

TENURED PROFESSOR – FIVE-YEAR REVIEW

Definition

Per **APM 200-0**, “Every faculty member shall be reviewed at least every five years.”

General Information (see [The CALL - Appendix 12](#))

- The purpose of the Five-Year Review is to identify faculty who have been inappropriately overlooked for advancement; to identify impediments so faculty members and university can develop strategies for advancement; and to ensure equitable distribution of university responsibilities
- The criteria for evaluation are established according to the appropriate series, rank, step and next step (or rank) of the appointee being reviewed
- Will be conducted in the spring of the academic year that ends a period of five years
- If an appointee has entered into a Pathways to Retirement agreement, the Vice Chancellor may defer the Five-Year Review
- If the candidate is unresponsive to departmental requests, the dossier will consist of materials available in the department
- The departmental recommendation must adopt one of the following three Outcomes:
 - Advancement (terminate review and proceed with merit or promotion dossier)
 - No advancement, performance satisfactory (meets criteria of current rank/step)
 - No advancement, performance unsatisfactory (does not meet criteria of current rank/step)

Submit the following to Luskin:

- ☐ Original plus one (1) single-sided copy of the dossier
- ☐ Two (2) copies of the Off-Scale Analysis

Dossier Contents in the order below:

- ☐ **Five-Year Review [Data Summary cover page](#)**
- ☐ If applicable, a **copy of the Joint Appointment waiver form**
- ☐ **History record** (entire history; no handwritten entries)
- ☐ **Five-Year Review [Data Summary pages](#)** (read instructions on each page)
 - **Candidate must initial these pages before committee or departmental review**
 - To ensure that a section is not overlooked, “N/A” or “None” should be notated
 - If the content does not fit on one page, append additional pages and number them with letters, for example 3a, 3b, 3c. Do not assign new numbers to the data summary pages.

Note: CAP requests a separate teaching tabulation page with the following information: Quarter, Course, Number of Students, Response, Instructor Rating, Course Rating, and Department Average. Place this page directly behind data summary page 3.
- ☐ **Bibliography ([L & S format](#) must be used)**
 - Mark “Since Last Review” in **ALL** sections. The candidate must initial these pages before any committee or department votes.
 - Refer back to the last action to make sure nothing is missing
- ☐ **Five-Year Review [Certification page](#)**
 - **Must** be read by the candidate and signed before committee or department review
 - Bulky items (exhibits, grant proposals, etc.) should include a footnote, “See envelope (or box)”
 - Indicate items supplied by the candidate on the bottom section. Immediately after this page, include:
 - CV, required
 - Self-statement (*optional, but strongly encouraged*)
 - Sabbatical Report, if applicable
 - Bias list, if applicable
- ☐ If applicable, **candidate’s written response to the Department Assessment**
- ☐ **Department Assessment Letter**
 - Addressed to the Vice Chancellor

- The letter shall include the following elements:
 - A chronological overview of the appointee's personnel history since the last review
 - An assessment of the appointee's achievements and specific weaknesses in each of the areas of evaluation: research or other creative work; teaching; professional activity; and University service
 - The proposed Outcome of the Five-Year Review, and an Action Plan to address deficiencies when required (see [The CALL - Appendix 12, Section V](#))

- ☐ If applicable, **the Chair's individual recommendation** (submit in a separate statement)
- ☐ If applicable, **Departmental ad hoc or standing committee report**

Opus

Process the action in Opus, and submit to the Dean's Office queue before the hard copies of the dossier are delivered.

Publications and Evaluations

Do not submit these to Luskin, but they should be available upon request by the Dean.

Routing and Approval

The Luskin analyst will review the case then forward it to the Dean for review and recommendation. The case will be submitted to the Vice Chancellor who determines the outcome.

The Luskin analyst will notify the department of the outcome.