Report of the Senate-Administration Workgroup on Policies and Practices Related to Teaching Professors

November 19, 2019

Workgroup Membership:

Senate:
Julian Betts, Professor, Economics, Workgroup Co-Chair
Doug Bartlett, Professor, SIO
John Eggers, LSOE, Mathematics
Nathan Delson, LSOE, MAE
Stephanie Mel, LSOE, Molecular Biology
Tom Humphries, Emeritus, Education Studies

Administration:
Robert Continetti, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Workgroup Co-Chair
Amy Adler, Professor and Chair, Visual Arts
Cindy Palmer, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel Services
Lynn Field-Karsh, Director, Academic Process Development & Training-APS
MarDestinee Perez, Director, Faculty Development and Diversity
# 1. Introduction and Charge of the Workgroup

# 2. The Approach Taken by the Workgroup

## 2.1 Sources Consulted

## 2.2 A Note on Naming Conventions

# 3. Findings

## 3.1 Survey on Department Practices

## 3.2 Survey of Teaching Professors

## 3.3 Practices at Other UC Campuses

# 4. Recommendations

## 4.1 Teaching

## 4.2 Compensation

### Entry Level Salary Agreements (ELSA’s)

### Salary Equity Studies

### UC San Diego’s Career Milestone Salary Incentives (CMSI’s)

### General Campus Compensation Plan

## 4.3 Academic Personnel

### Appointment of Assistant Teaching Professors

### Campus Review for Normal Merits

### Series Change Between the Teaching Professor Series and the Traditional Professor Series

### Department and Campus Expectations for Creative Activity of Teaching Professors

### Accelerated Advancement for Teaching Professors

### Raising Awareness among Department Chairs, MSOs and Departmental Academic Personnel Staff of Policies and Procedures for Evaluating Teaching Professors

### Solicitation Letter for Reviews of Teaching Professors

## 4.4 Voting Rights

### Non-Personnel Actions

### Personnel Actions

### Potential Changes to Bylaw 55

## 4.5 Service Beyond the Department

### Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

# 5. A Strategy for Communicating These Changes across the Campus

# 6. Conclusion
Summary of Recommendations ........................................................................................................................................ 29
Appendices........................................................................................................................................................................... 35

1 - Senate-Administration Workgroup on Policies and Practices Related to Teaching Professors – Committee Charge ............................................................................................................................... 36

2 - Senate-Administration Workgroup – Teaching Professor Survey Results – Spring 2019 ........................................ 40

3 - APM 133 – General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees – Limits on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles ................................................................................ 46

4 - APM 210 – Appointment and Promotion – Review and Appraisal Committees ......................................................... 63

5 - APM 285 – Appointment and Promotion – Lecturer with Security of Employment Series ................................................... 103

6 - APM 740 – Benefits and Privileges – Leave of Absence/Sabbatical Leaves .............................................................. 113

7 - Academic Senate Bylaw 55 ........................................................................................................................................ 137

8 - UC Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction – Interpretation on Academic Senate Bylaw 55 dated January 17, 2019 ........................................................................................................................................ 140
1. Introduction and Charge of the Workgroup

A Lecturer with Security of Employment (or Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment) is an Academic Senate faculty position designed to meet the long-term instructional needs of the University “that cannot be best fulfilled by an appointee in the professorial (Ladder-Rank) series” (APM 285-0.a). At UC San Diego we refer to this series as Teaching Professor. The series currently includes 90 Academic Senate appointments at UC San Diego across divisions and colleges, both within General Campus and at SIO.

Beyond being excellent teachers (a fundamental requirement for advancement), Teaching Professors are expected to engage in both service and professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity. They provide educational leadership within their disciplines, contribute to instructional innovation and design as well as curriculum development, facilitate the integration of new methods and technologies, and support the important task of mentoring and cultivating learners.

It is important to recognize that faculty in the traditional Professor (Ladder-Rank) series can be excellent teachers. However, faculty in the Teaching Professor series are charged with innovation in curriculum development and instruction, and therefore, often lead in the essential tasks of updating courses and exploring new teaching and assessment methods.

In 2018, the University of California revised sections of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) (APM 285, 210-3, 133, and 740) governing the Teaching Professor titles. These revisions were intended to “more accurately reflect the requirements for advancement in the series and make hiring, evaluation, and promotion practices more consistent across the UC system.”

Major aspects of the Teaching Professor series were impacted by the revisions, including:

- Academic expectations and evaluation
- Compensation and salary scales
- Rank and step structure
- Criteria for promotion to security of employment
- Sabbatical leave eligibility

The revisions to APM section 285 require that we at UC San Diego make corresponding revisions to bring our local Policy and Procedures Manual (PPM) into compliance. These systemwide policy changes offer an opportunity to pause and examine local policies and practices related to the Teaching Professor series to ensure that they foster a fair and supportive work environment for valued campus colleagues. Furthermore, these changes offer
the opportunity to identify questions or concerns not explicitly considered in the APM and endeavor to address them with greater clarity and consistency.

The Senate-Administration Workgroup on Policies and Practices Related to Teaching Professors received its initial charge letter and workgroup composition in May 2018, and an updated charge letter on January 3, 2019. The charge letter directed:

“The Workgroup is charged to undertake a study and provide a set of recommendations about how UC San Diego might change its local practices and PPM policies not mandated by APM requirements or non-PPM policies in ways that better support Teaching Professors and provide appropriate guidance to unit leaders.”

Specific issues, among others, to be considered by the Workgroup included:

- Independent external referee letters for junior-level appointments, to also include analysis of the language describing the distinction between the external independent letters required for advancement within the series and optional additional letters from UC San Diego colleagues regarding pedagogy.
- Eligibility for the Entry Level Salary Agreement (ELSA) or Career Milestone Salary Increment (CMSI) programs.
- A minimum (and perhaps a maximum) teaching load requirement should be instated.
- A communications strategy:
  - How can we best make the case that change benefits students, faculty and the institution as a whole?
  - How can we best inform unit leaders of the changes that will impact their work?

2. The Approach Taken by the Workgroup

The workgroup was comprised of six representatives from the Academic Senate (two full Professors, one serving as co-chair; three Teaching Professors, and one Professor Emeritus) and five representatives from the Administration (the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs serving as co-chair, the Department Chair for Visual Arts, the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, and two staff directors, one from Academic Personnel and one from the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion).

2.1 Sources Consulted

The workgroup was provided with many resources and references, including all relevant University of California academic personnel policies and salary scales, UC San Diego department voting bylaws, Senate bylaws, the recent UC LSOE Stepping Toolkit, the UC San Diego Pathways to Retirement document, resources provided by the Teaching + Learning Commons, and LSOE recall data. In addition, the workgroup surveyed all members of the teaching professor series, general campus and SIO department chairs, and academic personnel directors at our sister campuses.

2.2 A Note on Naming Conventions

Traditionally, our campus has used the term Ladder-rank Faculty (LRF) to refer to professors not in the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. This wording has become outmoded given the recent move to give the LSOE series its own set of salary steps, or ladder, that individuals can move through as they advance through the series. Throughout this document, we frequently refer to “traditional LRF” and “teaching LRF” to distinguish between professors not in the LSOE series and professors in the LSOE series, respectively. We also refer to the latter as Teaching Professors.

3. Findings

3.1 Survey on Department Practices

The Workgroup sent surveys to department chairs and MSO’s in spring 2019. Of the 30 UC San Diego general campus and SIO departments surveyed, 21 responded. It was noted in this effort that the number of appointees per department in the Teaching Professor series ranged from zero to six, with a mode of four and a median of three.

Regarding teaching loads, we found considerable consistency across the academic units. Of the 20 departments responding to this question, 80% of departments (16/20) have 6 required courses and 20% (4/20) have 5 required courses. Note that in several cases, the 6 course load is reduced to 5 (or even 4 in one case) for other significant departmental contributions (e.g., chairing an important committee, graduate TA training, program director, teaching large classes and/or labs). When respondents noted the level of courses taught, they are typically undergraduate (except in some cases of teaching load release). One department gives 1 course teaching relief for the first 2 years. There did appear to be a significant outlier: one department now requires 9 courses with no extra service, or 6 courses with significant service.

We note that the seeming consistency in course loads across most departments could hide meaningful differences in actual workloads from one department to the next because our survey neglected to differentiate courses by size and to distinguish between lab and lecture courses, etc. We suggest that in any follow-up to our work it would perhaps be more useful to compare student contact hours, or total hours spent on a class. For example, total hours on a
class might include TA training as well as “lab support” time (equipment repair, meeting/coordinating with staff, writing and updating lab manuals, etc.).

There is variation between departments on the subject of shared governance. In just over 40 percent (9/21) of the departments that responded, teaching LRF are “deeply involved,” “included in all ways in departmental governance,” and many stated that Teaching Professors have full voting rights and are seen as equal to traditional LRF. In contrast, one department stated that Teaching Professors are “not viewed as equals” and there is resistance to increasing the population.

Approximately 30% of departments surveyed reported significant involvement of Teaching Professors in departmental activities, but not in all categories. For example, while Teaching Professors are generally included in departmental meetings, departmental and campus committees, and votes on department matters, seven departments do not extend voting rights on appointments of traditional LRF, with some variation: some allow voting on new but not existing traditional LRF appointments, and some only on files at or below their rank. (Bylaw 55 of the UC Academic Senate regulations provides guidance to departments on voting rights, and establishes as a minimum that those in the teaching LRF series have a right to vote on all cases of appointment or promotion up to their current rank in the teaching LRF series, with the exception of the initial appointment as Assistant Teaching Professor. The Bylaw leaves open the possibility that departments can extend additional voting privileges to Teaching Professors.)

In summary, with the exception of voting rights, Teaching Professors appear to have significant involvement in shared governance in the majority of departments that responded. Voting rights vary from department to department, ranging from full voting rights on all appointments to more limited rights depending on the type and level of appointment. The survey showed that 65% of respondents reported the extension of voting rights to members in this series beyond those afforded in Senate Bylaw 55, while the remaining 35% said they do not. Most respondents did not elaborate on their “Yes” answers, but referred instead to their previous answer about voting rights. In one case, a department added that Teaching Professors can also vote on Academic Administrator/Academic Coordinator and Continuing Lecturer appointments.

Departments were asked if they had developed academic review standards for this series as a result of revisions to APM 285 – Lecturer with Security of Employment Series; if not, what were their plans for doing so? Fifty-nine percent (59%) responded yes and 41% responded no. All 10 responses to this question implied that the departments are “working on it.”

We also asked departments about the procedures the campus used in 2018-19 to assign teaching LRF to an appropriate step within their current rank. Feedback on this recent “stepping” process was split. Nine responses were positive, saying the process went smoothly, was straightforward, and there were few to no concerns. While most everyone agreed that the policy is a good idea (with one exception, saying it is introducing inequity for ladder-rank faculty), 6 responses were highly critical of the implementation. Comments included that the process was “rushed,” “very poorly communicated,” and “timing and implementation was
terrible.” Several expressed great frustration that departments were not initially involved; this resulted in “errors,” “incorrect information,” and “inappropriate recommendations.”

3.2 Survey of Teaching Professors

The Workgroup also sent a survey to all faculty in the Teaching Professor series in spring 2019. The survey aimed to better understand the experience of Teaching Professors on campus. Of 83 Teaching Professors contacted, we received 52 responses. The following is a summary based on the most common themes reported in the survey.

The survey found that of 52 respondents, all Teaching Professors participate in research, publication, and/or other creative work. The majority of the respondents also reported a lack of clarity and transparency on how their research is valued, as well as, confusion about the overall Academic Review process. The survey reported a split as to whether Teaching Professors believe their department has reviewed and adequately communicated the new standards for merit and accelerated advancements in APM 285 and APM 210-3. They proposed better training for AP staff, Department Chairs and Unit Heads, MSOs, and Deans about the Academic Review Process, as well as, the overall roles, rights, and expectations of Teaching Professors.

The survey found that while the course load varies across campus, the majority of Teaching Professors teach 6 courses a year. A small minority reported teaching 8 courses. The process of choosing courses likewise varies across campus. Courses are chosen by a combination of Teaching Professor preference and departmental needs. A majority reported that a large percentage of the classes they teach were classes they requested. Many comments were also made about inequity of workload within the 6-course structure. It was commonly reported that some classes require a much heavier workload than others and that departments should consider this more carefully when assigning courses. Teaching Professors also reported lack of clarity about expectations of graduate teaching. They would also like to see the Graduate Division lift the rule which disallows Teaching Professors from chairing thesis committees without a special letter of exemption. A majority of Teaching Professors believe there is a fair and transparent process for distribution of teaching resources such as assistants, graders, readers, and funds, but many reported too few TA’s and a lack of appropriate space to handle larger classes.

Teaching Professors routinely engage in major service to their departments and across campus. While many reported they are Departmental and University leaders, there is a reported lack of administrative clarity about leadership roles and rights of Teaching Professors, such as whether they can be department chair, chair of departmental and thesis committees, or serve on CAP. There is a stated interest in more leadership training opportunities designed specifically for Teaching Professors to better prepare them for the highest levels of academic service (such as Vice Chair of Education inside a department, Provost, etc.). Most Teaching Professors reported being allowed the right to vote on traditional LRF files, but a minority reported they are not able to vote and/or experience lack of clarity about their departmental voting rights.
Teaching Professors report a generally positive experience with the mentoring programs in their department, but also suggest it is more helpful to receive mentorship from senior faculty, specifically in the Teaching Professor series. There was also a consensus that departments should draft clearer guidelines and offer more structure for the relationship between faculty mentors and mentees.

Teaching Professors are well informed about organizations and offices on campus, such as the Teaching + Learning Commons and the Center for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion. When asked about other professional opportunities they would like to see at UC San Diego, Teaching Professors expressed an interest in more training for grant writing and equal access to grants and other funding opportunities that are available to ladder-rank faculty, such as the Hellman Fellowship.

While Teaching Professors acknowledged that progress has been made towards overall equity with the traditional LRF series, such as equal credits towards sabbatical and Pathways to Retirement, there were many comments that suggest a climate problem still exists on campus in which Teaching Professors feel they are treated as “lesser” and “lower class” than traditional LRF. Several respondents commented on the problem of the ambiguity of naming the series (LSOE or Teaching Professor, etc.) and that the naming confusion can be detrimental personally and to the department (for example external reviewers often don’t understand the term LSOE, which is problematic in recruiting new hires). Another suggested source of this sense of being second-class citizens is an overall lack of transparency of expectations, whether it be voting rights, course loads, space allocation, or the Academic Review process.

### 3.3 Practices at Other UC Campuses

In order to compare Teaching Professor (L(P)SOE) practices at UC San Diego with those at other UC campuses, we asked sister campus AP offices (with the exception of UCSF, which does not have Teaching Professors) to address four questions. These related to Teaching Professor (L(P)SOE) appointee numbers, hiring/advancement, teaching loads and department voting practices. All of the campuses approached responded with the exception of UCB. Teaching Professor (L(P)SOE) numbers vary from 8 and 12 at UCR and UCLA, respectively, to ~80-90 at UCI and UC San Diego, with an average of about 42.

Table 1 summarizes the responses of each campus. Below, we summarize the key findings.
Table 1 Responses from Each UC Campus to a Survey of AP Practices Conducted in April 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your campus have a standard minimum or maximum teaching load for this population - are departments afforded some manner of flexibility? (The more detail the better on this.)</td>
<td>Does your campus require independent letters for appointment and advancement in this series?</td>
<td>Have any of your campus departments extended voting rights to members in this series beyond those afforded in Senate Bylaw 55? If so, how?</td>
<td>How many appointees are currently in this series on your campus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>Did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Each department and their dean's office maintain the standards. We do not have a central standard. This is the information we previously provided as some guidance: The teaching load of LSOE-series faculty, measured as some combination of the number of courses, student credit hours (SCH) and special work associated with individualized mentorship and graded assignments, should be notably less than that of a Unit 18 Lecturer within the discipline, but more than that of a ladder-rank faculty member of similar rank. Reductions in teaching load for LSOE-series faculty should considered for especially demanding service activities or development of a major research program. Generally, but not always, we would expect this program to have a significant emphasis on teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Extramural letter requirements are as follows: Appointments as Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment require 3-5 letters, which do not need to be &quot;arm's-length,&quot; but which should include a combination of external and internal letters, depending on the teaching and professional experience of the appointee. Appointments as Lecturer with Security of Employment require 4-6 letters, which do not need to be &quot;arm's-length.&quot; Appointments as Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment require 6-8 letters, with at least 3 &quot;arm's-length&quot; letters. Promotions - normally 6-8 letters are adequate and at least half of the letters should be &quot;arm's-length&quot;.</td>
<td>Like others, some departments have amended their voting procedures to allow this series to vote on other academic actions since we have used this title for many years. We only recently started hiring into this series, so I expect more voting procedures to be revised. Previously, appointees in the LSOE series came from the Professorial Series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
<td>Each department and their dean's office maintain the teaching load standards.</td>
<td>Yes, external letters are required. Appointment: <a href="https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/app/3-20/">https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/app/3-20/</a>; Advancements: <a href="https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/app/3-60/">https://ap.uci.edu/policies-procedures/app/3-60/</a></td>
<td>At UCI, some departments have amended their bylaws to allow this series to vote on ladder-rank professorial academic actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Los Angeles</td>
<td>No standard other than &quot; In view of the limited responsibilities in areas other than teaching, appointees to this series normally will be assigned heavier instructional loads (relative to full-time equivalent service) than those normally carried by departmental appointees in the professorial series&quot; (standard ladder teaching load on campus varies from three-five 4-unit courses a year.</td>
<td>Yes, letters are required.</td>
<td>Our department by-laws are unevenly worded. Some only refer to &quot;all senate faculty&quot; as having voting rights, and other say &quot;all senate faculty which includes asst, assoc, full professors&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Merced</td>
<td>Although we don't have a formal campus policy, the typical load for L(P)SOEs is 3-3 (we are on the semester system). There is</td>
<td>Yes, external letters are required for appointments and promotions.</td>
<td>Some departments have amended their bylaws to allow L(P)SOEs to vote on some personnel actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Six courses is a usual teaching load. For more detailed information, please click on this link and refer to page 1-2: <a href="https://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/policies_and_procedures/lecturerssoepguidelines.pdf">https://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/policies_and_procedures/lecturerssoepguidelines.pdf</a></td>
<td>Yes, letters are required.</td>
<td>Yes. Letters of evaluation may come from UCSB Senate faculty, external to the department, who have conducted a peer review of the candidate’s teaching. Peer evaluation may include classroom visits or videotaping, commentary on course syllabi, reading assignments, and examinations. Such letters may not be substituted for the UC familiar letters, which are expected to be external to UCSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have 8 as of 4/16/19.</td>
<td>Yes, some departments have amended their voting bylaws to allow this series to vote on ladder-rank professorial academic actions.</td>
<td>Yes. All departments that have SOE appointees have extended voting rights to them. In most cases it parallels whatever the Professorial have in the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Around 55</td>
<td>We have 8 as of 4/16/19.</td>
<td>Yes. All departments that have SOE appointees have extended voting rights to them. In most cases it parallels whatever the Professorial have in the department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the need for external and independent letters at the time of hiring, and during promotion from Assistant Teaching Professor (L(P)SOE) to Associate Teaching Professor (LSOE) and to full Teaching Professor (Senior LSOE), practices vary from campus to campus. UCD and UCI require letters for full Teaching Professor (Senior LSOE) appointments and promotions. UCSB and UCSC require external independent review letters for appointment and career review advancement. UC San Diego appears to have the most rigorous standards, requiring that the requisite number of letters come from external independent sources, although generally also supplemented with internal reviews. It should be noted that campus responses to this issue were often vague. For example, it is not clear how independent reviewers are for appointments and promotions in the series at UCLA, UCM, and UCR.
Teaching loads are greater than for traditional LRF, but less than for Unit 18 Lecturers at the other UC campuses (and our own). Where specific numbers of four-unit courses were provided, the number was six with reductions possible, such as in cases of demanding service loads. Even UCM, which is on the semester system, has this teaching load, although UCM is considering reducing it to five.

