

REVISED: December 11, 2015
September 18, 2015

[Advisory to Deans #AA2015-08](#)

**DEANS, EXECUTIVE ASSOCIATE DEANS, ASSOCIATE DEANS, ASSISTANT DEANS, CHAIRS,
AND ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ANALYSTS**

Re: Action Form for Step Plus and Delegation of Authority guidance

Dear Colleagues,

After consultation with the Committee on Academic Personnel-Oversight Committee (CAP-OC), the administration and Senate leadership have identified necessary and important changes in the completion of the Action Form and the selection of Delegation of Authority for all actions. These changes are designed to improve alignment between our review process and the ideals underlying the Step Plus system, and are **effective immediately for the 2015-2016 review cycle**. As noted below, these changes supersede some instructions presented in Advisory #AA2015-04 or the 2015-2016 Annual Call, so please review this new document carefully. Please find detailed step-by-step procedures in the attached Appendix A. The most significant changes include:

- **The Action Form should now reflect, as the default action type, a 1.0-step advancement for all actions during the initial department review and vote.** This is also true for Above Scale actions (see first Above Scale formula at <http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/policies/step-plus/further-above-scale-merits.html>; after which Above Scale actions of 1.0-step = 5% salary increase).
Reminder: If the action is an Endowed Chair/Professorship Appointment/Reappointment or a Department Chair Five-Year Review, the current and proposed status on the Action Form should be the same rank and step.
- If the candidate's advancement eligibility (up to 2.0 steps) could potentially cross a promotion/barrier step, the department should prepare the dossier matching the longest potential review period. If advancement to promotion or a barrier step would require extramural letters, the candidate must be consulted regarding soliciting extramural letters. The actual solicitation of letters can be delayed until after the initial department vote. However, if any of the recommending bodies (department, FPC or dean) makes a recommendation for an advancement that requires extramural letters (promotion or crossing a barrier step), additional review and voting are required after receipt of the extramural letters.
- **In the case of a split vote, the highest step supported by at least half of the voters shall be the department recommendation.**
- Although this practice should not be encouraged, the candidate may make the case for a particular advancement (1.0, 1.5, or 2.0 steps) in their candidate's statement. However, this request *per se* does not affect either the Action Form or Delegation of Authority.
- After the results of the department vote are shared with the candidate, the candidate retains the option to pursue the action even if advancement is not supported by the majority of department voters. (In this case, the Action Form should be presented as a 1.0-step advancement.) Alternatively, the candidate may defer consideration for advancement by requesting a deferral, unless policy requires promotion or five-year review.
- The primary department should update the proposed status on the Action Form to reflect the highest advancement recommendation from any of the candidate's departments (home department, secondary department, etc.). The proposed action then determines the delegation of authority (see delegation discussion below). If the action is an Above Scale merit, please include the rate of the proposed action (1.0-, 1.5- or 2.0-step advancement) in the field "Rank and Title" under the Proposed Status in the Action Form. Please find examples in Appendix B.
- If the department has already prepared the Action Form and conducted the faculty vote based on advisory #AA2015-04 or the 2015-2016 Annual Call, which stated that the Action Form

should reflect the *candidate's* choice, please leave the Action Form as-is, since the candidate's request may have influenced the vote. However, the Delegation of Authority for the action should be updated according to the guidance below.

