ACADEMIC DEANS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

RE: Implementation Guidelines – Streamlining Merits for Academic Senate Faculty

This is to provide additional information and clarification of the memo of January 13, 2010, for streamlining and expanding faculty merit delegations to Academic Deans (also see attached Schedule).

The definition of “normal merit,” in delegated cases, is based on the Department’s recommendation. If the Department proposes a normal merit, then the Dean has the delegated authority to decide for, or against, it. A Dean’s decision not to grant a merit increase would result in a delegated decision for No Action.

The following actions are not delegated:

- Merit Reviews with Midcareer Appraisals, or MCA only
- No Action proposed by the Department
- Career Reviews
- Accelerations
- Off-scale salary decisions
- Reappointments or No Actions proposed by the Department
- Fifth-Year Reviews
- All merit actions to overlapping steps (Assistant V and VI; Associate IV and V)
- Merit actions from Professor, Step III to IV
- Advancements to Professor, Step VI
- Advancements to Professor, Above Scale, and Above Scale merits
- Merit increases having effective dates other than July 1
- Retroactive merit increases

I. DOCUMENTATION FOR DEAN DELEGATED MERIT (DDM) ACTIONS AND CAP-REVIEWED NORMAL MERITS

The Task Force on Efficiencies in the Academic Personnel Reviews developed a new form for delegated or CAP reviewed normal merits (UCI-AP-25) that incorporates the necessary information needed by reviewers into a compact document. On the new form, the “UC Academic Employment History” block has been removed from Part Two, to give the Dean sufficient space to record his or her evaluative comments.

We are asking that the following documentation be included in each Dean Delegated Merit Action or normal merit actions reviewed by CAP (also see revised checklist, UCI-AP-33DD):

1) A completed and signed (UCI-AP-25) form.
   The Department evaluation including the following:
   a. The Department vote (there are now two options to display the voting grid for DDM actions)
   b. A summary of the main aspects of the candidate’s Research/Creative Activity; Teaching and Mentoring; and University and Professional Service considered by the Department.

2) A separate recommendation of the Chair, or concurrence.

3) A brief evaluative statement signed by the Dean stating the grounds for his or her decision, based on the information in the file. The Deans’ written evaluation is no longer required unless their decision differs from the departmental evaluation.

4) Addendum (Form UCI-AP-10/UCI-AP-10-Clin) or Review Profile (myData report)

5) Curriculum Vitae

6) Signed Certification Statement (UCI-AP-50) by the Candidate.

NOTE: Publications and teaching evaluations should be forwarded for CAP-reviewed normal merits. For DDM, they will be maintained in the department, and provided upon request.
II. PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW FOR DEAN DELEGATED MERIT ACTIONS

The review process in the Department should be the same as for other merits. The Department Chair has the overall responsibility for the review, which includes notifying the candidate, documenting and presenting the Department’s recommendation, and forwarding the materials.

- **Use the Form (UCI-AP-25) and Checklist (UCI-AP-33DD)**
  The Department’s evaluation should be very brief, no longer than the allotted space. It should include the Department vote and a concise assessment of the candidate’s most noteworthy contributions under the following criteria:
  
  a. Research, creative activities, and grant funding
  b. Professional activities
  c. Teaching (significant courses and graduate mentoring)
  d. University and public service (significant service from Systemwide to Departmental)

- **Chair’s Recommendation**
  With the introduction of the new (UCI-AP-25) form, Chairs are able to indicate their vote on the form. However, if preferred, Chairs may provide a confidential recommendation in a separate letter. Chairs may also choose to record their vote with the department (this can be noted in the department’s evaluation.)

- **Forward to the Dean’s Office**
  The file should be forwarded to the Dean for a final decision, which may be one of the following:

  1) **Approval of proposed Dean Delegated merit:** If the Dean’s decision is to approve the merit increase, the letter informing the candidate of his or her new step and salary should also contain the following budgetary statement:
     
     "The salary increase associated with this advancement is contingent upon final approval of merit and promotion funding by the Office of the President."

     Note: For Assistant Professor merit increases, the letter informing the candidate should also include an effective and end date of the appointment.

  2) **Denial of proposed Dean Delegated merit:** If the Dean’s decision is to disagree with the proposed merit increase, their evaluation and reasons are included on the UCI-AP-25 form. The letter to the candidate should state that the decision is for No Action, or in the case of an Assistant Professor, the Dean may decide for Reappointment only. It is most helpful to the candidate if the letter also contains a brief statement of reasons for the negative decision and advice to the candidate for improving the record.