Campus practices vary widely in terms of teaching LRF voting on personnel matters within their departments. UCI, UCR, and UC San Diego all include departments that permit members of this series to vote on traditional LRF actions, as well as, those of their own series, and UCD and UCSB have departments that have extended additional teaching LRF voting rights beyond those prescribed in Bylaw 55. The same appears to be true at UCLA. UCSB teaching LRF voting tends to be exclusively within the series. UCSC has made few Bylaw 55 amendments affecting this series.

The general perception is that there is an opportunity for all UC campuses to provide greater attention to hiring, promotion, and voting procedures for their teaching LRF.

4. Recommendations

The overall sense of the workgroup is that UC San Diego has entered an exciting period of culture shift among the professoriate. Teaching LRF are distinct from both traditional LRF and temporary lecturers, but their mission aligns closely with that of the traditional LRF. That is, teaching LRF take on many responsibilities beyond teaching, and also are expected to engage in creative activity on a regular basis.

Indeed, with the revisions to the APM, we now have not one, but two types of ladder-rank faculty: Professors (“traditional LRF”) and Lecturers with (Potential) Security of Employment, the latter referred to by the working title of Teaching Professors or teaching LRF. These changes make our traditional terminology distinguishing the Professorial (as ladder-rank) and LSOE series obsolete, as has been clear in this narrative.

Both traditional LRF and teaching LRF are members of the Academic Senate. Both have responsibilities for teaching, service and research or, more broadly stated, creative activity. The campus emphasizes the relative importance of teaching versus research and/or creative activity differently in these two ladder-rank tracks. At the same time, the campus sees members of both tracks as key leaders of the University mission, and envisions partnership between the two series as essential.

The consensus of the workgroup is that the campus needs to acknowledge the complementary nature of the two tracks in achieving the University’s mission of research, teaching, and service. As far as possible, the campus needs to view the two tracks as equal contributors to the work of the campus. This sentiment undergirds the recommendations in this report, many of which call for aligning many campus practices between the two tracks.
Below, specific recommendations appear in italics. For the convenience of the readers, we also recapitulate all of our recommendations in the conclusion.

4.1 Teaching

Teaching load depends on many factors besides the number of classes, which often vary from department to department. These factors can include number of students, contact hours (which are often large in project-based classes), preparation time such as arranging for real-world project sponsors, lab classes, and new curriculum development. It is expected that teaching LRF would have a higher teaching load than traditional LRF given their expectations for research. However, excessive loads should be avoided. Teaching load assessments need to consider not only the number of classes, but the overall effort required to teach large courses and to develop new ones, among other factors.

The workgroup supports the current campus maximum load of 6 four-unit courses, with possibility of reductions when the teaching professor takes on unusually high administrative duties and/or teaches exceptionally large service courses. It is the recommendation of the workgroup that the campus does not set a minimum teaching load given the diverse leadership, service, and educational activities of Teaching Professors. More formally:

*The Workgroup recommends a maximum teaching load for Teaching Professors of six four-unit courses, with possibility of reductions in this load for those with high administrative duties or who are teaching exceptionally large or otherwise demanding courses. Given the heavy administrative loads of many Teaching Professors, the Workgroup recommends against a formal minimum in the number of courses that Teaching Professors must teach.*

*The Workgroup also recommends that departments adopt a transparent and equitable approach to quantifying teaching load for all faculty within a department.*

For example, a department may specify that a traditional LRF teaching load includes a set ratio of large service classes, research area classes, and elective classes, and many already do so. A similar ratio should be assigned to faculty in the teaching LRF track in terms of workload, even if the overall number of classes is larger.

Some teaching professors expressed concern about either a differential in departmental support for classes taught by them compared to traditional LRF, or a lack of transparency about how such support, including TAs and funding for classroom materials, is allocated.

*The Workgroup recommends that all departments develop transparent and equitable rules for allocation of teaching support if they have not already done so, and that traditional LRF and teaching LRF should be treated equitably by these rules in support of the teaching mission.*
We note that in the survey of Teaching Professors, some expressed concern about the current rule for chairing graduate committees, in which a department must seek permission from the campus to allow a Teaching Professor to chair a graduate committee. Our Working Group did not come to a firm conclusion on this question, in part because Teaching Professors will vary in their expertise in academic research.

*The Workgroup recommends that the campus consider whether the decision to appoint a Teaching Professor as chair of a graduate committee appointment decision could be delegated to the Department Chairs.*

4.2 Compensation

**Entry Level Salary Agreements (ELSA’s)**

For many years, departments have negotiated ELSA’s (a set entry level market off-scale salary component) for the traditional LRF with the administration to aid in meeting marketplace conditions. (In some cases, such entry level market off-scale salary components have been negotiated for other series.) An ELSA is put in place for a period of three years when a department successfully demonstrates with salary data from either sister UC’s, comparable institutions, or salary surveys published by academic associations that marketplace conditions require such a salary component.

*The Workgroup recommends that the use of Entry Level Salary Agreements (ELSA’s) be extended to the recruitment of teaching professors to account for disciplinary norms.*

**Salary Equity Studies**

Over the years, the campus has conducted salary equity studies among members of the traditional LRF series and for the first time in 2017-2018, the teaching LRF series was included in the equity study.

*The Workgroup recommends that salary equity studies on the teaching LRF population continue to be conducted by the campus at the same frequency as for the traditional LRF, thereby ensuring that such salary inequities among existing faculty continue to be identified and addressed by the administration.*

**UC San Diego’s Career Milestone Salary Incentives (CMSI’s)**

The CMSI program began in 2014 in order to acknowledge significant faculty career milestones with a special salary increase. General Campus and SIO traditional LRF who are granted tenure, promoted from Associate to Full Professor, advanced to or through Professor, Step VI, or who advance to Professor, Above Scale, receive a Career Milestone Salary Incentive (CMSI). The salary adjustment is issued as a market off-scale component that is automatically conferred
upon achievement of one of the milestones noted. This off-scale component is then added to the faculty member’s regular salary (rank/step scale rate plus any existing off-scale) and is subject to normal off-scale guidelines. There is a $10,000 career limit for these special salary increases.

The Workgroup recommends that the Career Milestone Salary Incentive (CMSI) program be extended to the teaching LRF series now that salary scales with steps within each rank have been created.

General Campus Compensation Plan

The General Campus Compensation Plan (“the Plan” or GCCP), introduced in 2012 as a pilot plan, allowed for a modest mechanism for Senate faculty to voluntarily contribute external funding resources toward their total UC salary. The Plan, like the well-established Health Sciences Compensation Plan, utilizes external fund sources to support a portion (the negotiated salary increment, or “Y increment”) of the total compensation for Senate faculty in the Plan, providing incentives to generate income, and rewarding academic merit. The Plan allows Senate faculty in all disciplines and fields of study to negotiate a Y increment when appropriate external funding is available. Although all faculty may not have funding sources necessary to receive a negotiated salary increment, the Plan benefits all faculty by increasing indirect cost recovery funds (“IDC”) and reducing reliance on state funds for market-driven salary increments. The Plan accomplishes these aims without negatively affecting any faculty member’s base salary guarantees.

With the recent announcement from the University of California Office of the President which states that participation of Teaching Professors in the General Campus Compensation Plan (GCCP) is permissible, the workgroup encourages departments and the campus to broadly advertise that this opportunity is now available to those in the series.

4.3 Academic Personnel

Appointment of Assistant Teaching Professors

CAP has for several years waived its review of appointments of Assistant Professors at Steps I-III in the traditional LRF series. At the same time, each fall CAP conducts a post-audit of these appointments made in the prior year. Neither of these policies is in place for the appointment of Assistant Teaching Professors. Another discrepancy is that CAP does not require arm’s length recommendations for steps I-II Assistant Professors, but does require independent letters for Assistant Teaching Professor appointments. The following recommendations aim to put junior appointments on a similar footing between the two series.

The Workgroup recommends that two actions be taken to align campus practices for the appointment of Assistant Teaching Professors at steps I-III with the appointment of Assistant
Professors at steps I-III: i) CAP should consider waiving its review of Assistant Teaching Professor appointments at Steps I-III and include these files in its annual post-audit of dean level appointments. ii) The Administration should delegate the approval authority of Assistant Teaching Professor appointments at Steps I-III to the Dean or Dean equivalent.

To align with campus practices on recruitment of Assistant Professors at Steps I-II, the Workgroup recommends that letters for appointments at Assistant Teaching Professor, Steps I and II need not be from independent letter writers.

In addition, as it was noted that in some fields it is challenging to find independent external reviewers who are familiar with the Teaching Professor series, we also make the following recommendation:

The Workgroup encourages department chairs to make effective use of the Teaching Professor cohort at other UC campuses as external reviewers of Teaching Professors, as well as considering the limited use of independent, arms-length local reviewers in certain instances.

Another factor relating to recruitment relates to properly explaining to candidates what the Teaching Professor position is. There has been confusion about the difference between the terms “tenure” and “security of employment,” with some candidates being told that these are the same. However, this Workgroup has confirmed that there are differences between these terms. The two series differ in considerations for advancement and in compulsory voting rights. On the other hand, the steps that the University of California must take to dismiss a tenured professor and a teaching professor with Security of Employment are identical, culminating in a vote of the Regents upon the recommendation of the President. Accordingly, department chairs should be prepared to point out key distinctions to candidates for Teaching Professor series.

The Workgroup recommends that department chairs and recruitment committees understand the differences between the traditional and teaching LRF series and that they routinely share the distinctions with candidates.

Campus Review for Normal Merits

As part of the process of harmonizing the existing practice for the traditional LRF series with that for Teaching Professors, we recommend the following to put normal merit consideration on a similar footing between the two series.

The Workgroup recommends that two actions be taken to align campus practices for normal merit advancements: i) CAP should consider waiving its review of Assistant Teaching Professor first review if normal merit, Associate Teaching Professor, Steps I-V, and Teaching Professor, Steps I-V and VII-VIII and include these files in its annual post-audit of dean level merit actions. ii) The Administration should delegate the approval authority of Assistant Teaching Professor
first review if normal merit, Associate Teaching Professor, Steps I-V, and Teaching Professor, Steps I-V and VII-VIII to the Deans or Dean equivalent.

Series Change Between the Teaching Professor Series and the Traditional Professor Series

At UC San Diego, series changes between the teaching LRF series and the traditional LRF series (in either direction) have been infrequent. But with the growth of the University, series change opportunities may increase. The Workgroup recognizes that with a few exceptions, departments may not have experience with series change from teaching LRF to traditional LRF or traditional LRF to teaching LRF. The Workgroup recommends this guiding principle:

*Senate members seeking a change of series between the traditional LRF and teaching LRF series should be required to demonstrate that they fully meet guidelines and standards of the series which they are seeking to enter.*

The Workgroup also recommends that series change be recognized as potentially beneficial. There may be benefits to departments of Teaching Professor appointments in managing departmental teaching load, including reducing the time to degree and an increase in student contact with their teachers. In addition, a recognition of where the strengths of specific faculty lie in research or in teaching, will provide a benefit to the University. Often circumstances will lead to a faculty member becoming more involved over time in research or in teaching, and it is appropriate that a request for series change that recognizes the reality of the evolving contributions of faculty members to an academic unit and the University be considered.

The Workgroup recommends addressing some misconceptions regarding series change at UC San Diego. A series change should not be seen as an escape from a series where the faculty member is underperforming by department or program standards. For example, there is a perception that a faculty member who has stopped advancing in the traditional LRF series is an appropriate candidate for a change to the teaching LRF series. In such cases, the reason for the series change must be addressed to ensure that the underperformance in one series does not affect performance in the new series. For example, to transfer to the teaching LRF series, merely adequate teaching will not suffice. Productivity in each series is a consideration both generally and specifically. For this reason, review committees should include members of both series. More formally:

*The Workgroup recommends that when series changes between traditional LRF and teaching LRF series are reviewed, members of both series should be included in the review as much as possible. Furthermore, all reviewers should have a clear understanding of the process and standards involved in the change.*

The small number of series changes coupled with turnover in staff and Chairs means that efforts to refresh historical memory need to be planned for and maintained.
The Workgroup recommends that series change between the traditional and teaching LRF series be a part of administrative and departmental discussions and training and that there be distribution of written guidance on the subject of series changes available to Chairs, MSO’s, and department AP Staff. The Workgroup recommends that Academic Personnel Services (APS) develop series change training materials for inclusion in the regular training schedules for Chairs.

Department and Campus Expectations for Creative Activity of Teaching Professors

The Workgroup acknowledged the challenge for departments in the establishment of expectations for creative activity in the Teaching Professors series. This partly reflects the diverse nature of creative activity among the cohort, with some focusing on pedagogical reform, others on pedagogical evaluation and research, others on public displays of art or music, and yet others on academic research. The workgroup makes the following recommendations concerning the establishment of expectations, with policy guidance from APM 210-3.

Departments are strongly encouraged to establish norms both for merit advancement and for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor that allow multiple ways of demonstrating creative activity.

The Workgroup further recommends that as part of the Academic Personnel Services quarterly department chair workshops, time be dedicated to a hands-on activity to assist department chairs with drafting department standards for merit and advancement for this series.

The Workgroup recommends that teaching professors play an active role in defining expectations for creative activity, and more broadly, for teaching and service for the series across departments.

When designing these standards, departments that have no or few teaching professors would be well advised to consult with other departments in related areas that have more experience with teaching professors. Deans should facilitate this consultation by encouraging departments that are relatively new to the Teaching Professor series to consult with departments in related disciplines that have more experience working with the series.

Accelerated Advancement for Teaching Professors

For traditional LRF, a quantitative expectation for accelerated merits already exists – double the expected number of publications, of the expected quality, plus outstanding teaching and service. The Workgroup discussed how departments might develop a similar quantitative target that teaching LRF would need to meet in creative activity to signal that an accelerated merit was in order.
The Workgroup recommends that departments design their expectations for normal merit advancements by being specific about alternative types and levels of creative activity that would rise to the level of a normal merit advancement. This specific set of quantitative and qualitative guidelines for each type of creative activity will thus provide a more transparent metric for the justification of accelerations.

At the least, these departmental standards should set expectations for those whose creative activity focuses more on pedagogical/curricular innovation and those whose creative activity focuses more on academic research articles. For example, if a department announced that in a two-year review period, a Teaching Professor’s creative activity in a given department could be either four academic papers or a major improvement to department pedagogy or curriculum, a candidate who had published two academic papers and made substantial, but perhaps not major improvements to pedagogical approaches or department curriculum, should be seen as meeting the criteria.

Raising Awareness among Department Chairs, MSOs and Departmental Academic Personnel Staff of Policies and Procedures for Evaluating Teaching Professors

Based on our findings, there is a clear need across campus to clarify and raise awareness about policies pertaining to the evaluation of Teaching Professors. We have identified three factors that are causing confusion and that warrant particular consideration. First is the existence of two similar, but distinctly different versions of policy criteria for evaluating Teaching Professors, namely the newly revised APM 285 and our current campus policy, PPM 230-285. Second is the regular turnover among general campus department chairs, MSO’s, and departmental AP staff. Third is the lack of experience of some departments with the teaching LRF series.

The first factor is the confusion that exists between two similar, yet distinct sets of criteria under which a Teaching Professor may be reviewed and advanced. To recap, the University of California released a revision of APM-285 and accompanying policies that went into effect October 1, 2018. The new policy applies to all those appointed to the series October 1, 2018 and thereafter. This change is best described in “Where CAP Stood” 2018/2019:

Issue 14: Teaching Professors.

Two changes took place in Academic Year 2018/19 in the Teaching Professor Series (LPSOE and LSOE). The first pertains to the expectations for individuals appointed into the series. Until this past year, per PPM 230-285-10.a, candidates were required to: (1) deliver teaching of truly exceptional quality, (2) maintain professional achievement and activity in their profession and in the pedagogy of their field, (3) perform significant University and public service, and (4) provide educational leadership across campus and beyond. Effective October 1, 2018, however, the PPM has been superseded by a new system-wide regulation, APM 285-9 which decrees that new hires in the Teaching Professor series must: (1) demonstrate teaching excellence, (2) evince professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity, and (3) perform significant University and public service.
At first sight, the most important difference between the two documents appears to be the elimination of educational leadership on and off-campus as a series criterion. On further examination, however, it becomes clear that educational leadership on and off-campus remains as important now as it ever was. APM 210-3 (2), which details evaluation guidelines for academic review committees assessing individuals in the Teaching Professor series, clarifies APM 285-9 by noting that reviewers evaluating the disciplinary or pedagogical activities of individuals in the series “…. should provide evidence of achievement, leadership, and/or influence on the campus or beyond.”

(In this last sentence from the CAP report we have underlined the word “or” to emphasize even more strongly a change from the earlier PPM.)