- The Delegation of Authority for the action should be updated by the primary department after the recommendation(s) of the department(s) is/are received. The Delegation of Authority may also be changed after receipt of the recommendation(s) from the Faculty Personnel Committee(s)(FPC) and/or dean(s). To determine the delegation of authority, see <http://academicaffairs.ucdavis.edu/dofa.cfm> and use the following guidance:
 - If none of the reviewing bodies (departments, FPC or deans) supports more than either a 1.0-step or 1.5-step advancement, and that highest supported advancement action is redelegated, then select “Redelegated” as the delegation of authority. If this redelegated action is the first action after appointment or promotion, the dean has decision authority and FPC review is optional.
 - If any department recommends a 2.0-step advancement or an action that is a promotion or merit that crosses a barrier step, the action is entered as “non-redelegated”. This applies to any primary or joint department(s) recommendation(s). Depending on how the dossier was prepared or if the barrier step requires extramural letters, the action may need to be returned to the primary department for possible dossier changes and new vote(s)/recommendation(s) from all departments.
 - If the FPC, primary dean, or joint dean makes a recommendation for a 2.0-step advancement or an action that crosses a barrier step, the action becomes non-redelegated. Depending on how the dossier was prepared or if the barrier step requires extramural letters, the action may need to be returned to the department level for possible dossier changes and new vote(s)/recommendation(s).

If you have any questions, comments or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Vice Provost Stanton (mlstanton@ucdavis.edu, 530-752-2072) or Kelly Anders, Director of Academic Personnel & Systems (kanders@ucdavis.edu, 530-754-8268).

Sincerely,



Maureen L. Stanton
Vice Provost—Academic Affairs
Distinguished Professor, Evolution and Ecology



André Knoesen
Chair, Davis Division Academic Senate Office
Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering

c: Chair Debra Long, CAP-OC
Executive Director Gina Anderson, Academic Senate

/kla

Appendix A: Interim APM UCD-220-Procedure 1

(changes to Procedure 1 due to this advisory are in **bold text and highlighted in yellow**)

Section 220, Academic Senate Review and Advancement

Procedure 1, Appraisal, Merit, Promotion, and Preliminary Assessment

A. Appraisal, merit, and promotion

Responsibility	Action
Dean	1. Compiles list of those eligible for appraisal, merit increase, and promotion; forwards list to departments for verification and to Vice Provost--Academic Affairs.
Department chair	<p>2. Consults with candidate regarding eligibility and preparation of review file; if applicable, solicits letters of evaluation; notifies Dean--Graduate Studies to prepare comments on service of candidates who are graduate group chairs (see Section UCD-245B). If the candidate requests a deferral on his/her action, and is entitled to take the deferral, then the chair prepares a letter with that request for submission to the Dean.</p> <p>MIV: Start the Action and create the Action Form. The Action Form should reflect a 1.0-step advancement for the initial department review and vote.</p> <p><i>Note: See detailed sequential checklist of chair's duties and responsibilities. Other checklists provide guidelines for preparation of supporting documentation. See Exhibit B for instructions pertaining to language required when letters of evaluation are solicited or when letters are received unsolicited and for model formats for letters.</i></p> <p>3. Provides copy of redacted extramural letters to candidate and informs candidate that he/she has the option to submit a rebuttal letter within 10 calendar days from date of receiving copies of redacted extramural letters.</p> <p>4. After receipt of the candidate packet, assign reviewers and open a review period. Consult with faculty, who meet, discuss candidate's record, and subsequently vote (Exhibit A). The faculty vote should consider a 1.0-, 1.5- and 2.0-step advancement in every case.</p> <p>5. Prepares departmental evaluation/recommendation letter; obtains review of letter by voting faculty; provides candidate with copies of all non-confidential documents.</p> <p>After the results of the department vote are shared with the candidate, the candidate retains the option to pursue the action without department support (prepare the Action Form as a 1.0-step advancement). Or, the candidate may defer consideration for advancement by requesting a deferral, unless policy requires promotion or five-year review.</p> <p>6. Informs candidate of right to submit a rejoinder to the departmental recommendation within 10 calendar days from date of receipt of department</p>

