

## FAQs on five-year reviews

---

Are five-year reviews mandatory?

- Yes. Per APM 200-0, "Every faculty member shall be reviewed at least every five years."

How do I initiate a five-year review?

- The faculty member should be given written notice of the review. This notification letter should state this is a five-year review and cannot be deferred. The notice should also give the faculty member information on what material to provide, the review period dates, and the departmental deadline by which to submit material (see sample letter).

What if the faculty member does not provide the requested review material?

- The department chair (or dean in professional schools) should meet with the faculty member and remind him or her the review is mandatory and encourage the faculty member to participate in the process. The chair or dean may wish to establish a new deadline for material after meeting with the faculty member. If the faculty member refuses to participate in the review process, the unit must gather whatever material it has and conduct the review based upon that material.

What sort of material may a unit include if the faculty member refuses to provide review material?

- Information on teaching and graduate student mentoring (note: more than ten years of data is provided on all faculty members in APBears through data feeds from CSIR and Graduate Division);
- Teaching evaluation scores (these should be added to individual course records in APBears);
- Most recent copy of a CV the unit may have on file or posted to a website;
- Publication list, if available, again from either departmental files or websites;
- An analysis of any University service which the unit knows about.

How do I ensure the fairness safeguards are followed if the faculty member refuses to participate in the review process?

- As with a normal merit review, the faculty member should be given an opportunity to inspect all non-confidential and redacted copies of confidential case material and be provided with a copy of the recommendation letter. These opportunities should be documented (note: APBears will date stamp when the candidate's clock to respond to the recommendation letter is started and stopped, thus showing the full seven days was provided).

How do campus reviewers feel towards five-year reviews?

- Reviewers recognize five-year reviews occur for a variety of reasons and will do a full evaluation of the record. Some five-year reviews are strong cases in which the faculty member deferred their reviews in previous years simply because they were too busy and didn't find time to put together their case material. These cases will normally result in a merit increase. In other cases, an individual may not be performing in one or more areas of review (research, teaching, or service) and reviewers may consider invoking APM 075-Termination for Incompetent Performance.

Can I ask for more than a step?

- A merit is given based on the body of work, not time. If the case material supports a 1.5 step, then the faculty member can request it (see Criteria for Faculty Step Accelerations document).

## Sample five-year review notification letter

Dear NAME:

This fall the Department will be considering you for a merit increase effective July 1, XXXX. Please update your Achievements in APBears and upload a self statement summarizing your research, service, and teaching activities since your last review, which occurred in the fall of XXXX, a cumulative CV, and a cumulative publication list (see enclosed list of publications used at the time of your last review). The deadline to update and upload these documents into APBears is XXXX. NAME OF FILE PREPARER can be contacted by email ([EMAIL ADDRESS](#)) or phone (PHONE NUMBER) if you have any questions about preparing your material.

This is a five-year review and cannot be deferred.

The criteria to be used in appraising a candidate's performance and the procedures to be followed in review and appraisal committees are set forth in Section 210 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). Policies regarding the maintenance of and access to the candidate's personnel file (as well as to other academic personnel records) are described in Section 160 of the APM. Section 220 describes the rights of a candidate, which include the opportunity to supply pertinent information to be included in the file; to inspect non-confidential documents (and to receive redacted copies of confidential documents) to be included in the personnel review file—prior to a determination of the departmental recommendation; to be informed of the departmental recommendation and the substance of its evaluation under applicable criteria; to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation for inclusion in the file; and to receive a written statement of the reasons for the final administrative decision.

The APM provides for a conference to discuss the review process and to ask any questions you may have. If you would like to meet, please contact me. You may, of course, submit in writing any information you would like used in the review.

**Please note that the cut-off point for materials that can be used in this review is June 30, XXXX.**

Sincerely,