The differences between our existing PPM and the new APM are subtle and challenging to decipher. The following table was recently released by Academic Personnel Services to help Teaching Professors, Department Chairs, and AP personnel clarify:

**Table 2 – Policy Series Criteria Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPM 230-285/230-210-3</th>
<th>New APM 285/210-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of truly exceptional quality and so specialized in character that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by Ladder-rank Professors</td>
<td>Teaching Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional achievement and activity</td>
<td>Professional and/or scholarly achievement, including creative activity, especially as they relate to instruction and pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be related to underlying discipline or pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of achievement, leadership, and/or influence on the campus or beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and public service</td>
<td>University and public service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational leadership beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities

As outlined above, our local policy differs slightly but significantly from systemwide policy. The workgroup recommends that our local PPM be updated to better align with the new APM:

The Workgroup suggests that sections 230-285.10 and 230-285.18 of PPM 230-285 are outdated and are in direct contradiction to the new APM 285. We recommend that they be eliminated/rescinded in order to better align with the new APM.

Secondly, a clear and consistent understanding of current policy is further challenged by the regular turnover among general campus department chairs, MSO’s, and departmental AP staff. The concern is that, with constantly changing personnel, departmental files might easily and unwittingly blend and/or confuse policies, putting the Teaching Professor at a disadvantage and making it harder for CAP to decipher the recommendation. Furthermore, there are time-sensitive factors to the policy changes that also may be easily confused by the turnover of personnel, specifically:

Teaching Professors holding appointments prior to October 1, 2018 will continue to be evaluated under the criteria set forth in policies in effect on September 30, 2018. (UCSD PPM 230-285 and UCSD PPM 230-210-3). By default, appointees (hired prior to Oct 1, 2018) will continue to be evaluated under previous criteria until June 20, 2023, and transition to new criteria 7/1/2023.

Teaching Professors may request evaluation under new criteria before 7/1/2023 via letter to the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel (AVC-AP). Likewise Teaching Professors may request evaluation under old criteria before 6/30/2023 via letter to the AVC-AP.

As part of the on-going training of general campus department chairs, MSO’s, and departmental AP staff, this timeline needs to be explained annually so that the proper guidance can be given to the Teaching Professor over the next 5 years.

The Workgroup recommends that the campus search for ways to train department chairs, MSO’s, and AP analysts on academic file preparation for teaching professors on an annual basis. Ideas include an annual session at the Council of Chairs meetings, quarterly department chair workshops, and an annual review of evaluation procedures at meetings by Deans with their Chairs and MSOs.

To lessen the problems faced by departments relatively new to hiring Teaching Professors, the Workgroup also recommends that such departments consult outside the department:
The Workgroup recommends that departments relatively new to hiring Teaching Professors regularly consult both their dean and other departments in their division regarding setting expectations and norms for preparation of academic files of teaching professors.

Solicitation Letter for Reviews of Teaching Professors

UCSD Academic Personnel recently issued the new, updated solicitation letter for candidates being considered for promotion to Associate or Full Teaching Professor. The letter writers are asked to address the following:

• [Professor/Dr.] [Last Name’s] accomplishments as a teacher; the demonstration of teaching excellence is the primary criterion in his academic series;
• Professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity;
• How [his/her/their] accomplishments compare to those of other educators in the field at a similar level at your institution or others
• If applicable, the quality of the venues in which [his/her/their] work may have appeared;
• Whether [he/she/they] would qualify for the proposed rank and step at your institution;
• Finally, if you are able to comment on [Professor/Dr.] [Last Name’s] service to the profession or the community, this would also be very helpful

The Workgroup is concerned that the list of bullet points does not accurately reflect the expectations of this series. Although the first point does state that a demonstration of teaching excellence is the primary criterion by which teaching professors should be evaluated, the next three points on the list are focused entirely on scholarly or creative activity, how this activity compares to others, and the quality of venues in which this work appears. This list seems to give more weight to, and seek more information about, scholarly achievement rather than teaching. This is clearly not aligned with the primary expectation of this series. The Workgroup questions why the demonstration of teaching excellence is not expanded upon and why the letter does not request the evaluation of specifics related to teaching excellence (see below in recommendations).

The Workgroup recommends that the new solicitation letter needs to better explain the series and to give directions to the letter writers that are more aligned with the series. The Workgroup recommends modifying the points the letter writers are asked to address as follows:

• The primary responsibility of faculty in this series is teaching, and the demonstration of teaching excellence is the primary criterion for advancement. Evidence of teaching excellence may include teaching awards, student evaluations, maintaining a high teaching load including large enrollment classes and/or labs, development and coordination of programs, IA/TA training, mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, pedagogical innovations, and/or demonstration of successful teaching strategies.
• Faculty in this series are also expected to be involved with professional and/or scholarly activities on campus or beyond. Evidence for this may include publications, presentations, posters, workshops, and/or other creative activities.
• Faculty in this series are also expected to be involved with service to the University or community. Evidence of service may include involvement in departmental and campus-wide committees, leadership positions, or engagement beyond the University.
• Please assess how [his/her/their] accomplishments compare to those of other educators in the field at a similar level at your institution or others.

4.4. Voting Rights

Non-Personnel Actions

UC Senate Bylaw 55, included as an appendix to this report, clearly stipulates that on all departmental matters apart from “certain personnel actions,” all members of the Academic Senate must be afforded an opportunity to vote. For example, this requires a department contemplating a new undergraduate or graduate program to allow not only traditional LRF but also teaching LRF to vote on the decision. Similarly if a department uses a vote to choose a new department chair, then both traditional and teaching LRF should be allowed to vote. Workgroup members believe that this point is widely understood, but bears repeating, for example, in training workshops for department chairs and administrative staff.

The Workgroup recommends that the Senate participate in regular training workshops for department chairs and administrative staff on Bylaw 55, and should inform participants that all Senate members have full rights to vote on any department question, apart from certain personnel decisions.

Personnel Actions

On the question of personnel decisions, Bylaw 55 is quite complex. In brief, it allows traditional LRF to vote on all appointments at their rank or below in both the traditional and teaching LRF series. In contrast, full Teaching Professors are allowed to vote on Associate Teaching Professor appointments but not Assistant Teaching Professor appointments, and Associate Teaching Professors are allowed to vote on Associate Teaching Professor appointments but not Assistant Teaching Professor appointments. The same rules apply to cases of advancement within rank, for example, an advancement from Step I to Step II in the Associate Teaching Professor ranks. In this case, both Associate Teaching Professors and full Teaching Professors are allowed to vote. However, Section C of Bylaw 55 also states that any department can, by a two-thirds vote of traditional LRF, confer additional voting rights upon other Senate members, including full Teaching Professors, Associate Teaching Professors, and Assistant Teaching Professors.

Taken as a whole then, Bylaw 55 confers, as a minimum, certain voting rights on personnel actions on Associate Teaching Professors and full Teaching Professors, but these rights are
limited compared to Associate Professors and Professors. It also allows departments to vote to confer additional voting rights on personnel actions should a department so choose.

Workgroup members viewed the personnel voting rights for teaching LRF in Bylaw 55 as a floor, or minimum. And, as noted earlier, at UC San Diego a number of departments have conferred identical voting rights on teaching LRF and traditional LRF who are at the same rank (e.g. Associate Teaching Professors have the same voting rights as Associate Professors). Other departments have not taken this step, an important one that would be a major step towards equity between the two series of Academic Senate members.

Could there be a concerted effort at UC San Diego to correct the inequity in voting rights by action at the departmental level? The Standing Orders of the Regents, as quoted in Senate Bylaw 55 clearly states that departments “shall determine their own form of administrative organization,” indicating that the UC San Diego administration and Senate lack the authority to impose additional voting rules beyond those explicitly defined and required in Bylaw 55.

Workgroup members believe that it makes sense to encourage departments to consider expanding voting rights on personnel matters to Teaching Professors. Affording teaching LRF and traditional LRF of the same rank equal voting rights honors the principle that the educational mission of the University is equally important as the research mission of the University. Moreover, affording equal voting rights encourages teaching LRF and traditional LRF to work together as partners to unify the educational and research missions to improve the experience of our students in an exceptional manner that cannot be found at a non-research university or a research park.

Nonetheless, any encouragement of departments to consider extending voting rights on personnel issues must be done with care. Departments alone have the authority to change their voting rules in the context of Bylaw 55. If traditional LRF were pressured to change the voting rules, unintended consequences of pushing departments to extend voting rights on personnel decisions could emerge. For example, consideration of this matter could convince some departments not to hire teaching LRF at all. Such an outcome would be highly counterproductive.

Workgroup members agreed that at the very least, opportunities should be found for department chairs and administrators in departments that have extended voting rights on personnel matters to share their experiences with other departments that have not done so, as well as, departments that have yet to hire their first Teaching Professor. Giving Teaching Professors a voice in personnel decisions outside those guaranteed by Bylaw 55, in the same way that Bylaw 55 allows departments to vote to give Emeritae/i a right to participate in department personnel discussions, would be one intermediate step that could improve decision making and improve collegiality.

The Workgroup recommends that the campus find opportunities for department chairs and administrators in departments that have extended voting rights on personnel matters to share
their experiences with other departments. Furthermore, departments that have not conferred full voting rights on personnel decisions to Teaching Professors should consider finding mechanisms for Teaching Professors to share their advice on personnel questions in department meetings or by written submission, with the goal of furthering the educational and creative missions of the campus.

We make the next recommendation based on evidence from our surveys of teaching professors and of chairs that for the most part, departments that have hired several teaching professors highly value their contributions to teaching and creative activity. The recommendation also derives from our concern that perceptions that teaching professors are still second-class members of the Academic Senate have produced asymmetry in some departments in voting rights on academic personnel. Further, this asymmetry is bad for morale of teaching professors and could well hinder the fuller engagement between traditional and teaching LRF that the campus needs to advance its teaching mission.

We recommend that departments strongly consider amending their bylaws, if they have not already done so, to grant equal voting rights to traditional LRF and teaching LRF on academic personnel issues.

Potential Changes to Bylaw 55

The Workgroup noted two issues in Bylaw 55 that the University of California as a whole should reconsider. The first is an asymmetry in overall voting rights between traditional and teaching LRF. Roughly speaking, Associate and Full Teaching Professors are authorized by the bylaw to vote on appointments and advancement, with some exceptions, in the teaching LRF series, but not the traditional LRF series. Traditional LRF, on the other hand, are authorized to vote on appointments and advancements in both series. This asymmetry likely contributes to the perception that teaching professors are a second class of professor in the Academic Senate, a comment which we saw both in our surveys of both teaching professors and department chairs. Indeed, Bylaw 55 effectively bakes this two-class structure into the DNA of the University of California.

The second issue is that although full Teaching Professors can vote on appointments and advancement of full and Associate Teaching Professors, and Associate Teaching Professors can vote on appointment and advancement of Associate Teaching Professors, Bylaw 55 does not grant either Associate Teaching Professors or full Teaching Professors the right to vote on the appointment or step advancement of Assistant Teaching Professors. This omission is odd and should be rectified.

This Workgroup does not have the standing to alter the language of Bylaw 55. But a duly appointed campus Senate Committee, such as Rules and Jurisdiction, does have the right to examine these issues and make recommendations to the campus Senate and potentially from there on to the systemwide Senate. The Workgroup makes the following recommendations
with this in mind, in the spirit that tenure and security of employment are essentially equivalent and should be treated equivalently with respect to voting on academic personnel actions.

The Workgroup recommends that the relevant committee or committees of the Academic Senate at UC San Diego, examine UC Bylaw 55 with respect to the voting rights conferred upon Associate and full Teaching Professors. Specifically, the Workgroup recommends that the relevant Senate committee(s) consider making two recommendations to the campus Senate, and ultimately the systemwide Senate:

i) to allow Associate and full Teaching Professors to vote on appointments to and merit advancements within the Assistant Teaching Professor rank.

ii) to allow teaching LRF to vote on appointments, advancements, and promotions of traditional LRF at the parallel or lower ranks.

4.5. Service Beyond the Department

The Workgroup notes that both traditional LRF and teaching LRF regularly provide valuable service to the Academic Senate, and that the Committee on Committees plays a key role in assigning faculty to campus committees.

The Workgroup recommends that nominations to stand for election as a member of the Committee on Committees be opened to include representation from Teaching Professors.

Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

A related issue concerns representation of Teaching Professors in the academic review process. The Workgroup found broad support for having representation of Teaching Professors in some form on CAP. The Workgroup discussed three possibilities.

i) The first option is that Teaching Professors who have gained security of employment serve on CAP. Representation could be roughly in proportion to the representation of the series as members of the Academic Senate. Alternatively, membership of CAP, which recently increased from 12 to 13 members to deal with increased workload, could initially add a 14th member, from the teaching professor series.

ii) A second approach would be for CAP to establish a standing ad hoc committee each year to aid in the review of teaching professor files.

iii) A third approach would be the establishment of a Teaching Professor CAP (TP-CAP) as another level of review prior to CAP.

All of these approaches have their advantages and disadvantages. We briefly describe the Workgroup discussion of each of these options’s strengths and weaknesses.
Option 1 -- Representation of Teaching Professors on CAP

Such a move would recognize that traditional LRF and teaching LRF are both members of the Academic Senate and therefore, should serve on all of its committees. A second advantage is that teaching professors who served on CAP would be well-placed to help evaluate the teaching component of all files, and to evaluate the creative activity of other teaching professors, especially that activity related to pedagogical innovation.

The main concern is that some professors might feel uncomfortable having one or more teaching professors serving on CAP when teaching professors’ expected academic research activity was not at same level as for professors in their departments. The Workgroup is mindful of the fact that departments make hiring decisions and not all have yet embarked on the relatively new path of hiring teaching professors. It may take more time before a decision can be made to regularly include teaching professors on CAP that has broad Senate support. However, the Workgroup perceived two rebuttals to this concern. First, some Workgroup members noted that having teaching LRF help evaluate the files of traditional LRF is not so different from having traditional LRF on CAP evaluate the research of other traditional LRF who are in entirely different research fields. Second, although teaching LRF are more focused on teaching, that does not necessarily mean that they do not do research and do not understand expectations for advancement in the traditional LRF series.

Another concern relates to the relative experience of Teaching Professors with the broader questions of academic review owing to the diversity in the extension of Bylaw 55 voting rights to individuals in the series. The challenge here is that if members of the series have not been involved in the academic review process at the departmental level, as is the case in a number of departments, it would be difficult for them to effectively serve on CAP.

The Workgroup notes that implementing this option will require that the bylaws of CAP be amended to allow those with security of employment to serve on CAP, in addition to those with tenure.

Options 2 and 3 -- Representation of Teaching Professors through a Committee Advising CAP

Options 2 and 3 are similar, with the main difference being whether the committee of Teaching Professors that would assess the files of teaching professors to be reviewed by CAP is a formal standing committee (“TP-CAP”) or a less formal ad hoc committee appointed by CAP each year. One advantage of these approaches is that there would be a systematic way of ensuring that a committee of teaching professors would evaluate the teaching and creative activity of other teaching professors up for review at CAP. A second advantage is that this approach might diminish concerns that might otherwise emerge from some parts of the Senate membership that teaching LRF may not always be in an ideal position to evaluate the research of traditional LRF.

A disadvantage of this approach is that it fails to recognize that both traditional LRF and teaching LRF are members of the Academic Senate. Failure to include representation from the
latter group on CAP would reinforce the feeling expressed by some teaching professors in the survey that they are viewed as second-class citizens. A second disadvantage of this approach is that it removes the possibility that teaching professors can use their expertise to help CAP evaluate the teaching and pedagogical innovations of all professors on campus, professors and teaching professors alike. A third disadvantage is that these approaches would add another layer of review, which could induce delays in the review process and opportunities for confusion about the review process.

The Workgroup encourages broad discussion between the administration and the Senate on the best way to proceed regarding Teaching Professors and participation on CAP or participation with the activities of CAP. Options that should be discussed include the direct inclusion of a representative number of Teaching Professors on CAP, or a committee of Teaching Professors that would advise CAP on the files of Teaching Professors being considered by CAP. In the latter case, committees could be formed as a series of ad hoc committees or one standing committee.

5. A Strategy for Communicating These Changes across the Campus

The Workgroup makes the following suggestions for ensuring campus leadership is informed regarding these changes and forums in which they can be educated on how it will impact their work.

i. Quarterly Department Chair Workshops: The campus should utilize these existing training workshops and offer a module on the Teaching Professor series at least every other year in order to reach chairs who may have rotated into this role. Most general campus department chairs serve terms of 2-3 years. This will ensure that they are oriented to the series and are provided with the opportunity to ask questions. Department MSO’s or department AP Staff should be encouraged to attend the workshop with their department chair in order to help solidify the knowledge base within their department.

ii. EVC-Sponsored Website on Teaching Professors at UC San Diego: We recommend that the EVC’s office sponsor a specific Teaching Professor web page under “Faculty Resources” on the APS Website which can be a starting point for not only those newly appointed to the series, but also a place where their contributions can be highlighted and celebrated.

iii. Campuswide Conference on Curriculum Innovations/Teaching Professors: We recommend that the EVC sponsor an annual showcase conference to be held on campus that would highlight contributions made by teaching professors over the past year. For the first year, a conference committee comprised of UC San Diego Teaching Professors would be formed to design and deliver such a conference under the guidance of the Teaching + Learning Commons. Invitees would include faculty and other academic appointees, as space allows. As the conference grows, teaching professors from other UC campuses might be invited to participate. The Chancellor would be invited to give the keynote address and promote the conference on campus websites and education-related publications.
iv. **Encouragement of cross-collaborations on teaching with traditional LRF**: We recommend that the Academic Senate or EVC office provide awards for cross-collaborations on curriculum development and pedagogical innovation.

v. **Establishment of a Teaching Professor Mentoring Program**: We recommend that the EVC’s office establish a formal mentoring program for Teaching Professors. This is especially important where there may only be 1-2 teaching professors in a department. The program should require that the department chair and mentor outline a mentoring plan for success with the new Teaching Professor and involve senior department faculty in the plan as well, with clear expectations for all involved, documented in an MOU.

6. **Conclusion**

The Workgroup coalesced in a firm belief that the traditional LRF series and the teaching LRF series complement each other and strengthen the University’s ability to meet its core missions of research, teaching and service. We have made the recommendations in this report with a mind to strengthening these complementarities between the two series. Our recommendations are also intended to address head on the concerns among some Teaching Professors that their series is viewed as somehow “lesser.” One way to overcome any such stigma is for the campus to set only the highest standards in the hiring and advancement of Teaching Professors. A lack of information about the Teaching Professor series is also seen by some as impediments to the fuller incorporation of the Teaching Professor series into the campus DNA. To this end, we have made recommendations that will strengthen the knowledge base of all faculty, staff, and administrators regarding the Teaching Professor series.

