

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF UCSF FACULTY

PURPOSE:

Per APM 200-0, any faculty member who has not had an academic personnel review processed within the previous five-year period must receive a Five-Year Review. The purpose of a five-year review of faculty is to ensure that the performance of a faculty member is appraised at regular intervals, to assess the faculty member's productivity, and to identify what more needs to be accomplished for advancement.

The five-year review process applies to the following categories of faculty members who are employed more than 50% time:

Assistant, Associate, and full Professors in the Ladder Rank series.

Assistant, Associate, and full Professors in the In-Residence series.

Assistant, Associate, and full Professors in the Clinical (X) series.

Assistant, Associate, and full Professors in the Adjunct series.

Assistant, Associate, and full Professors in the Health Sciences Clinical series.

In addition, faculty who have a full time commitment to the University and paid 50% time or less (e.g., faculty paid by affiliates) are also subject to the five-year review. Faculty members who are appointed in the Senior Management Program are excluded.

PROCEDURE:

Five Year Reviews will follow the general procedures of APM-220-80.

The Department Chair is responsible for identifying who should receive a five-year review and is required to initiate these reviews. The Department Chair and the faculty member will assemble the documentation. The contents of the file will include at a minimum:

- UCSF-formatted curriculum vitae in the on-line Advance system
- Cover letter from the department chair. It should address the criteria for the faculty member's series, rank and step and should include an assessment of the faculty member's contributions.
- The faculty member may provide a statement no longer than one page describing his/her perspective on why his/her advancement was not on time.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide the requested documentation within a reasonable time frame not to exceed three months, with extensions as appropriate, e.g., for periods of approved leaves of absence. If the faculty member does

not provide documentation upon request, then the faculty member should be notified that the review will proceed with the documentation available in the faculty member's personnel file. It is acknowledged that this documentation might not be current and could therefore affect the outcome of the review.

A departmental faculty vote is not required. Per APM 220-80, before the packet is forwarded to the Dean's office, the faculty member whose record is being assessed shall be informed about the contents of the file and have the opportunity to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation which will become part of the file. The candidate will be given 7 calendar days to review the contents and to provide a written statement at his/her discretion. If the departmental or Vice/Associate Dean's recommendation is made for merit or promotion, the appropriate documentation for the action must be compiled at that time.

Based on review of the materials submitted, the reviewing agencies will recommend one of the three outcomes:

Review Outcome	Definition	Next Steps
Advancement (Merit or Promotion) - Performance Satisfactory	Performance warrants review for advancement.	Merit or promotion file is prepared and forwarded with appropriate documentation according to standard procedures.
No Advancement - Performance Satisfactory	Performance continues to meet the criteria for the current rank/step of the series, but does not warrant advancement at this time.	The department chair monitors the performance of the faculty member and schedules the next review, which must take place in five years or less. Written notification is sent to the faculty member and the Dean that identifies what more needs to be accomplished for advancement.
No Advancement - Performance Unsatisfactory	One or more aspects of the performance are unsatisfactory for meeting the criteria that apply to the current rank/step of the series.	The department chair and faculty member will be required to submit a plan for improvement including necessary steps for advancement and/or retention. See below for additional details.

PROCESS AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS FOR A REVIEW OUTCOME OF PERFORMANCE UNSATISFACTORY:

GOOD STANDING: If the initial five-year review outcome is determined to be Performance Unsatisfactory, the faculty member is considered not to be in good standing for the duration of the performance improvement period. In addition to any of the School/Departmental compensation plan restrictions for not being in good standing (per APM 670), the faculty member is not eligible for academic leaves until the final outcome of the review has been determined by CAP to be Satisfactory.

PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP): If the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) recommends an outcome of Performance Unsatisfactory, specific information will be provided on the area(s) in which the performance is not consistent with the series, rank, and step of the faculty member. The chair and the faculty member will be required to submit a plan for improvement (PIP) that sets forth performance expectations to address those areas which have been identified as unsatisfactory. It is assumed that satisfactory performance will be maintained in all other areas. The PIP shall generally be one year in duration and can be extended for a second year if sufficient progress is achieved. The PIP must be submitted to the Vice Provost, Academic Affairs within 30 days of notification for unsatisfactory performance.

PROGRESS REPORT: The faculty member under review must submit a progress report to his/her Department Chair one year after the PIP was approved. The Chair makes an assessment on progress to date and submits the progress report to the Dean's office. If both the Chair and the Vice/Associate Dean of Academic Affairs find that sufficient progress is evident, then the review period may be extended for a second year as appropriate. If the assessment of both the Chair and the Vice/Associate Dean of Academic Affairs is that no progress, or insufficient progress, has been made one year after the PIP was approved, the progress report is submitted to CAP for final assessment. If the final assessment by CAP is that performance is unsatisfactory one year after the PIP was approved, the Chair should then recommend further action that is consistent with Academic Personnel Manual 075. In cases where the Chair's assessment and the Vice/Associate Dean's assessment are discrepant, the interim report should be forwarded to the VPAA for further review. Note that if the approved PIP was one year (or less) in duration, then only a final progress report at the end of the review period is required.

FINAL PROGRESS REPORT: At the end of the PIP review period, the faculty member under review must submit a final progress report to his/her Department Chair. The Chair makes an assessment on whether the performance expectations have been met and submits the final progress report to the Dean's office. The Vice/Associate Dean of Academic Affairs provides an assessment and submits the report to CAP. CAP shall make a summary recommendation based on the activities and accomplishments during the improvement plan period. CAP's recommendation shall consider whether the faculty member, upon re-review would be given a rating of Performance Satisfactory or Performance Unsatisfactory. If performance is satisfactory, then the five year review is considered complete and the faculty member will be eligible for academic review in the next appropriate review cycle for their rank and step. If performance is

unsatisfactory, then the Chair should recommend further action that is consistent with Academic Personnel Manual 075.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER POLICIES AND/OR DEPARTMENTAL ACTIONS:

Note that a faculty member undergoing initial assessment under this policy and/or during a period of improvement may be subject to actions governed by other policies, such as the In Residence Task Force Report and Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment (APM 137).

CHANGE IN SERIES: Upon discussion between the Department Chair and the faculty member, a change in series may be considered if during the review period or subsequent period of improvement, it is determined that the faculty member's performance would satisfactorily meet the criteria at the current rank/step in a different series. Note that a change of series is at the discretion of the Department Chair and must meet all of the relevant policies requirements such as faculty vote and academic search as appropriate. Upon approval of this request, a change in series packet should be submitted for academic review.