redacted copy of the confidential records. This is to allow the candidate the opportunity to correct any errors of fact and refute the contents of the letters by submitting a rebuttal letter within 10 days of receipt of the records.

9. Candidate's access to file after department review (APM UCD 220 V. B. 9.).

10. Assembly of the dossier (APM UCD 220 V. B. 10.).

11. Late submission of material and department responsibility for review (APM UCD 220 V. B. 11.).

Peer review and voting groups shall be invited to comment on any new material added to the review file.

12. Preliminary assessment (APM UCD 220 V. B. 12.). Preliminary assessments will be sent to departments only in cases of intended denial of promotion to associate rank with resulting termination of appointment. These policies and procedures apply only to the following title series:

- Agronomist (\_\_\_ in the AES)
- Specialist in Cooperative Extension

## VI. Approval Authority

The authority to make recommendations and decisions on academic reviews is outlined in the UC Davis delegations of authority <http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/dofa.cfm>

## VII. Procedures, Exhibits, Forms and Checklists

A. Procedure (See APM UCD 220 Procedures):

1. [Appointment](#)
  2. [Merit, Appraisal, Promotion, Career Equity Review, and Preliminary Assessment](#)
  3. [Deferral and Postponement](#)
  4. [Five-Year Review](#)
  5. [Appeal](#)
- B. Exhibits:
- A. [Criteria Used for Evaluating Performance when Soliciting Extramural Evaluations](#)
  - B. [Model Format for Soliciting Extramural Evaluations for Academic Federation Promotions](#)
- C. Forms and Checklists:

All forms and checklist are available at  
[http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/resources/forms\\_checklists/index.html](http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/resources/forms_checklists/index.html).