As a convenience to the reader, below we recapitulate each of the Workgroup’s recommendations. We earnestly hope that the following list will become a checklist for upcoming reforms.

**Summary of Recommendations**

**Teaching**

1. *The Workgroup recommends a maximum teaching load for Teaching Professors of six four-unit courses, with possibility of reductions in this load for those with high administrative duties or who are teaching exceptionally large or otherwise demanding courses.* Given the heavy administrative loads of many Teaching Professors, the Workgroup recommends against a formal minimum in the number of courses that Teaching Professors must teach.

2. *The Workgroup also recommends that departments adopt a transparent and equitable approach to quantifying teaching load for all faculty within a department.*

3. *The Workgroup recommends that all departments develop transparent and equitable rules for allocation of teaching support if they have not already done so, and that traditional LRF and teaching LRF should be treated equitably by these rules in support of the teaching mission.*
4. The Workgroup recommends that the campus consider whether the decision to appoint a Teaching Professor as chair of a graduate committee appointment decision could be delegated to the Department Chairs.

**Compensation**

5. The Workgroup recommends that the use of Entry Level Salary Agreements (ELSA’s) be extended to the recruitment of teaching professors to account for disciplinary norms.

6. The Workgroup recommends that salary equity studies on the teaching LRF population continue to be conducted by the campus at the same frequency as for the traditional LRF, thereby ensuring that such salary inequities among existing faculty continue to be identified and addressed by the administration.

7. The Workgroup recommends that the Career Milestone Salary Incentive (CMSI) program be extended to the teaching LRF series now that salary scales with steps within each rank have been created.

8. With the recent announcement from the University of California Office of the President which states that participation of Teaching Professors in the General Campus Compensation Plan (GCCP) is permissible, the workgroup encourages departments and the campus to broadly advertise that this opportunity is now available to those in the series.

**Academic Personnel**

9. The Workgroup recommends that two actions be taken to align campus practices for the appointment of Assistant Teaching Professors at steps I-III with the appointment of Assistant Professors at steps I-III: i) CAP should consider waiving its review of Assistant Teaching Professor appointments at Steps I-III and include these files in its annual post-audit of dean level appointments. ii) The Administration should delegate the approval authority of Assistant Teaching Professor appointments at Steps I-III to the Dean or Dean equivalent.

10. To align with campus practices on recruitment of Assistant Professors at Steps I-II, the Workgroup recommends that letters for appointments at Assistant Teaching Professor, Steps I and II need not be from independent letter writers.

11. The Workgroup encourages department chairs to make effective use of the Teaching Professor cohort at other UC campuses as external reviewers of Teaching Professors, as well as considering the limited use of independent, arms-length local reviewers in certain instances.

12. The Workgroup recommends that department chairs and recruitment committees understand the differences between the traditional and teaching LRF series and that they routinely share the distinctions with candidates.
13. The Workgroup recommends that two actions be taken to align campus practices for normal merit advancements: i) CAP should consider waiving its review of Assistant Teaching Professor first review if normal merit, Associate Teaching Professor, Steps I-V, and Teaching Professor, Steps I-V and VII-VIII and include these files in its annual post-audit of dean level merit actions. ii) The Administration should delegate the approval authority of Assistant Teaching Professor first review if normal merit, Associate Teaching Professor, Steps I-V, and Teaching Professor, Steps I-V and VII-VIII to the Deans or Dean equivalent.

14. Senate members seeking a change of series between the traditional LRF and teaching LRF series should be required to demonstrate that they fully meet guidelines and standards of the series which they are seeking to enter.

15. The Workgroup recommends that when series changes between traditional LRF and teaching LRF series are reviewed, members of both series should be included in the review as much as possible. Furthermore, all reviewers should have a clear understanding of the process and standards involved in the change.

16. The Workgroup recommends that series change between the traditional and teaching LRF series be a part of administrative and departmental discussions and training and that there be distribution of written guidance on the subject of series changes available to Chairs, MSO’s and department AP Staff. The Workgroup recommends that Academic Personnel Services (APS) develop series change training materials for inclusion in the regular training schedules for Chairs.

17. Departments are strongly encouraged to establish norms both for merit advancement and for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor that allow multiple ways of demonstrating creative activity.

18. The Workgroup further recommends that as part of the Academic Personnel Services quarterly department chair workshops, time be dedicated to a hands-on activity to assist department chairs with drafting department standards for merit and advancement for this series.

19. The Workgroup recommends that teaching professors play an active role in defining expectations for creative activity, and more broadly, for teaching and service for the series across departments.

20. The Workgroup recommends that departments design their expectations for normal merit advancements by being specific about alternative types and levels of creative activity that would rise to the level of a normal merit advancement. This specific set of quantitative and qualitative guidelines for each type of creative activity will thus provide a more transparent metric for the justification of accelerations.
21. The Workgroup suggests that sections 230-285.10 and 230-285.18 of PPM 230-285 are outdated and are in direct contradiction to the new APM 285. We recommend that they be eliminated/rescinded in order to better align with the new APM.

22. The Workgroup recommends that the campus search for ways to train department chairs, MSO’s, and AP analysts on academic file preparation for teaching professors on an annual basis. Ideas include an annual session at the Council of Chairs meetings, quarterly department chair workshops, and an annual review of evaluation procedures at meetings by Deans with their Chairs and MSOs.

23. The Workgroup recommends that departments relatively new to hiring Teaching Professors regularly consult both their dean and other departments in their division regarding setting expectations and norms for preparation of academic files of teaching professors.

24. The Workgroup recommends that the new solicitation letter needs to better explain the series and to give directions to the letter writers that are more aligned with the series. The Workgroup recommends modifying the points the letter writers are asked to address as follows:

- The primary responsibility of faculty in this series is teaching, and the demonstration of teaching excellence is the primary criterion for advancement. Evidence of teaching excellence may include teaching awards, student evaluations, maintaining a high teaching load including large enrollment classes and/or labs, development and coordination of programs, IA/TA training, mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, pedagogical innovations, and/or demonstration of successful teaching strategies.
- Faculty in this series are also expected to be involved with professional and/or scholarly activities on campus or beyond. Evidence for this may include publications, presentations, posters, workshops, and/or other creative activities.
- Faculty in this series are also expected to be involved with service to the University or community. Evidence of service may include involvement in departmental and campus wide committees, leadership positions, or engagement beyond the University.

Please assess how [his/her/their] accomplishments compare to those of other educators in the field at a similar level at your institution or others.

Voting Rights/Bylaws

25. The Workgroup recommends that the Senate participate in regular training workshops for department chairs and administrative staff on Bylaw 55, and should inform participants that all Senate members have full rights to vote on any department question, apart from certain personnel decisions.

26. The Workgroup recommends that the campus find opportunities for department chairs and administrators in departments that have extended voting rights on personnel matters to share their experiences with other departments. Furthermore, departments that have not conferred
full voting rights on personnel decisions to Teaching Professors should consider finding mechanisms for Teaching Professors to share their advice on personnel questions in department meetings or by written submission, with the goal of furthering the educational and creative missions of the campus.

27. We recommend that departments strongly consider amending their bylaws, if they have not already done so, to grant equal voting rights to traditional LRF and teaching LRF on academic personnel issues.

28. The Workgroup recommends that the relevant committee or committees of the Academic Senate at UC San Diego, examine UC Bylaw 55 with respect to the voting rights conferred upon Associate and full Teaching Professors. Specifically, the Workgroup recommends that the relevant Senate committee(s) consider making two recommendations to the campus Senate, and ultimately the systemwide Senate: i) to allow Associate and full Teaching Professors to vote on appointments to and merit advancements within the Assistant Teaching Professor rank. ii) to allow teaching LRF to vote on appointments, advancements, and promotions of traditional LRF at the parallel or lower ranks.

Service Beyond the Department

29. The Workgroup recommends that nominations to stand for election as a member of the Committee on Committees be opened to include representation from the Teaching Professors.

30. The Workgroup encourages broad discussion between the administration and the Senate on the best way to proceed regarding Teaching Professors and participation on CAP or participation with the activities of CAP. Options that should be discussed include the direct inclusion of a representative number of Teaching Professors on CAP, or a committee of Teaching Professors that would advise CAP on the files of Teaching Professors being considered by CAP. In the latter case, committees could be formed as a series of ad hoc committees or one standing committee.

A Strategy for Communicating These Changes across the Campus

31. The Workgroup makes the following suggestions for ensuring campus leadership is informed regarding these changes and forums in which they can be educated on how it will impact their work.

i. Quarterly Department Chair Workshops: The campus should utilize these existing training workshops and offer a module on the Teaching Professor series at least every other year in order to reach chairs who may have rotated into this role. Most general campus department chairs serve terms of 2-3 years. This will ensure that they are oriented to the series and are provided with the opportunity to ask questions.
Department MSO’s or department AP Staff should be encouraged to attend the workshop with their department chair in order to help solidify the knowledge base within their department.

ii. EVC-Sponsored Website on Teaching Professors at UC San Diego: We recommend that the EVC’s office sponsor a specific Teaching Professor web page under “Faculty Resources” on the APS Website which can be a starting point for not only those newly appointed to the series, but also a place where their contributions can be highlighted and celebrated.

iii. Campuswide Conference on Curriculum Innovations/Teaching Professors: We recommend that the EVC sponsor an annual showcase conference to be held on campus that would highlight contributions made by teaching professors over the past year. For the first year, a conference committee comprised of UC San Diego Teaching Professors would be formed to design and deliver such a conference under the guidance of the Teaching + Learning Commons. Invitees would include faculty and other academic appointees, as space allows. As the conference grows, teaching professors from other UC campuses might be invited to participate. The Chancellor would be invited to give the keynote address and promote the conference on campus websites and education-related publications.

iv. Encouragement of cross-collaborations on teaching with traditional LRF: We recommend that the Academic Senate or EVC office provide awards for cross-collaborations on curriculum development and pedagogical innovation.

v. Establishment of a Teaching Professor Mentoring Program: We recommend that the EVC’s office establish a formal mentoring program for Teaching Professors. This is especially important where there may only be 1-2 teaching professors in a department. The program should require that the department chair and mentor outline a mentoring plan for success with the new Teaching Professor and involve senior department faculty in the plan as well, with clear expectations for all involved, documented in an MOU.
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Background

University of California is presently contemplating revisions to the sections of the APM (285, 210-3, 133, and 740) governing the Lecturers with Security of Employment series1 (for which UC San Diego uses the working title Teaching Professors or LPSOE/LSOE). Major topics that are anticipated to be impacted by the revisions include:

- Name of the series and titles within the series
- Academic expectations and evaluations
- Compensation and salary scales
- Sabbatical leaves
- Security of employment

The final form of the revisions is expected to become effective on July 1, 2018, at which time UC San Diego will make corresponding mandated revisions to our campus PPM sections.

Moreover, in recent discussions between the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), and between the EVC and divisional deans and department chairs, several observations about our current practices with regard to Teaching Professors have been raised, including:

- Requirements for evaluation letters in CAP files for Teaching Professors merit re-examination
- Teaching Professors are not presently eligible for certain salary-related programs

Another issue that has been raised is that Teaching Professors are primarily evaluated on the basis of their teaching performance, making it essential to have robust ways to evaluate teaching on our campus. A Senate-Administration Workgroup on Holistic Teaching Evaluation has recently been charged to rethink our campus approach to teaching evaluations; its report will be available on October 1, 2018.

Two other joint workgroups have recently been charged to investigate certain issues that impact multiple faculty series, including Teaching Professors.

- Faculty Recruitment Practices Workgroup is charged with drafting a faculty recruitment policy based on institutional goals, current departmental processes, and established best practices. The report from this workgroup is expected by March 1, 2019.
- Faculty Workload Workgroup is charged with reviewing departmental workload standards in the context of the University’s mission and their use setting expectations for faculty engagement. The report from this workgroup is to be submitted by March 1, 2019.

The recommendations of these workgroups will be germane to the deliberations of this Workgroup.

The efforts stated above present an opportunity to re-examine policies and practices related to the Teaching Professor series in order to foster a fair and supportive work environment for valued campus colleagues.

1 Details may be found at https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/policies-under-review/apm-285-210-133-740.html
**Charge**
In accordance with Academic Senate policies this is a joint Senate and Administration workgroup to be co-chaired by an administrator and a Senate member.

The Workgroup is charged to undertake a study and provide a set of recommendations about how UC San Diego might change its local practices and PPM policies not mandated by APM requirements non-PPM policies in ways that better support Teaching Professors and provide appropriate guidance to unit leaders.

Specific issues to be considered by the Workgroup include - but are not limited to - the following:

- Independent external referee letters are required for all LPSOE/LSOE appointments, whereas they are not required for Assistant Professor I or II appointments. It is not clear whether this difference is justifiable and should be preserved.
- The language describing the distinction between the external independent letters required for advancement within the series and optional additional letters from UC San Diego colleagues regarding pedagogy may not be sufficiently clear.
- Teaching Professors are not presently eligible for the Entry Level Salary Agreement (ELSA) or Career Milestone Salary Increment (CMSI) programs. Some units ask whether eligibility could be expanded to help address salary equity, inversion, compression, and competitiveness issues.
- Appointees in LPSOE/LSOE series are assigned heavier instructional loads compared to ladder-rank faculty, since teaching is their primary mission. A minimum (and perhaps a maximum) teaching load requirement should be instated.
- A communications strategy:
  - How can we best make the case that change benefits students, faculty and the institution as a whole?
  - How can we best inform unit leaders of the changes that will impact their work?

We encourage the Workgroup to think expansively. In particular, we ask that it:

- Review current UC San Diego resources and practices;
- Review practices and policies at other UC campuses;
- Consider smart practices from peer institutions and a literature review

The Workgroup should consult broadly, seeking input from Academic Personnel Services, Senate Committee members, former CAP Chairs, leaders of academic units employing Teaching Professors, and faculty and staff colleagues with experience in this area.

We request that this Workgroup’s recommendations incorporate relevant elements from the reports of the workgroups on Faculty Recruitment, Holistic Teaching Evaluations, and Faculty Workload.

---

2 See, for instance, [http://soeadm.ucsd.edu/ppi/academic_personnel/compensation/elsa.sfe](http://soeadm.ucsd.edu/ppi/academic_personnel/compensation/elsa.sfe)
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This appendix tabulates answers to survey questions. Some questions sought written responses. Because the Workgroup promised confidentiality to respondents, and because written responses could potentially be linked to specific respondents, we do not show verbatim responses to this latter type of question. But the main text summarizes the main points made by respondents in these written responses. We list the written response questions below even though we do not show the responses.

**Q1 - Do you participate in research, publication, and/or other creative work?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2 - If Yes, how does your department evaluate this work when you are reviewed?**

**Q3 - What is your department/school/unit’s annual teaching expectations (e.g., number of courses, other teaching-related duties) for members in the teaching professor series?** (Please also note the annual teaching load in regular 4-unit course equivalents to the right of your selection.)

Note: The respondents who chose “Other” provided written explanations. The left-hand side of the table below shows that 11.5% chose “Other”. The right-hand side of the table uses the written responses to translate those responses into one of the numerical categories.

**Q3 on Teaching Load: How Does this Answer Change When Attempt to Translate the "Other" Category into Numbers?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of 4-unit Courses</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 - When teaching assignments are made, is the overall course number you are assigned determined by factors such as type of course? (Check all the course characteristics that affect the number of courses you teach.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of course (lab, seminar, lower-division required course, upper-division required course, upper-division elective)</td>
<td>47.72%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment level (small vs. large class)</td>
<td>29.54%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing intensive</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>47.72%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The percentage of the 44 people answering this question who picked the each item is shown.

Q5 - Is there a transparent process for distribution of teaching resources, such as teaching/instructional assistants, graders, readers and funds for printing materials in your department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6 - Do you have the resources and/or other supports you need (e.g., teaching/instructional assistants) to teach undergraduates effectively?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - If no, please explain</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 - In a typical year, what percent of the classes you teach are those that you requested to teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% or less</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8 - In what other ways are you contributing to the education mission of your department? (Check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA Training</td>
<td>73.07%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Design</td>
<td>86.53%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair for Education</td>
<td>9.61%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairing Education/ Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>32.69%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI on an education grant, such as National Science Foundation (NSF), Research Experience for Undergraduates (REU), Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN)/Department of Education</td>
<td>32.69%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>57.69%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The percentage of the 52 people answering this question who picked each item is shown.

Q9 - Under Academic Senate Bylaw 55, members of the Teaching Professor series are afforded rights to vote on appointment and promotion proposals in their own series. Have you been afforded the right to vote on such proposals for other instructional series in your department?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.34%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10 - Are you invited to share in the governance of your department/school/unit by participating in and or chairing departmental committees and workgroups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - if yes, please describe</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 - Did you know that Teaching Professors can serve as PI on a grant application? See PI Eligibility Table located at: https://blink.ucsd.edu/research/finding-funding/pi-eligibility.html

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88.46%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12 - Were you assigned a faculty mentor when you were appointed into the teaching professor series?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80.77%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 - Are you aware of the following organizations and offices here on campus? If so, have you participated in any of their activities? (Check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Aware of but not Participated</th>
<th>Aware of and Participated</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Center for Advancing Multidisciplinary Scholarship for Excellence in Education (CAMSEE)</td>
<td>25.49% 13 64.70% 33 9.81% 5 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching + Learning Commons</td>
<td>21.56% 11 78.43% 40 0% 0 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Faculty Diversity &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>68.62% 35 15.68% 8 15.70% 8 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other? Name:</td>
<td>1.96% 1 9.80% 5 88.24% 45 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other? Name:</td>
<td>1.96% 1 5.88% 3 92.16% 47 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 51 responded to this question

Responses for “Other”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Aware of but not Participated</th>
<th>Aware of and Participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAZA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Resource Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;H Professional Dev. Lectures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSED Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Discipline DBER Mtgs between Chem &amp; Bio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15 - What other professional development opportunities or resources would you like to see here at UC San Diego?
Q16 - Has your department reviewed the recent policy revisions, and created departmental standards for merit and accelerated advancements to take into account the new criteria emphasis in APM 285 and APM 210-3? [Relevant text: APM 285-4 a. “The Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series is used for appointees who are members of the faculty of an academic or professional college, school, division, department, or program of the University whose primary responsibility is teaching and teaching-related tasks, and secondary responsibility is professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity, especially as they relate to instruction and pedagogy. The faculty in this series also have responsibility for University and public service. APM 210-3 d. (2) Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity “Clearly demonstrated evidence of professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity, is one of the criteria for appointment or advancement. Professional and/or scholarly activities may be related to the underlying discipline itself or to the pedagogy.”]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 - Anything else you would like to share about your experience as a teaching professor at UC San Diego?
Important Introductory Note

Please read this note before consulting APM - 133-0.