	<p>letter.</p> <p>7. Obtains Candidate's Disclosure Certificate from candidate that verifies that he/she has reviewed the file.</p> <p>8. Update the proposed status and the delegation of authority on the Action Form according to the highest department recommendation.</p> <p>9. Forward complete review file to dean.</p>
Dean	10. Assures that review file is in compliance with established policies and procedures and assembled in established format for evaluation.
<p><i>The following steps apply when the approval authority for the action has been delegated to the dean (refer to the Delegations of Authority).</i></p>	
Dean	11. Submits the proposed action directly to college/division/school faculty personnel committee (FPC).
FPC	12. Evaluates review file and makes recommendation to dean.
Dean	<p>13. Makes final decision; at dates specified by the Vice Provost, sends announcement to department chair, with comments.</p> <p>If the Dean does not support advancement, the options are “Recommend denial” or “Denied”.</p> <p>If the Dean supports the proposed action on the Action form, the recommendation/final decision selection in MIV is “Recommend Approval” or “Approved”.</p> <p>If the Dean supports anything other than what is proposed on the Action Form, the recommendation/final decision selection in MIV is “Recommend Other” or “Other”. Be sure the recommendation/final decision is documented in the comment box.</p> <p>If the FPC, joint dean(s), or primary dean make a recommendation for a 2.0-step advancement or an action that crosses a barrier (promotion, Step VI or Above Scale), the action becomes non-redelegated. Skip to step 19, unless the action needs to be returned to the department-level for changes to the dossier (such as modified review period, addition of extramural letters, new department vote(s) and letter(s)).</p> <p><i>Note: When dean's final decision is different from recommendation of FPC, reasons for the decision must be included in dean's comments.</i></p>
Department chair	<p>14. Transmits decision (in writing) to candidate with copy of reviewers' comments.</p> <p>15. If the action is denied, has candidate sign certification form indicating he/she has received reviewers' comments; sends form to the dean.</p>
Dean	16. Forwards completed dossiers to Vice Provost--Academic Affairs.
Vice Provost	17. Forwards dossiers and copy of dean's notification list to the Academic Senate office for postaudit by Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP).

CAP	18. Following postaudit, returns completed actions to Vice Provost--Academic Affairs as the office of record.
<i>The following steps apply when the approval authority for the action is the Vice Provost--Academic Affairs/Chancellor.</i>	
Dean	19. Evaluates review file and writes evaluative recommendation letter and forwards review file to Vice Provost--Academic Affairs. If the Dean does not support advancement, select “Recommend denial”. If the Dean supports the action proposed on the Action Form, select “Recommend Approval”. If the Dean supports anything other than what is proposed on the Action Form, select “Recommend Other”. Be sure the recommendation/final decision is documented in the comment box.
Vice Provost--Academic Affairs	20. Assures that review file is in compliance with established policies and procedures; forwards review file to CAP.
<i>If ad hoc committee is required for review:</i>	
CAP	21. Evaluates review file; forwards ad hoc committee nominations to Vice Provost--Academic Affairs.
Vice Provost--Academic Affairs	22. Appoints ad hoc committee; forwards list of ad hoc committee members to CAP.
Ad hoc committee chair	23. Obtains review file from Academic Senate Office, circulates review file to members.
Ad hoc committee	24. Reviews file, meets and discusses file, makes recommendation.
Ad hoc committee chair	25. Drafts final report; returns report and review file to Academic Senate Office.
CAP staff	26. Prepares final ad hoc committee report; obtains signatures of ad hoc committee members following their review of report; forwards report to CAP.
CAP	27. Reviews file and ad hoc committee report; discusses, and votes on recommendation; writes report of recommendation to Vice Provost--Academic Affairs; forwards file and recommendation to Vice Provost--Academic Affairs.
Vice Provost--Academic Affairs	28. Reviews ad hoc and CAP reports and reviews file; makes decision; if Chancellor has the final decision authority (e.g., for tenure cases), forwards file and written recommendation letter to Chancellor (or Regents). If the VP/Provost/Chancellor does not support the proposed advancement, the options are “Recommend denial” or “Denied”. If the VP/Provost/Chancellor supports the proposed action on the Action Form, the recommendation/final decision selection in MIV is “Recommend Approval” or “Approved”.

