

## San Francisco Campus

### **FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF UCSF FACULTY**

#### **PURPOSE:**

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 since the last successful advancement 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. Faculty members who are in the Senior Management Program are excluded. In addition, faculty who have a full time commitment to the University and paid 50% time or less are also subject to the five-year review:

Associate Professors and Professors in the Ladder Rank series.

Associate Professors and Professors in the In-Residence series.

Associate Professor and Professors in the Clinical (X) series.

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

Assistant, Associate, and Professors in the Clinical Professor series.

#### **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 conduct these reviews. The Department Chair and the faculty member will assemble the documentation. The contents of the file will include:

- University-formatted curriculum vitae
- 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 should provide a statement no longer than one page describing his/her perspective on why his/her advancement was not on time.

A departmental faculty vote is not required. The faculty member whose record is being assessed shall be informed about the contents of the file and have the opportunity to add materials to the file. 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

If performance is deemed satisfactory by a reviewing agency, it will recommend either 1) No Advancement (Performance Satisfactory) the current rank and step is appropriate or 2) Advancement (Merit or Promotion) which will then require the preparation of an appropriate dossier. If the performance is deemed No Advancement (Performance Unsatisfactory), the review will continue through the process. If the final decision is unsatisfactory, the department chair and faculty member will be required to submit a plan for

improvement including necessary steps for advancement and/or retention. This plan must include a timetable.

Advancement: If performance warrants advancement, the 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's letter identifies what more needs to be accomplished for advancement.

No advancement, performance unsatisfactory: Some aspects of the performance are less than satisfactory for meeting the criteria that apply to the current rank/step of the series.

#### **REVIEW OUTCOME:**

If performance warrants advancement, the file is prepared and submitted through standard procedures. Written notice is given to the faculty member and the Dean.

If performance is deemed satisfactory but no advancement is recommended, the chair monitors the performance of the faculty member and schedules the next review that must take place in five years or less. Written notification is sent to the faculty member and the Dean.

If performance is deemed unsatisfactory in one or more areas, written notification is sent to the faculty member and the Dean. The chair and faculty member submits a plan for improvement. The chair monitors the performance of the faculty member according to the plan for progress and its timetable. If no progress is evident, the chair may reapportion a faculty member's duties, reassign space or facilities, or deny privileges.

If member's performance is deemed unsatisfactory for an extended period of time, the chair should recommend further action that is consistent with Academic Personnel Manual 075, Termination for Incompetent Performance.