I. For determining years toward the eight-year limitation of service with certain academic titles, see APM - 133-0 printed below. APM - 133-0 applies to individuals who are appointed to one of the titles specified in 133-0-a, -b, or -c.

For determining years toward the eight-year limitation of service, the combined total of periods of leave unrelated to academic duties and time off the clock may not exceed two (2) years. For exceptions to the eight-year limit, see APM - 133-12 and see the appropriate APM section for a specific title.

II. This section does not cover limits on State funding for certain titles. See APM - 275-16-b for the Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series, APM - 270-16-b for the Professor in Residence series, APM - 278-16-a for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, and APM - 280-16-b for the Adjunct Professor series.

III. Campuses may have service limits which are more restrictive than those in this APM section.

IV. The maximum period of service in individual titles may be shorter than eight (8) years. For further information, please consult the appropriate APM section for a specific title.

133-0 Policy

An academic appointee’s current title (e.g., Assistant Professor, Assistant Astronomer) determines which of the following three subsections (a, b, or c) applies in order to compute that appointee’s years of service which count toward the eight-year limit.

a. This subsection applies to an individual who currently holds one of the following titles:

Assistant Professor, Assistant Agronomist, Assistant Supervisor of Physical Education, Assistant Astronomer, and Assistant Professor in Residence
Periods of service on any campus of the University of California in any combination of the following titles count toward the eight-year limit in determining the status of an Assistant Professor under Section 103.9 of the Standing Orders of The Regents quoted below:

An Assistant Professor who has completed eight (8) years of service in that title, or in that title in combination with other titles as established by the President, shall not be continued after the eighth year unless promoted to Associate Professor or Professor.

Service in the following titles is also applied to determine the eight-year limit for (1) other academic appointees who hold a title eligible for tenure review (i.e., Assistant Agronomist, Assistant Supervisor of Physical Education, Assistant Astronomer); (2) Assistant Professor in Residence, a title which is not eligible for tenure but which has the same criteria for appointment and promotion as an Assistant Professor.

Professor series and related titles

Instructor
Assistant Professor
Acting Assistant Professor
Visiting Assistant Professor
Acting Associate Professor
Visiting Associate Professor
Acting Professor
Visiting Professor

Supervisor of Physical Education series

Junior Supervisor of Physical Education
Assistant Supervisor of Physical Education

Professor in Residence series

Instructor in Residence
Assistant Professor in Residence

Astronomer series and related titles

Junior Astronomer
Acting Junior Astronomer
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Assistant Astronomer
Acting Assistant Astronomer
Visiting Assistant Astronomer

Agronomist in the Agricultural Experiment Station series and related titles

Junior Agronomist
Acting Junior Agronomist
Assistant Agronomist
Acting Assistant Agronomist
Visiting Assistant Agronomist

The following additional provisions apply:

(1) Unless otherwise indicated in the above list, an appointment at any percentage of time including zero (0) percent counts toward the eight-year limit. Appointments which are zero (0) percent time because the appointee is on leave may be eligible for exclusion. (See APM - 133-17-g.) Some campuses call zero (0) percent appointments “without salary (WOS) appointments.”

(2) For information on temporary transfers, changes of status, and periods of leave in regard to the computation of years of service, see APM - 133-17-g. For information on breaks in service, see APM - 133-17-e.

(3) In cases where there has been a review of an Assistant Professor or Assistant Professor in Residence and the Chancellor has decided not to continue the individual’s appointment in that series, the individual may not be appointed on any campus to certain faculty titles for a period of five (5) years. For a list of these faculty titles, see APM - 133, Appendix A.

(4) Years of service are calculated over a lifetime on any campus. For example, an individual who previously served as an Assistant Professor and who is appointed as an Assistant Professor on another campus after a break in service of five (5) years will have previous years of service “on the clock” (APM - 133-17-e).
b. This subsection applies to a person who holds the title Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment.

Periods of service in any combination of the following titles on any campus of the University of California count toward the eight-year limit in determining the status of a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (PSOE) appointed at more than fifty percent (50%) time. (See Regents’ Bylaw 40.)

*Security of Employment titles at more than fifty percent (50%) time*

- Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment
- Acting Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment
- Acting Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Acting Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment

*Professor series and related titles*

- Instructor
- Assistant Professor
- Acting Assistant Professor
- Visiting Assistant Professor
- Acting Associate Professor
- Visiting Associate Professor
- Acting Professor
- Visiting Professor

*Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series*

- Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine)

*Health Sciences Clinical Professor series*

- Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor at more than fifty percent (50%) time
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Supervisor of Physical Education series

Junior Supervisor of Physical Education
Assistant Supervisor of Physical Education

Professor in Residence series

Instructor in Residence
Assistant Professor in Residence

Adjunct Professor series

Adjunct Instructor at more than fifty percent (50%) time
Assistant Adjunct Professor at more than fifty percent (50%) time

The following additional provisions apply:

(1) Unless otherwise indicated in the above list, an appointment at any percentage of time including zero percent (0%) counts toward the eight-year limit. Appointments which are zero percent (0%) time because the appointee is on leave may be eligible for exclusion. (See APM - 133-17-g.) Some campuses call zero percent (0%) appointments “without salary (WOS) appointments.”

(2) For information on temporary transfers, changes of status, and periods of leave in regard to the computation of years of service, see APM - 133-17-g. For information on breaks in service, see APM - 133-17-e.

(3) When there has been a review of a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment at more than fifty percent (50%) time and the Chancellor has decided not to continue the individual’s appointment in that series, the individual may not be appointed on any campus to certain faculty titles for a period of five (5) years. For a list of these faculty titles, see APM - 133, Appendix A.

(4) Previous years of service as a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment count toward the eight-year limit, regardless of campus or a break in service.
c. This subsection applies to an appointee who currently holds one of the following titles:

Instructor, Acting Assistant Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Acting Associate Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Acting Professor, Visiting Professor, Instructor in Residence, Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor at more than fifty percent (50%) time, Junior Supervisor of Physical Education, Adjunct Instructor at more than fifty percent (50%) time, Assistant Adjunct Professor at more than fifty percent (50%) time, Junior Astronomer, Acting Junior Astronomer, Assistant Astronomer, Visiting Assistant Astronomer, Junior Agronomist (A.E.S.), Acting Junior Agronomist (A.E.S.), Acting Assistant Agronomist (A.E.S.), or Visiting Assistant Agronomist (A.E.S.).

Periods of service on any campus of the University of California in any combination of the titles listed below count toward the eight-year limit for the titles above. The maximum period of service in some of the individual titles is shorter than eight (8) years.

Professor series and related titles

Instructor
Assistant Professor
Acting Assistant Professor
Visiting Assistant Professor
Acting Associate Professor
Visiting Associate Professor
Acting Professor
Visiting Professor

Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series

Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine)

Health Sciences Clinical Professor series

Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor at more than fifty percent (50%) time
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**Supervisor of Physical Education series**

- Junior Supervisor of Physical Education
- Assistant Supervisor of Physical Education

**Professor in Residence series**

- Instructor in Residence
- Assistant Professor in Residence

**Adjunct Professor series**

- Adjunct Instructor at more than fifty percent (50%) time
- Assistant Adjunct Professor at more than fifty percent (50%) time

**Astronomer series and related titles**

- Junior Astronomer
- Acting Junior Astronomer
- Assistant Astronomer
- Acting Assistant Astronomer
- Visiting Assistant Astronomer

**Agronomist in the Agricultural Experiment Station and related titles**

- Junior Agronomist
- Acting Junior Agronomist
- Assistant Agronomist
- Acting Assistant Agronomist
- Visiting Assistant Agronomist

**Lecturer titles at more than fifty percent (50%) time**

- Lecturer
- Senior Lecturer
- Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment
The following provisions apply:

1. Unless otherwise indicated in the above list, an appointment at any percentage of time, including zero percent (0%), counts toward the eight-year limit. Appointments which are zero percent (0%) because the appointee is on leave may be eligible for exclusion (see APM - 133-17-g). Some campuses call zero percent (0%) appointments “without salary (WOS) appointments.”

2. For information on temporary transfers, changes of status, and periods of leave in regard to the computation of years of service, see APM - 133-17-g. For information on breaks in service, see APM - 133-17-e.

3. For purposes of calculating the eight-year limit, service on any campus of the University of California counts. “On any campus” means “anywhere in the Universitywide system.”

133-6 Responsibility

It is the responsibility of the Chancellor to arrange for appropriate reviews so that a decision may be made with regard to the future of the appointee which will assure compliance with APM - 133-0 and such requirements for notice as are set forth in the section of this Manual applicable to the title of the appointee.

133-12 Exceptions

a. Standing Order 103.9 and Regents’ Bylaw 40 provide that by exception the President may approve appointment of an Assistant Professor or a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment beyond the eighth year for no more than two (2) years.

b. Failure of the Chancellor or designee, through error or oversight, to comply with the provisions of APM - 133-6 as to non-reappointment shall be promptly corrected. In such case, if adequate notice cannot be given, the Chancellor may authorize an additional and terminal appointment in the same title for a period not to exceed one (1) year. Neither the failure to provide the required notice nor the additional appointment shall afford tenure or security of employment. This authority may not be redelegated.

For a person to be promoted to a title that carries tenure or security of employment, the person must hold a title eligible for tenure or security of
employment and the Chancellor must make in writing an affirmative decision which stems from a review process that involves consultation with the Academic Senate.

c. Appointment at less than full time to a title listed in APM - 133-0-a while in student status on any campus of the University of California will not count toward the eight-year period of maximum service specified in that section.

133-17 Computation of Years of Service

The following rules of computation shall be observed for service by an appointee with any of the titles listed in APM - 133-0-a:

a. Years of service are calculated from the beginning of the first complete semester or quarter of service.

b. For an academic-year appointee, the eight-year period shall consist of sixteen (16) complete semesters or, under the quarter system, twenty-four (24) complete quarters, or a combination of these two with one (1) semester equal to one and one-half (1.5) quarters. However, no academic-year appointee shall accrue more than three (3) quarters of service credit in any one (1) fiscal year toward the eight-year period unless the fourth quarter was approved under an arrangement to provide compensatory time off and that year is immediately preceded or succeeded by a two (2)-quarter year of service.

c. For a fiscal-year appointee, the eight-year period shall consist of ninety-six (96) months of completed service, inclusive of accrued vacation time.

d. Complete semesters or quarters of service for an academic-year appointee and complete months of service for a fiscal-year appointee shall be counted regardless of the percentage of time of the appointment, except for those titles listed in APM -133-0-a requiring a stated minimum percent of full-time appointment.

e. Any break in service, whether because of leave without salary or because of resignation and subsequent reappointment, does not invalidate the counting of service prior to the interruption.

f. Service on any campus of the University of California is included in the computation.
g. Applicability of Periods of Leave

The applicability of periods of leave toward the eight-year period shall be as follows:

(1) Temporary transfers or changes of status from Assistant Professor (or any other title listed in APM - 133-0) to any other title or title series shall be regarded as periods of academically-related leave under this rule and shall be included as service toward the eight-year period.

(2) A leave of absence, with or without salary, taken in the year in which the promotion review of an Assistant Professor is otherwise scheduled shall not provide a basis for postponement of that review.

(3) Periods of leave, whether with or without salary, shall be included as service toward the eight-year period unless, upon the basis of a petition filed at the time leave is requested, the Chancellor determines that the activity undertaken during the course of the leave is substantially unrelated to the individual’s academic career and that the period of the leave shall not count toward the eight-year service period.

A period of leave, with or without salary, which is based on a serious health condition or disability, shall be included as service toward the eight-year period unless, upon the basis of a petition normally filed within one (1) quarter or semester after the leave is taken, the Chancellor determines that the leave shall not be included as service toward the eight-year period. In each case, the Chancellor shall report such a decision in writing to the individual.

However, any childbearing or parental leave, provided for in APM - 760-25 and 760-27 which is equal to or exceeds one (1) semester or one (1) quarter and which is not greater than one (1) year, whether with or without salary, shall be excluded from service toward the eight-year period unless the faculty member informs the department chair in writing before, during, or within one (1) quarter or semester after the leave that it should not be excluded from service toward the eight-year period. (See APM - 133-17-a, -b, -c, -d, and -i.)

Note: Exclusion of one (1) or two (2) quarters or one (1) semester will not necessarily delay the timing of a review.
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Any other approved leave provided for in APM - 133-17-h also is excluded from service toward the eight-year period.

(4) For determining years toward the eight-year limitation of service, the combined total of periods of leave unrelated to academic duties and time off the clock may not exceed two (2) years.

h. Stopping the Clock

A faculty member may request to stop the clock during the probationary period for personal reasons (see below), including childbearing, childrearing, serious health condition, disability, bereavement, or significant circumstance or event that disrupts a faculty member’s ability to pursue his or her duties. Extensions are normally granted for a period of up to one (1) year for each event, automatically for some reasons, and upon request and approval for other reasons. For those extensions needing approval, such approval will be at the discretion of the Chancellor.

A faculty member may be granted no more than two (2) years of extension during the probationary period. A faculty member is eligible to stop the clock even if the faculty member does not take a formal leave or have a modification of duties. A request to stop the clock should be made as soon as the need becomes apparent.

(1) Childbearing or Childrearing (See APM - 760)

A faculty member may stop the clock during the probationary period to care for any child who is, or becomes part of the faculty member’s family. To be eligible to stop the clock, a faculty member at the Assistant level must be responsible for fifty percent (50%) or more of the care of the child. The birth or placement of one (1) or more children at the same time constitutes a single event of birth or placement.
(See also APM - 760-30.)

For a faculty member who takes childbearing and/or parental leave and who has provided the appropriate documentation supporting the need for the leave, the period of approved leave will be automatically excluded from service in accordance with APM - 133-17-g(3).
(2) Serious Health Condition Including Disability or Bereavement

A faculty member may request to stop the clock during the probationary period, when his or her ability to pursue his or her duties is significantly disrupted by a serious health condition or disability, by the need to care for a close family member who is seriously ill, or by the death of a close family member. This provision also covers other persons residing in the faculty member’s household or cases involving close personal connection or interdependence.

For a faculty member with a serious health condition or disability who has provided the appropriate supporting medical documentation and for whom stopping the clock would be a reasonable accommodation as determined by the University, an appropriate period (which may include periods of leave provided as a reasonable accommodation) will be excluded from service upon the request of the faculty member. A faculty member’s request to stop the clock by the need to care for a close family member who is seriously ill or by the death of a close family member must provide supporting documentation as required by campus procedures.

A faculty member’s request to extend the tenure clock for a period longer than an approved sick leave or extended illness leave may be appropriate in certain circumstances, although the two (2)-year extension limit still applies.

(3) Significant Circumstance or Event

A faculty member may request to stop the clock during the probationary period, for reasons due to a significant circumstance or event beyond the faculty member’s control that disrupts the faculty member’s ability to pursue his or her duties. Examples of significant circumstances or events beyond the faculty member’s control for which the faculty member may request to stop the clock include the effects of a natural disaster or the effects of significant delays in the provision of research space, facilities, or resources committed to the faculty member and necessary for his or her research activities.
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The faculty member must provide appropriate supporting documentation, as determined by established campus procedures.

i. Faculty members shall not be arbitrarily disadvantaged in their promotion, advancement, or compensation because they have elected to take a childbearing or parental leave, to stop the clock for reasons listed in section (h) above, or to defer a personnel review. Personnel reviews that are deferred due to a family accommodation as defined in APM - 760 should be treated procedurally in the same manner as personnel reviews conducted at the usual intervals. The file shall be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normal period of service and so stated in the department chair’s letter.

133-20 Notice of Non-Reappointment

The schedule for the Professor series set forth in APM - 220-20 applies also to notice not to reappoint individuals with titles listed in APM - 133-0-a except for individuals with Acting or Visiting appointments. Appointments of these latter types are self-terminating with specified ending dates, and no further notice is required.

133-96 Reports

See APM - 200-96.

Revision History

October 1, 2018:

- Substantive revisions to support revisions made to APM - 285; and
- Revisions to titles in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series.

For details on prior revisions, please visit the Academic Personnel and Programs website: https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/policy-issuances-and-guidelines/index.html.
## Title Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles

**Summary Chart**

*See APM - 220-17-a. Total University service as Instructor may not exceed two (2) years.

**The two (2)-year limit applies only to consecutive years. No limit if years are not consecutive.

***Acting Professors in the Law Schools have an eight-year limit.

**GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES**

**APM - 133**

**SUMMARY CHART**

Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles in Which Service Counts Toward the Eight-Year Limitation</th>
<th>Percent of Time</th>
<th>Time Counts Toward Series with (T) Tenure: 133-0-a (S) SOE: 133-0-b</th>
<th>Maximum Period in Years for Each Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor Series and Related Titles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Associate Professor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Associate Professor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Professor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor of Physical Education Series</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Supervisor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Supervisor</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SUMMARY CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Percent of Time</th>
<th>Time Counts Toward Series with (T) Tenure: 133-0-a (S) SOE: 133-0-b</th>
<th>Maximum Period in Years for Each Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor in Residence Series</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor in Residence</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor in Residence</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T, S</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) Series</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine)</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor</td>
<td>More than 50%</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjunct Professor Series</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Instructor</td>
<td>More than 50%</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>More than 50%</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Astronomer Titles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Astronomer</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Junior Astronomer</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Percent of Time</th>
<th>Time Counts Toward Series with (T) Tenure: 133-0-a (S) SOE: 133-0-b</th>
<th>Maximum Period in Years for Each Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Astronomer</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Assistant Astronomer</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Assistant Astronomer</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agronomist in A.E.S. Titles****

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Percent of Time</th>
<th>Time Counts Toward Series with (T) Tenure: 133-0-a (S) SOE: 133-0-b</th>
<th>Maximum Period in Years for Each Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior Agronomist</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Junior Agronomist</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Agronomist</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Assistant Agronomist</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Assistant Agronomist</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lecturer with Security of Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment</th>
<th>Percent of Time</th>
<th>Maximum Period in Years for Each Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment</td>
<td>More than 50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment</td>
<td>More than 50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Lecturer with Security of Employment</td>
<td>More than 50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment</td>
<td>More than 50%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****A.E.S. - Agricultural Experiment Station
For purposes of APM - 133-0-a(3) and APM - 133-0-b(3), the following faculty titles or series are applicable.