	<p>If the VP/Provost/Chancellor supports anything other than what is proposed on the Action Form, the recommendation/final decision selection in MIV is “Recommend Other” or “Other”. Be sure the recommendation/final decision is documented in the comment box.</p> <p><i>Note: When final recommendation of the Vice Provost is different from recommendation of personnel committee, reasons for the recommendation must be included in the letter to the dean.</i></p> <p>29. Transmits final decision, with reviewer comments, to the dean.</p>
Dean	30. Informs department chair of final decision, with reviewer comments.
Department chair	<p>31. Transmits final decision and copy of reviewers' comments to candidate. This should be done in writing to document date of notification.</p> <p>32. If action is denied, has candidate sign Certification form indicating he/she has received reviewers' comments; sends form, through dean's office, to Vice Provost--Academic Affairs.</p>

B. Preliminary assessment

Responsibility	Action
Vice Provost-- Academic Personnel	<p>1. Makes preliminary assessment to deny promotion to Associate rank.</p> <p>2. Notifies department chair (with copy to the dean).</p>
Dean	<p>3. Provides comments of all reviewers.</p> <p><i>Note: Responses from all parties are due in 14 calendar days from date of notification to the department.</i></p> <p>4. Reviews responses from department chair and candidate; submits written recommendation for action to Vice Provost--Academic Personnel.</p>
Vice Provost-- Academic Personnel	5. Forwards review file to CAP for reconsideration.
CAP	6. Reconsiders case and submits recommendation to Vice Provost--Academic Personnel.
Vice Provost-- Academic Personnel	7. Reviews personnel committee recommendation and reviews file; sends recommendation to Chancellor.
Chancellor	8. Makes final decision; returns to Vice Provost--Academic Personnel.
Vice Provost-- Academic Personnel	9. Notifies dean.
Dean	10. Notifies department chair.

Appendix B: Above Scale Action Form Data Entry Example

Data entry screen:

Non-Redelegated Merit effective July 1, 2016

Appointment Details

Present Status

Information and Educational Technology - Application Development - 100%

* Department: Information and Educational Technology - Appl

* % of Time: 100

Professor - 100%

* Title Code: 1100

* Rank and Title: Professor Step: AS

* % of Time: 100 Without Salary:

* Basis/Paid Over: 9/12

If Monthly salary is selected both Monthly and Annual salary are required.

* Salary Period: Monthly Hourly

* Monthly Salary: 16,143.75 * Annual Salary: 193,725

* Years At Rank: 30

* Years At Step: 4

Add Title

Proposed Status

Information and Educational Technology - Application Development - 100%

* Department: Information and Educational Technology - Appl

* % of Time: 100

Professor (1.5 step) - 100%

* Title Code: 1100

* Rank and Title: Professor (1.5 step) Step: AS

* % of Time: 100 Without Salary:

* Basis/Paid Over: 9/12

If Monthly salary is selected both Monthly and Annual salary are required.

* Salary Period: Monthly Hourly

* Monthly Salary: 17,354.50 * Annual Salary: 208,254

Add Title

Resulting PDF:

Effective Date: July 1, 2016

Normal: **Acceleration Years:**

Present Status

Home Department:
Information and Educational Technology
Application Development

% of Time: 100%

Title Code: 1100

Rank and Title: Professor **Step:** AS

% of Time: 100% **Basis/Paid Over:** 9/12

Monthly Salary: 16,143.75 **Annual Salary:** 193,725.00

Years At Rank: 30 **Years At Step:** 4

Proposed Status

Home Department:
Information and Educational Technology
Application Development

% of Time: 100%

Title Code: 1100

Rank and Title: Professor (1.5 step) **Step:** AS

% of Time: 100% **Basis/Paid Over:** 9/12

Monthly Salary: 17,354.50 **Annual Salary:** 208,254.00