

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.

ADDENDUM A:

Progress Report Requirements and Procedure for **Unsatisfactory** 5-Year Reviews

This addendum is intended to provide clarification and details on the process for submission and review of a Progress Report of a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).

After the initial year of the PIP, the faculty member under review is required by UCSF policy to submit a progress report to his/her Department Chair. Additionally, a final progress report is required at the end of the PIP review period. **Note:** 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.

Process for submitting Progress Reports (includes Interim and Final Reports):

- 1) The Office of the VPAA will notify the appropriate Service Center that a progress report is due (30 days prior to the one year anniversary of the original PIP).
- 2) The Service Center will contact the Department Chair and provide a copy of the PIP and the 5-Year Review policy.
- 3) The Department Chair requests a signed progress report from the faculty member (template below) and discusses as appropriate.
- 4) Once the progress report is received, the Department Chair sends the progress report and the Department Chair's assessment on progress to date to the Service Center. Note: for interim progress reports, the Department Chair's assessment must include whether the review period should be extended for a second year.
- 5) Upon receipt of the progress report and the Department Chair's assessment, the Service Center sends a copy of both documents to the faculty member and notifies him/her of the 14 calendar day rebuttal period.
- 6) After 14 calendar days, the Service Center sends the following to the Office of the VPAA, whereupon the information below is submitted for Vice/Associate Dean review:
 - a.) Faculty member's progress report
 - b.) Chair's assessment of progress to date
 - c.) A copy of the email from the service center to the faculty member notifying him/her of his/her right to submit a rebuttal
 - d.) Response or Rebuttal from faculty member, if provided.

Frequently Asked Questions

Q. Does the chair have the right to see the faculty member's rebuttal that was submitted to the service center?

A. Yes, upon request.

Q. Should the chair submit an assessment even if the faculty member fails to submit a progress report by the deadline?

A. Yes, if the faculty member does not provide the progress report, then the faculty member should be notified by the chair that he/she will proceed with the assessment based on information available to the chair at that time.

*If the faculty member prefers, he/she may send the rebuttal directly to the Office of the VPAA.

Q. Is all the text of the template email below required?

A. Yes, the template text is required; however, the chair may add additional information or text as appropriate.

Q. Are signed copies of all progress reports required or is email ok?

A. Email is acceptable as long as it is clear that the correspondence took place between the chair and the faculty member and not a third party.

Template email from Chair to the faculty member under review:

Dear Dr. X,

It has been one year since we submitted your performance improvement plan resulting from your Unsatisfactory 5-Year Review. At this time, it is required that you submit a signed progress report to me within 30 days of this request. Once I receive your progress report, I will make an assessment, in writing, on your progress to date. If you do not send your progress report to me by the deadline, I will be required to assess your progress and submit my assessment without your report.

You will be provided a copy of my assessment and given 14 days to submit a response or rebuttal before submission to the reviewing agencies.

If you would like to meet to discuss your progress and submission of the report, please contact me as soon as possible.

A full copy of the 5-Year review policy can be found online here: <https://academicaffairs.ucsf.edu/academic-personnel/media/FiveYearReviewPolicy-Final-July-2011.pdf>

Regards,