Professor series
   Acting titles
   Visiting titles

Professor in Residence series

Adjunct Professor series

Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series

Health Sciences Clinical Professor series

Supervisor of Physical Education series

Supervisor of Teacher Education

Lecturer with Security of Employment Series
   Acting titles

Coordinator of Field Work

Field Work Supervisor

Field Work Consultant

Note:

The title Lecturer in Summer Session and the volunteer Clinical Professor series are not included in this list.
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210-0 Policy

In their deliberations and preparations of reports and recommendations, academic review and appraisal committees shall be guided by the policies and procedures set forth in the respective Instructions that appear below.

210-1 Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor and Corresponding Series

The following instructions apply to review committees for actions concerning appointees in the Professor series and the Professor in Residence series; and, with appropriate modifications, for appointees in the Adjunct Professor series.

a. Purpose and Responsibility of the Review Committees

The quality of the faculty of the University of California is maintained primarily through objective and thorough appraisal, by competent faculty members, of each candidate for appointment or promotion. Responsibility for this appraisal falls largely upon the review committees nominated by the Committee on Academic Personnel or equivalent Committee and appointed by the Chancellor or a designated representative. It is the duty of these committees to ascertain the present fitness of each candidate and the likelihood of the candidate’s pursuing a productive career. In judging the fitness of the candidate, it is appropriate to consider professional integrity as evidenced by performance of duties. (A useful guide for such consideration is furnished by the Statement on Professional Ethics issued by the American Association of University Professors. A copy of this Statement is appended to these instructions of 210-1 for purposes of reference.) Implied in the committee’s responsibility for building and maintaining a faculty of the highest excellence is also a responsibility to the candidate for just recognition and encouragement of achievement.

b. Maintenance of the Committee’s Effectiveness

(1) The membership, deliberations, and recommendations of the review committee are strictly confidential. The chair of each such committee should remind members of the committee of the confidential nature of the assignment. This should be kept in mind in arranging for all written or oral communications; and when recommendations with supporting documents have been forwarded, all copies or preliminary drafts should be destroyed. Under the provisions of Section 160 of the Academic Personnel Manual, the candidate is entitled to receive upon request from
the Chancellor a redacted copy of all confidential academic review records in the review file (without disclosure of the identities of members of the ad hoc review committee).

(2) The whole system of academic review by committees depends for its effectiveness upon each committee’s prompt attention to its assignment and its conduct of the review with all possible dispatch, consistent with judicious and thorough consideration of the case.

(3) The chair of the review committee has the responsibility of making sure that each member of the committee has read and understands these instructions.

c. Procedure

(1) General — Recommendations concerning appointment, promotion, and appraisal normally originate with the department chair. The letter of recommendation should provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate’s qualifications together with detailed evidence to support this evaluation. The letter should also present a report of the department chair’s consultation with the members of the department, including any dissenting opinions. The letter should not identify individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation except by code. In addition to the letter of recommendation, the department chair is expected to assemble and submit to the Chancellor an up-to-date biography and bibliography, together with copies of research publications or other scholarly or creative work.

(2) Appointments — The department chair should include in the documentation opinions from colleagues in other institutions where the nominee has served and from other qualified persons having firsthand knowledge of the nominee’s attainments. Extramural opinions are imperative in cases of proposed appointments to tenure status of persons from outside the University.

(3) Promotions — Promotions are based on merit; they are not automatic. Achievement, as it is demonstrated, should be rewarded by promotion. Promotions to tenure positions should be based on consideration of comparable work in the candidate’s own field or in closely related fields. The department and the review committee should consider how the candidate stands in relation to other people in the field outside the University who might be considered alternative candidates for the position. The department chair shall supplement the opinions of
colleagues within the department by letters from distinguished extramural informants. The identity of such letter writers should not be provided in the departmental letter except by code.

(4) **Assessment of Evidence** — The review committee shall assess the adequacy of evidence submitted. If in the committee’s judgment the evidence is insufficient to enable it to reach a clear recommendation, the committee chair, through the Chancellor, shall request amplification. In every case all obtainable evidence should be carefully considered.

If in assessing all obtainable evidence, the candidate fails to meet the criteria set forth in Section 210-1-d below, the committee should recommend accordingly. If, on the other hand, there is evidence of unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth, the committee should not hesitate to endorse a recommendation for accelerated advancement. If there is evidence of sufficient achievement in a time frame that is extended due to stopping the clock for reasons as defined in APM - 133-17-g-i or a family accommodation as defined in APM - 760, the evidence should be treated procedurally in the same manner as evidence in personnel reviews conducted at the usual intervals. All evidence produced during the probationary period, including the period of extension, counts in the evaluation of the candidate’s review file. The file shall be evaluated without prejudice as if the work were done in the normative period of service and so stated in the department chair’s letter.

d. **Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Appraisal**

The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate’s performance in:

1. teaching,
2. research and other creative work,
3. professional activity, and
4. University and public service.

In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing when the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. The review committee must judge whether the candidate is engaging in a program of work that is both sound and productive. As the University enters new fields of endeavor and refocuses its ongoing activities, cases will arise in which the proper work of faculty members departs markedly from established academic patterns. In such cases, the review committees must take exceptional care to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. However, flexibility does not entail a relaxation of high standards. **Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions.** Insistence upon this standard for holders of the professorship is necessary for maintenance of the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to the discovery and
transmission of knowledge. Consideration should be given to changes in emphasis and interest that may occur in an academic career. The candidate may submit for the review file a presentation of his or her activity in all four areas.

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population, or research in a scholar’s area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for minimum standards in judging the candidate, not to set boundaries to exclude other elements of performance that may be considered.

(1) Teaching - Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate’s teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate’s command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate’s learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate’s participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups. The committee should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of
evidence on which its appraisal of teaching competence has been based. In those exceptional cases when no such evidence is available, the candidate’s potentialities as a teacher may be indicated in closely analogous activities. In preparing its recommendation, the review committee should keep in mind that a redacted copy of its report may be an important means of informing the candidate of the evaluation of his or her teaching and of the basis for that evaluation.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. More than one kind of evidence shall accompany each review file. Among significant types of evidence of teaching effectiveness are the following: (a) opinions of other faculty members knowledgeable in the candidate’s field, particularly if based on class visitations, on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the candidate, or on the performance of students in courses taught by the candidate that are prerequisite to those of the informant; (b) opinions of students; (c) opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the University; (d) number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate and of those attracted to the campus by the candidate’s repute as a teacher; and (e) development of new and effective techniques of instruction, including techniques that meet the needs of students from groups that are underrepresented in the field of instruction.

All cases for advancement and promotion normally will include: (a) evaluations and comments solicited from students for most, if not all, courses taught since the candidate’s last review; (b) a quarter-by-quarter or semester-by-semester enumeration of the number and types of courses and tutorials taught since the candidate’s last review; (c) their level; (d) their enrollments; (e) the percentage of students represented by student course evaluations for each course; (f) brief explanations for abnormal course loads; (g) identification of any new courses taught or of old courses when there was substantial reorganization of approach or content; (h) notice of any awards or formal mentions for distinguished teaching; (i) when the faculty member under review wishes, a self-evaluation of his or her teaching; and (j) evaluation by other faculty members of teaching effectiveness. When any of the information specified in this paragraph is not provided, the department chair will include an explanation for that omission in the candidate’s dossier. If such information is not included with the letter of recommendation and its absence is not adequately accounted for, it is the review committee chair’s responsibility to request it through the Chancellor.
(2) **Research and Creative Work** — Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate’s published research or recognized artistic production in original architectural or engineering designs, or the like.

Publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible. When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, it is the responsibility of the department chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort. It should be recognized that special cases of collaboration occur in the performing arts and that the contribution of a particular collaborator may not be readily discernible by those viewing the finished work. When the candidate is such a collaborator, it is the responsibility of the department chair to make a separate evaluation of the candidate’s contribution and to provide outside opinions based on observation of the work while in progress. Account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate’s field. Appraisals of publications or other works in the scholarly and critical literature provide important testimony. Due consideration should be given to variations among fields and specialties and to new genres and fields of inquiry.

Textbooks, reports, circulars, and similar publications normally are considered evidence of teaching ability or public service. However, contributions by faculty members to the professional literature or to the advancement of professional practice or professional education, including contributions to the advancement of equitable access and diversity in education, should be judged creative work when they present new ideas or original scholarly research.

In certain fields such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate’s merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. It should be recognized that in music, drama, and dance, distinguished performance, including conducting and directing, is evidence of a candidate’s creativity.

(3) **Professional Competence and Activity** — In certain positions in the professional schools and colleges, such as architecture, business
administration, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for appointment or promotion. The candidate's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems, including those that specifically address the professional advancement of individuals in underrepresented groups in the candidate’s field. It is responsibility of the department chair to provide evidence that the position in question is of the type described above and that the candidate is qualified to fill it.

(4) **University and Public Service** — The faculty plays an important role in the administration of the University and in the formulation of its policies. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively and imaginatively in faculty government and the formulation of departmental, college, and University policies. Services by members of the faculty to the community, State, and nation, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities when the work done is at a sufficiently high level and of sufficiently high quality, should likewise be recognized as evidence for promotion. Faculty service activities related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education represent one example of this kind of service. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisers to student organizations should be recognized as evidence, as should contributions furthering diversity and equal opportunity within the University through participation in such activities as recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students.

The Standing Orders of The Regents provide: “No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee.” This provision is pertinent to every stage in the process of considering appointments and promotions of the faculty.

e. **The Report**

(1) The report of the review committee forms the basis for further review by the Committee on Academic Personnel or its equivalent and for action by the Chancellor and by the President. Consequently, the report should include an appraisal of all significant evidence, favorable and unfavorable. It should be specific and analytical and should include the review committee’s evaluation of the candidate with respect to each of
the qualifications specified above. It should be adequately documented by reference to the supporting material. It should document the vote of the review committee but not identify the voters. It should not provide the identity of individuals who have provided confidential evaluations except by code.

(2) The review committee has the responsibility of making an unequivocal recommendation. No member should subscribe to the report if it does not represent that member’s judgment. If the committee cannot come to a unanimous decision, the division of the committee and the reasons therefore should be communicated either in the body of the report or in separate concurring or dissenting statements by individual members, submitted with the main report and with the cognizance of the other committee members.

Appended for reference is the statement on professional ethics referred to in APM - 210-1-a of these instructions.
American Association of University Professors  
Policy Documents & Reports  
Pages 75-76, 1990

Statement on Professional Ethics  
(Endorsed by the Seventy-Third Annual Meeting, June 1987)

The Statement

I. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

II. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles of intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

III. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.
IV. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

V. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.
210-2 Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning the Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) Series

a. The policies and procedures set forth in APM - 210-1-a, -b, -c, and -e shall govern the committee in the confidential conduct of its review and in the preparation of its report. The committee should refer to APM - 275 for policies on the Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series.

b. The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate’s performance in:

1. teaching, 2. professional competence and activity, 3. creative work, and 4. University and public service.

The department chair is responsible for documenting the faculty member’s division of effort among the four areas of activity. The chair should also indicate the appropriateness of this division to the position that the individual fills in the department, school, or clinical teaching faculty.

Appointees in the Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series are to be evaluated in relation to the nature and time commitments of their University assignments.

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for the review committee in judging the candidate, not to set boundaries to the elements of performance that may be considered.

Clinical teaching, professional activity, and creative work may differ from standard professorial activities in the University, but can be judged on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, and originality.

(1) Teaching — Excellent teaching is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Clinical teaching is intensive tutorial instruction, carried on amid the demands of patient care and usually characterized by pressure on the teacher to cope with unpredictably varied problems, by patient-centered immediacy of the subject matter, and by the necessity of preparing the student to take action as a result of the interchange.

Nevertheless, the criteria suggested in the instructions for the regular Professor series (see APM - 210-1) are applicable: the candidate’s command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate’s learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; the extent and skill of the
candidate’s participation in the general guidance and advising of students.

In addition, the clinical teacher should be successful in applying knowledge of basic health science and clinical procedures to the diagnosis, treatment, and care of a patient in a manner that will not only assure the best educational opportunity for the student, but also provide high quality care for the patient.

For appointment to a title in this series, the appointee should have a record of active participation and excellence in teaching, whether for health professional students, graduate students, residents, postdoctoral fellows, or continuing education students.

For promotion to or appointment at the Professor rank, the appointee should be recognized as an outstanding clinical teacher. Most candidates will have designed educational programs at a local level, and some will have designed such programs at a national level.

(2) Professional Competence and Activity — There must be appropriate recognition and evaluation of professional activity. Exemplary professional practice, organization of training programs for health professionals, and supervision of health care facilities and operations comprise a substantial proportion of the academic effort of many health sciences faculty. In decisions on academic advancement, these are essential contributions to the mission of the University and deserve critical consideration and weighting comparable to those of teaching and creative activity.

(a) Standards for Appointment or Promotion

For entry level positions, the individual should have three (3) or more years of training and/or experience post M.D., Ph.D. or equivalent terminal professional degree. In addition, an appointee should show evidence of a high level of competence in a clinical specialty.

For promotion to or appointment at the Associate Professor rank, an appointee should be recognized at least in the local metropolitan health care community as an authority within a clinical specialty. A physician normally will have a regional reputation as a referral physician; another health professional normally will have a regional reputation as evidenced in such work as that of a consultant.

For promotion to or appointment at the Professor rank, the appointee will have a national reputation for superior accomplishments within
a clinical specialty and may have a leadership role in a department or hospital. Appointees may receive patients on referral from considerable distances, serve as consultants on a nationwide basis, serve on specialty boards, or be members or officers of clinical and/or professional societies.

(b) Evaluation of Clinical Achievement

Evaluation of clinical achievement is both difficult and sensitive. In many cases, evidence will be testimonial in nature and, therefore, its validity should be subject to critical scrutiny. The specificity and analytic nature of such evidence should be examined; the expertise and sincerity of the informant should be weighed.

Overly enthusiastic endorsements and cliche-ridden praise should be disregarded.

Comparison of the individual with peers at the University of California and elsewhere should form part of the evidence provided. Letters from outside authorities, when based on adequate knowledge of the individual and written to conform to the requirements cited above, are valuable contributions. Evaluation or review by peers within the institution is necessary. The chair should also seek evaluations from advanced clinical students and former students in academic positions or clinical practice.

If adequate information is not included in the materials sent forward by the chair, it is the review committee’s responsibility to request such information through the Chancellor.

(3) Creative work — Many faculty in the health sciences devote a great proportion of their time to the inseparable activities of teaching and clinical service and, therefore, have less time for formal creative work than most other scholars in the University. Some clinical faculty devote this limited time to academic research activities; others utilize their clinical experience as the basis of their creative work.

An appointee is expected to participate in investigation in basic, applied, or clinical sciences. In order to be appointed or promoted to the Associate or full Professor rank, an appointee shall have made a significant contribution to knowledge and/or practice in the field. The appointee’s creative work shall have been disseminated, for example, in a body of publications, in teaching materials used in other institutions, or in improvements or innovations in professional practice that have been adopted elsewhere.
Evidence of achievement in this area may include clinical case reports. Clinical observations are an important contribution to the advancement of knowledge in the health sciences and should be judged by their accuracy, scholarship, and utility. Improvements in the practice of health care result from the development and evaluation of techniques and procedures by clinical investigators. In addition, creative achievement may be demonstrated by the development of innovative programs in health care itself or in transmitting knowledge associated with new fields or other professions.

Textbooks and similar publications, or contributions by candidates to the professional literature and the advancement of professional practice or of professional education, should be judged as creative work when they represent new ideas or incorporate scholarly research. The development of new or better ways of teaching the basic knowledge and skills required by students in the health sciences may be considered evidence of creative work.

The quantitative productivity level achieved by a faculty member should be assessed realistically, with knowledge of the time and institutional resources allotted to the individual for creative work.

(4) University and Public Service — The review committee should evaluate both the amount and the quality of service by the candidate to the department, the school, the campus, the University, and the public, paying particular attention to that service which is directly related to the candidate’s professional expertise and achievement. The department chair should provide both a list of service activities and an analysis of the quality of this service.

210-3 Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series1

a. The Bylaws of The Regents provide: “No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee.” This provision is pertinent to every stage in the process of considering appointments and advancements.

b. The policies and procedures set forth above in APM - 210-1-a, -b, -c, and -e, shall govern the committee in the confidential conduct of its review.

1 Until the earlier of a date specified by the campus or June 30, 2023, faculty appointed in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series prior to October 1, 2018, will continue to be evaluated under the criteria in effect as of September 30, 2018, and set forth in Appendix B to this policy. All other provisions of this policy apply effective October 1, 2018.
and in the preparation of its report. The committee should refer to APM - 285 for policies on the Lecturer with Security of Employment series.

c. A review committee shall evaluate the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties considering the record of the candidate’s performance in:
(1) Teaching excellence, (2) Professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity, and (3) University and public service.

Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced particularly in excellent teaching and secondarily in professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to security of employment. This standard for appointees in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series is necessary for maintaining the quality of the University as an institution dedicated to education. A review committee must further evaluate whether the candidate has a record of excellence in teaching while engaging in a program of professional and/or scholarly or creative activity that is appropriate for this series.

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. For faculty in this title series, these contributions to diversity and equal opportunity are most likely to be focused on teaching and learning and can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population, or teaching that is particularly sensitive to diverse populations. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel process.

d. The candidates are expected to submit for the review file a presentation of their activity in all three areas of teaching excellence, professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, and University and public service. Evidence may be relevant to evaluation of achievement in more than one category and a review committee will assign the evidence to the appropriate category. Campus guidelines may include separate requirements, expectations, or guidelines for various schools or departments. The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for minimum standards by which to evaluate the candidate, not to set boundaries to exclude other elements of performance that may be considered.

(1) **Teaching Excellence**

Clearly demonstrated evidence of excellent teaching is an essential
criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Faculty in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series are expected to maintain a continuous and current command of their disciplinary subjects. They should, among other things, demonstrate the ability to foster an inclusive, stimulating, and effective learning environment.

