


COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

August 27, 2021

To: UCR Academic Senate faculty
Department Chairs
Deans

Via: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Yinsheng Wang, Chair 
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: CAP's Approach to The Call

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has identified sections of the 2021-2022 Call that we believe could confuse faculty due to conflicting or inconsistent language in separate parts of the document. Although CAP appreciates many of the administration's changes to the 2021-2022 Call, the conflicting sections, unfortunately, create the dilemma of which to follow. To promote consistency and transparency of review criteria, CAP discussed these issues and agreed on how the committee will approach these matters next year.

Acceleration at time of Advancement to Professor VI

The Call, p. 11, states: *The bar is set higher for acceleration to Professor Step VII and above, as required in APM 220-18-b(4), revised in 2008. A recommendation for acceleration to these steps requires exceptional performance at the standards noted in APM 220-18-b(4).*

The Call, p. 24, states: *As specified in Section II.A.4.b.iii, advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V. For placement at a higher step, the candidate's record with respect to expectations for the proposed step should be clearly articulated. In the absence of such justification, acceleration criteria will apply.*

CAP interprets these two statements, taken together, to imply that at the time of advancement to Step VI, recommendations for advancement to Step VII or above will be considered multi-year accelerations, and evaluated using the higher bar described on p. 11. The articulation of the candidate's record referenced on p. 24 will be considered, in part, for assessing whether the candidate meets this higher bar for acceleration at this level.

Promotion

The Call, p. 29, states: *A promotion review examines the candidate's record with respect to the criteria as set forth in Section II.A.5. Unless appointed at a barrier step, at least one positive merit will normally be required before a candidate is reviewed for promotion. The question of acceleration should not be an issue in promotion to Associate Professor and*

Professor cases; the issue is whether the candidate has met the criteria, not whether the criteria have been met in a particular time frame.

A promotion involves reviewing the overall career and reviewing bodies should consider where to place the candidate relative to their record. For placement at a higher step, the candidates record with respect to expectations for the proposed step should be clearly articulated. The Department Letter must offer specific recommendations for placement and rationale in support of these recommendations. There is no appeal process for decisions on placements.

CAP interprets these statements to imply that, for placement at a higher step during promotion, acceleration criteria will apply if there is no clear rationale in support of the higher placement. For placement at a higher step, the candidate can also choose to submit a career review.

CAP notes that the responsibility for returning files to the department when they are “absent of justification” lies with the Academic Personnel Office. For files absent of such justification and sent on by the AP Office to CAP, CAP will interpret these statements to imply that, for placement at a higher step during promotion, acceleration criteria will apply.

Weighing achievements across evaluation areas

The Call, p. 13, states: *The flexibility provided in APM-210-1-d should be used when weighing achievements across the different evaluation areas. The relevant verbiage in APM-210-1-d is: “In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another.” Some level of compensation between achievements can support a merit advance, but a significant imbalance will not be successful.*

CAP notes the ambiguity in this paragraph of balancing within areas (APM-210-1-d) with the Call’s reference to balancing between achievements. CAP will consider balancing achievements within areas and between areas. Notwithstanding this flexibility, CAP holds that a minimum standard for advancement or promotion is satisfactory performance in all three areas of review.

Contributions that promote equal opportunity and diversity

As part of the Addendum, Academic Personnel Review and COVID-19, The Call, p. 3, states: *It is recommended to be intentional about recognizing faculty achievements that promote equal opportunity and diversity.*

As part of the main text, The Call, p. 14 states: *extraordinary contributions to equal opportunity and diversity within the existing categories of research, teaching, and service can be recognized as additional strengths of a file.*

CAP notes that these statements are redundant. In evaluating files, CAP will (as stated on p. 14) take into account extraordinary contributions to diversity regardless of COVID-19 considerations.