  3) **Recommendation for acceleration:** If the Dean reviews a normal merit case, which would be delegated, and judges that the candidate’s record warrants an acceleration, then the action becomes non-delegated and will require review by CAP and approval by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

  4) **Request for authorization for an off-scale salary for DDM:** If the Department, Chair, or Dean recommends a new off-scale salary, or something other than the normal 75% return-to-scale increase, then the Vice Provost must authorize the salary, though the Dean retains authority for the merit decision. Once the Dean has decided on the merits of the case and has completed their written evaluation on the UCI-AP-25 form, the entire file should be forwarded to Academic Personnel, justifying the request for an exceptional off-scale salary. The Dean will be informed of the decision on the proposed salary, and may then send his or her final approval letter, with the authorized salary, to the candidate.
• **Office of Record**
  Academic Personnel will remain the office of record for all academic personnel actions, including delegated actions. Completed original dossiers should be sent to Academic Personnel, along with a copy of the Dean’s letter to the candidate, within 30 days of the Dean’s final decision.

• **Post-Audit of Dean Delegated Actions by CAP**
  Academic Personnel will be responsible for providing CAP with a copy of the delegated file at the appropriate time.

• **The Next Action Following No Action or Fifth Year Review**
  If the previous action resulted in No Action, was a reappointment without a merit increase, or Fifth Year Review, then the next action would not be considered normal and would not be delegated. Following a final decision of No Action, faculty may request a merit increase beginning with the next year (this would not be an accelerated action) or may have the benefit of a full 2-year review period (or 3-year period, depending on rank) to strengthen their record.

• **Deferrals**
  If a faculty member’s last review was positive but he or she has requested and received a one-year deferral of review, the next action is considered normal and may be delegated. The one-year deferral is to be non-prejudicial, and is not considered when determining if the next merit action can be delegated to the dean.

• **Split Appointments**
  Where a faculty member holds appointments in more than one school, it would be in the best interests of the candidate for the schools involved to conduct a joint review, starting with a joint committee to review the file (with members of this review committee appointed by each department or unit). The committee would present a report to each unit, which would then discuss the report and vote. It is preferred that the dean of the school with the designated home department make the final decision, based on the recommendations of the joint committee, the units involved, and the dean of the other school.

If you have questions about the implementation procedures, please call your Academic Personnel analyst.

Herbert P. Killackey  
Vice Provost

Attachment: Schedule of Dean Delegated Merit Actions and Normal Merit Actions Reviewed by CAP

cc: Council on Academic Personnel  
CPO’s  
Academic Personnel
# SCHEDULE OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEW ACTIONS

## 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Merit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professor</strong>&lt;br&gt;In Residence&lt;br&gt;Clinical X&lt;br&gt;Sr/Lecturer PSOE</td>
<td>Dean Delegated Merit&lt;br&gt;Normal merit actions* within rank after appointment, promotion, or acceleration. Dean may decide against a merit increase and in favor of Reappointment only.&lt;br&gt;Step I to II&lt;br&gt;Step II to III (if no MCA and if previous action not delegated)&lt;br&gt;Step III to IV (if no MCA and if previous action not delegated)&lt;br&gt;Merit from Step IV to V not delegated&lt;br&gt;Merit from Step V to VI not delegated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professor</strong>&lt;br&gt;In Residence&lt;br&gt;Clinical X&lt;br&gt;Lecturer SOE</td>
<td>Dean Delegated Merit&lt;br&gt;Normal merit actions* within rank after appointment, promotion, or acceleration. Dean may decide against a merit increase and decide for No Action.&lt;br&gt;Step I to II&lt;br&gt;Step II to III (if previous was not delegated)&lt;br&gt;Merit from Step III to IV not delegated&lt;br&gt;Merit from Step IV to V not delegated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor</strong>&lt;br&gt;In Residence&lt;br&gt;Clinical X&lt;br&gt;Sr/Lecturer SOE</td>
<td>Dean Delegated Merit&lt;br&gt;Normal merit actions.* Dean may decide against a merit increase and for No Action. Step I to II&lt;br&gt;Step II to III (except if previous dean delegated action resulted in No Action*)&lt;br&gt;Step III to IV not delegated&lt;br&gt;Step IV to V&lt;br&gt;Advancement to Step VI not delegated&lt;br&gt;Step VI to VII&lt;br&gt;Step VII to VIII (if previous action was not delegated)&lt;br&gt;Step VIII to IX (if previous action was not delegated)&lt;br&gt;Advancement to Above Scale and Above Scale Merit not delegated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Normal merit is defined by Department action. No Actions requested by the Department are non-delegated. The Dean may make a final decision of approval or for No Action. If the Dean reviews a normal merit case, which would be delegated, and judges that the candidate’s record warrants an acceleration, then the action becomes non-delegated and will require review by CAP and approval by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.