When evaluating the effectiveness of a candidate’s teaching, a committee should consider the following objectives for individuals in this series: display evidence of continuous growth and mastery of the subject field; emphasize the connections between the subject and other fields of study; foster an environment that supports student curiosity, independent evaluation of evidence, and capacity to reason; provide guidance, mentoring, and advising to students; create an academic environment that facilitates active participation and learning by all students with a focus on developing effective strategies to advance learning by students in various underrepresented groups; contribute to the development and adoption of effective evidence-based pedagogical strategies including instructional units, materials, and resources; incorporate and promote significant curricular revisions informed by current pedagogical knowledge, and apply and advocate for effective teaching techniques.

A committee should attend to the variety of demands placed on the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should evaluate the total performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. A committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which its appraisal of teaching excellence has been based. In preparing its recommendation, a review committee should keep in mind that the report is an important record of the candidate’s teaching and serves as the basis for additional recommendations and the final decision.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful evaluation, accompanied by supporting evidence, of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness.

The following is a broadly defined, non-exclusive list of evidence that may be presented concerning teaching excellence:

(a) Peer review assessments from other faculty members based on knowledge in the candidate’s field; class visitations; attendance at the candidate’s lectures before professional societies or in public; and the performance of students who have studied with the candidate;

(b) Evaluations or comments solicited from students in courses taught since the candidate’s last review;
(c) A term-by-term enumeration of the number and types of courses and tutorials taught since the candidate’s last review:

(i) the level of courses and tutorials taught;

(ii) the enrollments of courses and tutorials taught;

(iii) the percentage of student course evaluations in relation to the total number of students in each course;

(iv) brief explanation for abnormal course loads;

(d) Identification of any new courses taught or of previously taught courses for which the candidate has substantially reorganized the approach and/or content;

(e) Documentation of new substantive developments in the field or of new and effective techniques of instruction, including techniques that meet the needs of students from groups that are underrepresented in the field of instruction;

(f) Documentation of success as a positive role model or effective mentor for students at all levels; including those serving as teaching assistants;

(g) Results from studies conducted to measure changes in student understanding of subject material from the beginning to the end of the course;

(h) Written testimony from former students on the impact and effectiveness of the candidate’s teaching and mentorship;

(i) Awards or other acknowledgments of excellent teaching;

(j) A self-evaluation of the candidate’s teaching.

Initial appointment to the Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment title requires clear evidence of the potential for teaching excellence.

Appointment or promotion to the Lecturer with Security of Employment title requires clear documentation of consistent and sustained excellence in effective teaching. Under no circumstances will security of employment be conferred unless there is clear documentation of consistent and sustained excellence in teaching.
Appointment or promotion to the Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment title requires evidence of consistent and sustained excellence in effective teaching and demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to teaching the particular subject.

(2) **Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity**

Clearly demonstrated evidence of professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity, is one of the criteria for appointment or advancement. Professional and/or scholarly activities may be related to the underlying discipline itself or to the pedagogy. Such activities should provide evidence of achievement, leadership, and/or influence on the campus or beyond. Certain administrative work (e.g., of learning centers and teaching programs) and community outreach work are also relevant, as would be presentations of seminars or lectures at other institutions or professional societies, or participation in scholarly activities (e.g., summer seminars) designed to enhance scholarly expertise in relevant fields. Other records of participation in intensive programs of study - in order to be a more effective teacher and scholar, with the goal of enhancing one’s teaching and scholarly responsibilities - are also relevant evidence of professional and/or scholarly activity.

Creative activities count as relevant professional and/or scholarly activities in appropriate disciplines. In certain fields, such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, an accomplished creation should receive consideration as an example of professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity. In evaluating creative activities, an attempt should be made to define the candidate’s merit in light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression.

The following are broadly defined, non-exclusive examples of evidence that may be presented:

(a) Documentation of the development of or contributions to:

   (i) Original materials designed to improve learning outcomes;

   (ii) Evidence-based design and evaluation of educational curricula or pedagogy;

   (iii) Administration and evaluation of a teaching program or a learning center;

   (iv) Systematic quality improvement programs and evaluation of their implementation;
(v) Discipline-specific information systems;

(vi) Development and evaluation of community outreach or community-oriented programs.

(b) First, senior, or collaborative authorship of scholarly or professional publication;

(c) Accomplished performance, including conducting and directing;

(d) Accomplished artistic or literary creation, including exhibits;

(e) Accepted invitations to present seminars or lectures at other institutions or before professional societies.

Initial appointment to the Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment title requires evidence or promise of productive and creative contributions to professional and/or scholarly activity that would support excellent teaching.

Appointment or promotion to the Lecturer with Security of Employment title requires evidence of sustained professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity and a profile of excellent teaching.

Appointment or promotion to the Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment title requires evidence of consistent and sustained professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity and a profile of excellent teaching that have made the candidate a leader in the professional field and/or in education.

(3) University and Public Service

A review committee should evaluate the quantity and quality of service to the department, the campus, the University, and the public (whether to the local community, state, or nation). Service that is directly related to the candidate’s professional expertise and achievement is of special relevance but so too is service in areas beyond those special capacities when the work done is of sufficiently high quality. Examples of service include: service related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education; service on thesis and dissertation committees or on student-faculty committees and service to student organizations; participation in Academic Senate and campus committees and initiatives; and contributions furthering diversity and equal opportunity within the University through participation in recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students.
Initial appointment to the Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment title requires evidence of the likelihood of participation in department activities and the potential for service to the campus.

Appointment or promotion to the Lecturer with Security of Employment title requires evidence of activity on committees within the professional field, department, school, campus, or University; or service to the public in areas directly related to the candidate’s professional expertise and achievement.

Appointment or promotion to the Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment title requires active participation on committees within the professional field, department, school, campus, or University; or of service to the public or profession in areas directly related to the candidate’s professional expertise and achievement.

210-4 Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on the Appointment, Merit Increase, Promotion, Career Status Actions for Members of Librarian Series

a. The committees here referred to, either standing or ad hoc or both, are designated as review committees in what follows. Authorization for their appointment is described in APM - 360-6-b and -c.

b. The quality of the librarian series at the University of California is maintained primarily through objective and thorough review by peers and administrators of each candidate for appointment, merit increase, promotion, and career status action. Responsibility for this review falls, in part, upon the review committee(s). For purposes of appointments, it is the duty of these committees to assess the present qualifications of the candidates and their potential as productive members of the library staffs. For purposes of merit increases, promotions, and career status actions, it is the duty of these committees to assess an individual’s performance during a given review period to determine if a merit, promotion, or career status action should be recommended. Review committees should refer to APM - 360 for information concerning appointment, merit increase, promotion, and career status actions.

In conducting its review and arriving at its judgment concerning a candidate, each review committee shall be guided by the criteria as mentioned in APM - 360-10 and described in APM - 210-4-e.

c. Maintenance of the Committees’ Effectiveness

(1) The deliberations and recommendations of the review committees are to be strictly confidential. The membership and report of each ad hoc review committee are confidential. The chair of each committee shall remind
members of the confidential nature of the assignment. This requirement must be kept in mind when arrangements are made through the Chancellor for written or oral communications. When recommendations with supporting documents have been forwarded to the Chancellor, all copies or preliminary drafts shall be destroyed. Under the provisions of APM - 360-80-1, the candidate is entitled to receive from the Chancellor a redacted copy of the confidential documents in the academic review record (without disclosure of the identities of members of the ad hoc review committee and without separate identification of the evaluation and recommendation made by the ad hoc review committee).

(2) The entire system of review by such committees depends for its effectiveness upon each committee’s prompt attention to its assignment and its conduct of the review with all possible dispatch, consistent with judicious and thorough consideration of the case.

(3) The chair of the review committee has the responsibility for making sure that each member of the committee has read and understands these instructions.

d. Procedures

(1) General - Recommendations for appointments, merit increases, promotions, and career status actions typically originate with the department or unit head, herein called the review initiator, (see APM - 360-80-e). The letter of recommendation shall provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate’s qualifications, together with detailed evidence to support the evaluation. The letter should also present a report of consultation with appropriate members of the professional library staff and others in a position to evaluate performance and should include any dissenting opinions.

In the case of an appointment, opinions from colleagues in other institutions where the candidate has served and from other qualified persons having firsthand knowledge of the candidate’s attainments are to be included, if feasible.

In the review of a proposed merit increase, promotion, or career status action (the general procedure for all shall typically be the same, subject to any special campus procedures), extramural evidence, when it can be obtained, is highly desirable although not required.

(2) Assessment of Evidence - The review committee shall assess the adequacy of the evidence submitted. If, in the committee’s judgment, the evidence is incomplete or inadequate to enable it to reach a clear recommendation, the committee shall solicit additional information through
If, according to such evidence, the candidate fails to meet the criteria set forth in APM - 210-4-e, the committee should recommend against the proposed action.

If, on the other hand, there is evidence of unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth, the committee should not hesitate to endorse or propose a recommendation for higher rank or higher salary point within rank which would constitute an accelerated advancement of an appointee.

e. Criteria

(1) **Appointments** - A candidate for appointment to this series shall have a professional background of competence, knowledge, and experience to assure suitability for appointment to this series. Such background will typically include a professional degree from a library school with a program accredited by the American Library Association. However, a person with other appropriate degree(s) or equivalent experience in one or more fields relevant to library services may also be appointed to this series.

Selection of an individual to be appointed to the rank of Assistant Librarian is based upon the requirements of the position with due attention to the candidate’s demonstrated competence, knowledge and experience. A person appointed as Assistant Librarian without previous professional library experience should typically be appointed at the first salary point. A person who has had previous experience relevant to the position may be appointed to one of the higher salary points in this rank, depending on the candidate’s aptitude, the extent of prior experience, and/or the requirements of the position.

A candidate with extensive previous relevant experience and superior qualifications may be appointed to one of the two higher ranks in the series. The criteria for the appointment to either of these levels will be the same as those for promotion as outlined below.

(2) **Merit Increases and Promotions** - At the time of original appointment to a title in this series, each appointee shall be informed that continuation, advancement, or promotion is justified only by demonstrated superior professional skills and achievement. In addition, promotion shall be justified by growing competence and contribution to the candidate’s position, and/or the assumption of increased responsibility. This is assessed through objective and thorough review. If, on the basis of a review, the individual does not meet the criteria for advancement there is no obligation on the
part of the University to continue or advance the appointee. Promotion may also be tied to position change. The assumption of administrative responsibilities is not a necessary condition for promotion.

(3) In considering individual candidates, reasonable flexibility is to be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of the criteria listed below. A candidate for merit increase or promotion in this series shall be evaluated on the basis of professional competence and quality of service rendered within the library and, to the extent that they are relevant, one or more of the following: professional activity outside the library; University and public service; and research and other creative activity.

(a) Professional Competence and Quality of Service Within the Library - Although contribution in each of the following areas will vary considerably from person to person, depending on each person’s primary functions as a librarian, performance and potential shall be reviewed and evaluated in any or all of the five major areas of librarianship: obtaining, organizing, and providing access to information; curating and preserving collections of scholarly, scientific, cultural, or institutional significance; engaging with users to provide them with guidance and instruction on the discovery, evaluation, and use of information resources; carrying out research and creative activity in support of the foregoing and for the continual improvement of the profession; and library administration and management. Additionally, librarians should be judged on consistency of performance, grasp of library methods, command of their subjects, continued growth in their fields, judgment, leadership, originality, ability to work effectively with others, and ability to relate their functions to the more general goals of the library and the University.

Evidence of professional competence and effective service may include, but is not limited to, the opinions of professional colleagues, particularly those who work closely or continuously with the appointee; the opinions of faculty members, students, or other members of the University community as to the quality of a collection developed, for example, or the technical or public service provided by the candidate; the opinions of librarians outside the University who function in the same specialty as the candidate; the effectiveness of the techniques applied or procedures developed by the candidate; and relevant additional educational achievement, including programs of advanced study or courses taken toward improvement of language or subject knowledge.

(b) Professional Activity Outside the Library - A candidate’s professional commitment and contribution to the library profession
should be evaluated by taking account of such activities as the following: membership and activity in professional and scholarly organizations; participation in library and other professional meetings and conferences; consulting or similar service; outstanding achievement or promise as evidenced by awards, fellowships, grants; teaching and lecturing; and editorial activity.

(c) **University and Public Service** - Evaluation of a candidate’s University and public service should take into account University-oriented activities, including, but not limited to the following: serving as a member or chair of administrative committees appointed by the Chancellor, University Librarian, or other University administrative officers; serving as a member or chair of other University committees, including those of student organizations and of the departments and schools other than the library, such as serving on undergraduate or graduate portfolio committees. Public service includes professional librarian services to the community, state, and nation.

(d) **Research and Other Creative Activity** - Research by practicing librarians has a growing importance as library, bibliographic, and information management activities become more demanding and complex. It is therefore appropriate to take research into account in measuring a librarian’s professional development. The evaluation of such research or other creative activity should be qualitative and not merely quantitative and should be made in comparison with the activity and quality appropriate to the candidate’s areas of expertise. Note should be taken of continued and effective endeavor. This may include authoring, editing, reviewing or compiling books, articles, reports, handbooks, manuals, and/or similar products that are submitted or published during the period under review.

f. **The Report**

(1) The report of the review committee(s) forms the basis for further administrative review and action by the Chancellor. Consequently, the report should include an assessment of all significant evidence, favorable and unfavorable. It should be specific and analytical, should include the review committee’s evaluation of the candidate with respect to the qualifications specified, and should be adequately documented by reference to the supporting material.

(2) The review committee has the responsibility of making an unequivocal recommendation. No member should subscribe to the report if it does not represent that member’s judgment. If the committee cannot come to a unanimous decision, the division of the committee and the reasons therefore should be communicated either in the body of the report.
210-5 Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Supervisor of Physical Education Series

The following instructions apply to review committees for actions concerning appointees in the Supervisor of Physical Education series (see APM - 300).

The Supervisor of Physical Education series has been designated for those members of a Department of Physical Education or Physical Activities who teach, promote and/or supervise physical activities, intercollegiate athletics, or intramural sports programs; teach courses and establish curricula in physical education; coordinate or administer campus intercollegiate athletics or recreation programs.

The titles Assistant Supervisor, Associate Supervisor, and Supervisor of Physical Education have been granted limited equivalency with the corresponding titles in the Professor series. The equivalency extends to leave of absence privileges (including sabbatical leave) and tenure at the two higher ranks. The supervisor series is not used for those members of a Department of Physical Education or Physical Activities of whom research is required and thus properly belong in the Professor series.

a. Purpose and Responsibility of the Review Committees

While the review criteria differ in the supervisor series from the requirements of the Professor series, the quality of the faculty in both series is maintained through objective and thorough appraisal of each candidate for appointment and promotion. Significant responsibility for this appraisal falls to the review committees nominated by the Committee on Academic Personnel (or other appropriate committee) and appointed by the Chancellor. It is the duty of the review committee to ascertain the present fitness of each candidate and the likelihood of a continuing productive career. Implicit in the committee’s responsibility for maintenance of a quality faculty is just recognition and encouragement of achievement on the part of the candidate.

b. Maintenance of the Committee’s Effectiveness

The chair of the review committee has the responsibility of assuring that these instructions have been read and understood by the members, that strict confidentiality is maintained by the committee, and that committee actions are carried out with as much dispatch as is consistent with thoughtful consideration. These requirements are presented in greater detail in Section 210-1-b.
c. Procedure

(1) **General** — Recommendations for appointment and promotion normally originate with the department chair who should include in the letter of recommendation a comprehensive assessment of the candidate’s qualifications and detailed related evidence, and a report of the appropriate consultation with departmental colleagues, recording the vote and the nature of any dissenting opinions. In addition, the department chair is expected to assemble and submit with the recommendation teaching evaluations, updated biographical information, evidence of the candidate’s effectiveness, leadership, and professional growth in all assigned areas of responsibility, and any other items pertinent to the review.

(2) **Appointments** — The documentation provided with the department chair’s recommendation should include opinions from colleagues in other institutions where the candidate has served, and from other qualified persons having direct knowledge of the candidate’s attainments. Extramural opinions are imperative in the case of proposed tenured appointments.

(3) **Promotions** — Promotions are based on merit, and should be recommended only when achievement and the promise of future contributions warrant such action. Both the department and the review committee should consider the candidate’s teaching, leadership, professional development and standing in relation to others who might be considered alternative candidates for the position. The department chair should supplement the opinions of departmental colleagues with letters from qualified extramural informants.

(4) **Assessment of Evidence** — The review committee shall assess the adequacy of the evidence submitted and if deemed inadequate to reach a clear recommendation, the committee chair shall request, through the Chancellor, additional evidence or amplification. All obtainable evidence shall be carefully considered.

If, according to all obtainable evidence, the candidate fails to meet the criteria set forth in Section 210-5-d below, the committee should recommend against appointment or promotion. If, on the other hand, there is evidence of unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth, the committee should not hesitate to endorse a recommendation for accelerated advancement.
d. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion

The review committee shall judge the candidate for the proposed rank and duties, considering the record of performance in: (a) teaching, (b) professional achievement and leadership in one or more of the following: physical activities, campus intramural or recreation programs, extramural sports, or intercollegiate sports programs; and (c) University and public service. In evaluating the candidate’s qualifications within these areas, the review committee shall exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter responsibilities in another. Although published research is not required of those in the supervisor of physical education series, such research or other creative activity should be given appropriate recognition as adding to the knowledge in the field. However, neither the flexibility noted above nor the absence of a research requirement should entail a relaxation of the University’s high standards for appointment and promotion. Superior attainment and the promise of future growth, as evidenced in teaching, program leadership, professional development, and University and public service, are indispensable qualifications for appointment and promotions to tenure positions.

The criteria outlined below are intended to guide reviewing agencies in judging the candidate, not to set boundaries to the elements of performance that may be considered.

(1) **Teaching** — Effective teaching is an essential criterion to appointment or advancement. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is a clear evidence of ability and diligence in the teaching role. In assessing performance in this area, the committee should consider the candidate’s command of the subject; continued growth; mastering of new topics to improve effective service to the University; ability to organize and present course materials; grasp of general objectives; ability to awaken in students an awareness of the importance of subject matter to the growth of the individual; extent and quality of participation; achievements of students in their field.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to provide meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, including student evaluations, regarding the candidate’s effectiveness in teaching.

If the information provided is deemed inadequate, it is the responsibility of the chair of the committee to request additional material, through the Chancellor.

(2) **Professional Achievement and Activity** — Although published research is not required of those in the supervisor series, any pertinent activity or
creative work in this area shall be given due consideration as evidence of professional achievement or leadership.

