



Office of the Chair
Telephone: (510) 987-9303
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: george.blumenthal@ucop.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate, Academic Council
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

July 29, 2005

**M.R.C. GREENWOOD
PROVOST AND SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT**

Re: Proposed Modifications to APM 220-18 – Criteria for Advancement to Step VI and Above Scale

Dear M.R.C.:

At its July 27, 2005 meeting, the Academic Council considered and approved by a 14 to 3 vote the enclosed modifications to the criteria for advancement to Step VI and Above Scale (APM 220-18), as proposed by the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). The Academic Council believes that these modifications will lend much needed clarity to the academic personnel process for campus CAPs and the general faculty, and improve the current disparities among the campuses in advancements to these levels.

UCAP took on this task at the request of the Academic Council based on a finding in the report of the [Academic Council Professorial Step System Task Force](#) that the APM criteria for advancement from Step V to Step VI were unclear and difficult to distinguish from the criteria for advancement to Above Scale. UCAP anticipates that the revised criteria will provide for more consistent CAP decisions across the campuses that are grounded more firmly and objectively in the language of the APM.

On behalf of the Academic Council, I want to acknowledge UCAP for its excellent work on developing more appropriate standards for advancement to the Step VI and Above Scale levels, and I urge you to consider amending APM 220-18 to incorporate these long-overdue changes. We would welcome a response from you concerning our recommendation.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "George".

George Blumenthal, Chair
Academic Council

Encl.: Proposed Revisions to APM 220-18

Copy: Alan Barbour, UCAP Chair
Academic Council
María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director

Proposed Amendment to APM 220-18
Approved by the Academic Council July 27, 2005

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 **involves a career review,** usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V, and will be granted on evidence of ~~highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent University teaching,~~ sustained excellence. ~~In interpreting these criteria, reviewers should require evidence of excellence and high merit in original scholarship or creative achievement, teaching and service, and,~~ **University teaching.** In addition, **with respect to scholarly or creative achievement or teaching,** great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, **will be required.** ~~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 or 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 ~~is~~ **involves a career review that is** reserved for scholars ~~and teachers of the highest distinction whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent.~~ **whose work of sustained excellence has attained international recognition and broad acclaim, reflective of its wide impact across the field; whose teaching performance is excellent, and 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~~ **previous** advancements ~~to Step IX was~~ **have been** based. 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 is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increases at intervals shorter than four years be approved.