

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

*John B. Oakley*  
*Distinguished Professor of Law, U.C. Davis*  
*Telephone: (510) 987-9303*  
*Fax: (510) 763-0309*  
*Email: [John.Oakley@ucop.edu](mailto:John.Oakley@ucop.edu)*

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council*  
*Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents*  
*University of California*  
*1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor*  
*Oakland, California 94607-5200*

April 13, 2007

## **WYATT R. HUME, PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT ACADEMIC AND HEALTH AFFAIRS**

### **Re: Proposed Amendments to APM 220-18: Advancement to Professor Step VI and Above Scale**

Dear Rory,

At its March 28, 2007, meeting, the Academic Council considered and unanimously approved the enclosed amendments to the criteria for advancement to Step VI and Above Scale (APM 220-18.b(4)), as proposed by the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). The Academic Council believes that these amendments will bring the APM criteria in line with current CAP practices, will provide faculty with a clearer understanding of the distinct features of and differences between Step VI and Above Scale reviews, and thus will result in a more consistent and equitable application of the criteria across campuses.

As you know, this concludes a two-year process by which UCAP has sought to amend APM 220-18 in a way most amenable to all Senate constituencies. On behalf of the Academic Council, I want to acknowledge UCAP for its exceptional work in developing more appropriate standards for advancement to the Step VI and Above Scale levels. I respectfully request that review of the enclosed amendments commence this academic year, to ensure an expeditious and appropriate review process. I welcome a response from you concerning this recommendation.

Sincerely,

John Oakley, Chair  
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council  
María Bertero-Barceló, Senate Director

Enclosure: 1

JO:mar

**Proposed Amendment to APM 220-18**  
**Adopted by the Academic Council March 28, 2007**

APM 220-18.b

(4) Professor: The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V, **involves an overall career review**, and will be granted on evidence of **sustained excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) highly distinguished scholarship or creative achievement, (2) highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching, and (3) service.** ~~In interpreting these criteria, reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, teaching and service and, In addition, great academic distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, will be required in at least one these three categories. in scholarly or creative achievement or in teaching.~~ Service at Professor, Step VI, or higher, may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII, to Step IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

Those Professors who are paid on the special Law School scale which has nine steps for the range are subject to the same criteria as Professors as outlined above.

Advancement to an above-scale salary **involves a career review that** is reserved for ~~scholars~~ **distinguished faculty** whose **(1) work of sustained excellence has attained international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact ;** ~~and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed~~ **(2) whose teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is meritorious.** Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. **There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which previous advancements have been based to Step IX was** ~~based is required.~~ A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good ~~service~~ **performance in each of the three categories** is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases ~~based on~~ where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.