In reviewing the candidate’s suitability for appointment or promotion, the committee should evaluate the evidence for professional achievement as shown by educational attainment, record of accomplishment, and promise of future growth. No recommendation for tenure should be made unless this evidence clearly demonstrates that the candidate has superior leadership qualities in one or more of the areas of supervising, coaching, or administering programs in physical education, physical activities, recreation or sports. For appointment or promotion to the rank of Supervisor, significant and extramurally recognized distinction is required. It is the responsibility of the department chair to provide evidence that bears on the questions of leadership and of professional achievement and activity. This may include evidence related to educational accomplishment; the institution of effective and innovative programs; competitive sports records; activity in professional organizations; supervision of personnel; administration of activities, sports, or recreation programs; and other appropriate information.

(3) **University and Public Service** — The committee should evaluate both the amount and the quality of service by the candidate to the department, the campus, the University, and the public, paying particular attention to that service which is directly related to the candidate’s professional expertise and achievement. The department chair should provide both a listing of service aspects and an analysis of the quality of this service.

The Standing Orders of The Regents provide: “No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee.” This provision is pertinent to every stage in the process of considering appointments and promotions of faculty members.

e. **The Report**

(1) The report of the review committee forms the basis for further review by the Committee on Academic Personnel (or equivalent) and for action by the Chancellor and by the President. Consequently, it should include an appraisal of all significant evidence, favorable or unfavorable. It should be specific and analytical and should include the review committee’s evaluation of the candidate with respect to each of the qualifications specified above. It should be adequately documented by reference to the supporting material.

(2) The review committee has the responsibility of making an unequivocal recommendation. No member should subscribe to the report if it does not represent that member’s judgment. If the committee cannot come to
a unanimous decision, the division of the committee and the reason therefore should be communicated either in the body of the report or in separate concurring or dissenting statements by individual members, submitted with the main report and with the cognizance of the other committee members.

210-6 Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series

a. The policies and procedures set forth in APM - 210-1(a), (b), (c), and (e) shall govern the committee in the confidential conduct of its review and in the preparation of its report. The instructions below apply to review committees for actions concerning appointees in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series. The committee should refer to APM - 278 for policy on the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

b. The review committee shall evaluate the candidate with respect to proposed rank and duties, considering the record of the candidate’s performance in: (1) teaching (2) professional competence and activity (3) scholarly or creative activity, and (4) University and public service. Activities in items (3) and (4) are derived from their primary responsibilities in clinical teaching and professional service activities (see APM - 278-4 and -10) and thus shall be appropriately weighted and broadly defined to take into account the primary emphasis on clinical teaching and patient care services. Candidates for promotion should demonstrate substantial growth and accomplishment in their area of expertise.

The Dean or Department Chair is responsible for documenting the faculty member’s division of time and effort among the four areas of activity; this written recommendation letter shall be placed in the dossier and shall be shared with the faculty member. The Chair will indicate the appropriateness of this division to the position that the individual fills in the department, school, or clinical teaching faculty.

Appointees in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series shall be evaluated in relation to the nature and time commitments of their University assignments. Faculty with part-time appointments are expected to show the same quality of performance as full-time appointees, but the amount of activity may be less.

Clinical teaching, professional activity, and scholarly or creative activity may differ from standard professorial activities in the University, and may therefore be evaluated on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, and originality.
c. Letters of evaluation from internal reviewers are required for health care professionals in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series being considered for appointment or promotion to the Associate Professor or Professor ranks, as well as for advancement to Step VI or to Above Scale status. Although letters of evaluation from external reviewers may not be required for faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series who are being considered for appointment or promotion to the Associate Professor or Professor ranks, they may be useful to document other health care professionals’ recognition of the candidate’s achievement in professional competence and activity. Letters of evaluation are required from external reviewers and from advanced clinical students and former students now in academic positions or clinical practice for appointment or advancement to Step VI and to Above Scale status for all faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series. If adequate information is not included in the materials sent forward by the Department Chair, it is the review committee’s responsibility to request such information through the Chancellor.

If, in assessing all evidence obtained, the candidate fails to meet the criteria set forth below, the committee should recommend accordingly. If, on the other hand there is evidence of unusual achievement and exceptional promise of continued growth, the committee should not hesitate to endorse a recommendation for accelerated advancement.

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guidelines for the review committee in judging the candidate, not as boundaries for the elements of performance that may be considered. See section 210-6-d below for more details on reviews for advancement to Health Sciences Clinical Professor Step VI and for Above Scale status.

1. Teaching

Teaching is a required duty of Health Sciences Clinical Professor series faculty. Before making an initial appointment to this series, the review committee should evaluate the candidate’s potential to be an effective teacher and mentor. Evidence of excellence in clinical or clinically-relevant teaching is essential for advancement in this series. Teaching must include registered University of California students and/or University interns, residents, fellows, and postdoctoral scholars. Typically, teaching in the clinical setting comprises intensive tutorial instruction, carried on amid the demands of patient care and usually characterized by multiple demands on the teacher to cope with unpredictably varied problems, patient needs, and the necessity of preparing the students to exercise judgment and/or take action. Nevertheless, the criteria suggested for evaluating teaching in the Professor series are applicable to Health Sciences Clinical Professor series faculty:
In evaluating the effectiveness of a candidate’s teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate’s command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it effectively; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the potential relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate’s learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate’s participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students and trainees in various underrepresented groups. (For the full statement on criteria for evaluating teaching in the Professor series, see APM - 210-1-d(1).)

In addition, the clinical teacher should be successful in applying knowledge of basic health science and clinical procedures to the diagnosis, treatment, and care of a patient that will assure the best educational opportunity for the student, and will also provide the highest quality care for the patient. Dossiers for advancement and promotion normally will include evaluations and comments solicited from students and trainees.

For initial appointment to the Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor title, the candidate may have a record of active teaching of health sciences professional students, graduate students, residents, postdoctoral scholars, fellows, and/or continuing education students. Appointments may also be made based on the promise of teaching excellence when appropriate.

For appointment or promotion to the Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor title, demonstrated excellence in teaching and mentoring is essential. Evidence typically includes teaching evaluations or the receipt of teaching awards. Other evidence may include invitations to present Grand Rounds, seminars, lectures, or courses at the University of California or at other institutions, by participation in residency review committees, programs sponsored by professional organizations, recertification courses or workshops, peer evaluation, or by documentation of activity as a role model or mentor.

For appointment or promotion to the Health Sciences Clinical Professor title, the appointee should be recognized by sustained or continued excellence as a clinical teacher and/or mentor. Evidence typically includes teaching evaluations or the receipt of teaching awards. Other evidence may include invitations to present Grand Rounds, seminars, lectures, or courses at the University of California or at other institutions, by participation in...
residency review committees, programs sponsored by professional programs, recertification courses or workshops, peer evaluation, or documentation of activity as a role model or mentor.

(2) **Professional Competence and Activity**

The evaluation of professional competence and activity generally focuses on clinical expertise or achievement and the quality of patient care. A demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for appointment or promotion. The candidate’s professional activities should be reviewed for evidence of achievement, leadership, and/or demonstrated progress in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems. The review committee should judge the significance and quantity of clinical achievement and contribution to the profession. In many cases, evidence of clinical achievement will be testimonial in nature. An individual’s role in the organization or direction of training programs for health professionals and the supervision of health care facilities and operations may provide evidence of exemplary professional activity; in decisions bearing on academic advancement, these activities should be recognized as important contributions to the mission of the University.

For an initial appointment to the rank of Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor, the committee should ascertain the present capabilities of the candidate, as well as the likelihood that the candidate will be a competent teacher, develop an excellent professional practice, and have the potential to make contributions to the clinical activities of the academic department and to the mission of the University.

In addition to proven excellence in teaching and/or mentoring, creative contributions, and meritorious service, a candidate for appointment or promotion to the rank of Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor or Health Sciences Clinical Professor in this series should show evidence of distinguished clinical and professional expertise. Such evidence may include, but is not limited to, evaluations that demonstrate: provision of high-quality patient care; a high level of competence in a clinical specialty; expanded breadth of clinical responsibilities; significant participation in the activities of clinical and/or professional groups; reputation as an outstanding referral health care provider; effective development, expansion, or administration of a clinical service; or, recognition or certification by a professional group.
(3) Scholarly or Creative Activity

The review committee should evaluate scholarly or creative activity from the perspective that these activities are generally derived from clinical teaching and professional service activities. Evidence of scholarly or creative activity should be evaluated in the context of the candidate's academic responsibilities and the time available for creative activity. Candidates in this series may be involved in clinical research programs; many may demonstrate a creative or scholarly agenda in other ways that are related to the specific discipline and clinical duties. Campus guidelines may include separate requirements or expectations for various schools or departments.

In order to be appointed or promoted to the Associate Professor or Professor rank in this series, the individual’s record is expected to demonstrate contributions to scholarly, creative, or administrative activities. Evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following examples of such activity: participation in platform or poster presentations at local, regional, or national meetings; development of or contributions to educational curricula; development of or contributions to administration of a teaching program; participation in the advancement of professional education; participation in research, not necessarily as primary or independent investigator; first, senior, or collaborative authorship of peer-reviewed research papers; publication of case reports or clinical reviews; development of or contributions to administration (supervision) of a clinical service or health care facility; development of or contributions to clinical guidelines or pathways; development of or contributions to quality improvement programs; development of or contributions to medical or other disciplinary information systems; participation in the advancement of university professional practice programs; development of or contributions to community-oriented programs; or development of or contributions to community outreach or informational programs.

(4) University and Public Service

The review committee should evaluate both the amount and the quality of service by the candidate to the department, the school, the campus, the University, and the public, with particular attention paid to service that is directly related to the candidate’s professional expertise and achievement. There may be overlap between guidelines for service and other criteria for evaluation (professional activity and scholarly or creative activity). However, the review committee should assess the evidence from the perspective of the candidate’s unique contributions to the discipline and assign the evidence to the appropriate category. Campus guidelines may include separate requirements or expectations for various schools or departments.
Evidence of achievement in this area is demonstrated by participation in University, campus, school, department, and hospital or clinic committees; election to office or other service to professional, scholarly, scientific, educational, and governmental agencies and organizations, and service to the community and general public which relates to the candidate’s professional expertise in health, education, scholarly or creative activity, and practice.

For initial appointment to the Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor rank, the candidate should be evaluated for the likelihood of participation in department activities and the potential for service to the University.

For appointment or promotion to the Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor rank, University and public service may be demonstrated by active participation on committees or task forces within the program, department, school, campus, or University; or by service to local, regional, state, national, or international organizations through education, consultation, or other roles.

For appointment or promotion to the Health Sciences Clinical Professor rank, service may be demonstrated by awards from the University, or local, regional, national, or international organizations; or appointment to administrative positions within the University such as program director, residency director, or chair of a committee. Service as officer or committee chair in professional and scientific organizations or on editorial boards of professional or scientific organizations is also considered.

d. Advancement to Health Sciences Clinical Professor, Step VI and Above Scale Status

(1) Advancement to Step VI

The normal period of service is three (3) years in each of the first four (4) steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur before at least three (3) years of service at Step V; it involves an overall career review and may be granted on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in the following categories: (1) teaching, (2) professional competence and activity, (3) scholarly or creative achievement, and (4) service. Above and beyond that, great distinction in academic health sciences, recognized at least regionally, will be required in teaching and professional competence and activity. Service at Step V or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not occur before at least three (3) years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level for advancement to Step VI.
(2) **Advancement to Above Scale Status**

Advancement to Above Scale status involves an overall career review and is reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty: (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained at least national recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact; (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four (4) 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 advancement to Step IX was based. A merit increase in salary for a faculty member already serving at Above Scale must be justified by continuing evidence of accomplishment consistent with this level. Intervals between such merit 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 (4) years be approved.

**210-24 Authority**

The responsibility to nominate and the authority to appoint review committees shall be in accordance with the stipulations set forth in the Academic Personnel Manual Sections concerning the respective title series.

**Revision History**

October 1, 2018:
- Substantive revisions to APM - 210-3 to support revisions made to APM - 285.
- Minor technical revisions to grammar.

Until the earlier of a date specified by the campus or June 30, 2023, review criteria in this appendix shall apply to individuals appointed in the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series prior to October 1, 2018.

APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

Review and Appraisal Committee

Appendix B

210-3 Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series

a. The policies and procedures set forth above in APM - 210-1-a, -b, -c, and -e, shall govern the committee in the confidential conduct of its review and in the preparation of its report. The committee should refer to APM - 285 both for policies and procedures on appointments in the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series.

b. The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties considering the record of the candidate’s performance in (1) teaching, (2) professional achievement and activity, and (3) University and public service.

c. The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for minimum standards by which to judge the candidate, not to set boundaries to exclude other elements of performance that may be considered, as agreed upon by the candidate and the department.

(1) Teaching

Clearly demonstrated evidence of excellent teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstances will security of employment be conferred unless there is clear documentation of outstanding teaching.

In judging the effectiveness of a candidate’s teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate’s command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; ability to arouse curiosity in students and to encourage high standards; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate’s participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; and effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students. The committee should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on Lecturers by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which its appraisal of teaching competence has been based. In those exceptional cases of an
Until the earlier of a date specified by the campus or June 30, 2023, review criteria in this appendix shall apply to individuals appointed in the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series prior to October 1, 2018.
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initial appointment where no such evidence is available, the candidate’s potential as a teacher may be indicated in closely analogous activities. In preparing its recommendation, the review committee should keep in mind that the report may be an important means of informing the candidate of the evaluation of his or her teaching and of the basis for that evaluation.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness. Among significant types of evidence of teaching effectiveness are the following: (a) opinions of other faculty members knowledgeable in the candidate’s field, particularly if based on class visitations, on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the candidate, or on the performance of students in courses taught by the candidate that are prerequisite to those of the informant; (b) opinions of students; (c) opinions of graduates; and (d) development of new and effective techniques of instruction.

All cases for advancement and promotion normally will include: (a) evaluations and comments solicited from students for most, if not all, courses taught since the candidate’s last review; (b) a quarter-by-quarter or semester-by-semester enumeration of the number and types of courses and tutorials taught since the candidate’s last review which includes (i) the level of courses and tutorials taught, (ii) the enrollments of courses and tutorials taught, and (iii) for each course, the percentage of student course evaluations in relation to the total number of students in the course; (c) brief explanations for abnormal course loads; (d) identification of any new courses taught or of old courses which the candidate has substantially reorganized in approach or content; (e) notice of any awards or other acknowledgments of distinguished teaching; (f) when the faculty member under review wishes, a self-evaluation of his or her teaching; and (g) commentary by other faculty on teaching effectiveness. When any of the information specified in this paragraph is not provided, the department chair will include an explanation for that omission in the candidate’s dossier. If such information is not included with the letter of recommendation and its absence is not adequately accounted for, it is the review committee chair’s responsibility to request it through the Chancellor.

(2) Professional Achievement and Activity

A demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to teaching the particular subject is one of the criteria for appointment or promotion. The candidate’s professional activities should be scrutinized
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for evidence of achievement and leadership. Intellectual leadership must be documented by materials demonstrating that the candidate has, through publication (either in traditional forms or in electronic format), creative accomplishments, or other professional activity, made outstanding and recognized contributions to the development of his or her special field and/or of pedagogy.

(3) University and Public Service

The review committee should evaluate both the quantity and the quality of service by the candidate to the department, the campus, the University, and the public, paying particular attention to that service which is directly related to the candidate’s professional expertise and achievement. Evidence of suitability for promotion may be demonstrated in services to the community, state, and nation, both in the candidate’s special capacities as a teacher and in areas beyond those special capacities when the work done is at a sufficiently high level and of sufficiently high quality. Faculty service activities related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education represent one example of this kind of service. Similarly, contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisers to student organizations should be recognized as evidence. The department chair should provide both a list of service activities and an analysis of the quality of this service.

The Standing Orders of The Regents provide: “No political test shall ever be considered in the appointment and promotion of any faculty member or employee.” This provision is pertinent to every stage in the process of considering appointments and promotions.
Policy

285-0

Lecturer titles that have or lead to security of employment are faculty positions designed to meet the long-term instructional needs of the University that cannot be best fulfilled by an appointee in the professorial series. (See APM - 220.)

A budgeted FTE must be allocated for any full-time appointment in this series. Should the Chancellor approve a less than one hundred percent (100%) appointment, a portion of a budgeted FTE equal to the percent time appointment must be allocated. See APM - 285-16 for more information on part-time appointments.

Definition

285-4

The Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series is used for appointees who are members of the faculty of an academic or professional college, school, division, department, or program of the University whose primary responsibility is teaching and teaching-related tasks and secondary responsibility is professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity, especially as they relate to instruction and pedagogy. The faculty in this series also have responsibility for University and public service.

An appointee in this series will regularly carry a heavier load of teaching than appointees in the professorial series.

Types of Appointments

285-8

Titles in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series are:

1. Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment. This title is used for those that have not yet been conferred security of employment.

2. Lecturer with Security of Employment.

1 Until the earlier of a date specified by the campus or June 30, 2023, faculty appointed in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series prior to October 1, 2018, will continue to be evaluated under the criteria in effect as of September 30, 2018, and set forth in Appendix A to this policy. All other provisions of this policy apply effective October 1, 2018.

Appendix 5
(3) Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment.

b. An appointment (as distinguished from a promotion or reappointment) occurs when a person is employed in one of the three ranks above, if the individual’s immediately previous status was:

(1) not in the employ of the University;

(2) in the employ of the University but not with a title in this series; or

(3) in the employ of the University in the same title but at a different campus.

c. A promotion is advancement from one rank to a higher rank within the LSOE series.

d. A merit increase is advancement in salary rate and/or step without change of rank. (See APM - 610, Salary Increases.)

e. A reappointment is the renewal of a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment appointment immediately following the end date of a previous appointment (i.e., without a break in service). A reappointment may or may not be accompanied by a merit increase.

f. Acting titles may be used. (See APM - 235.)

g. When it is desirable in order to meet campus needs and with the approval of the Chancellor following consultation with the Academic Senate, a working title may be assigned in addition to the payroll title for use campuswide, provided the working title is not the same as an official University payroll title used for a different position.

285-9 Criteria

a. A candidate for appointment, reappointment, merit increase, or promotion in this series shall be evaluated by the following three criteria with teaching excellence being more highly weighted than the other two:

(1) Teaching excellence: The demonstration and maintenance of teaching excellence is the primary criterion for the series.

(2) Professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity, including creative activity.
(3) University and public service.

These criteria are further explained in APM - 210-3, Instructions to Review Committees That Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) Series.

b. Change of series

In cases when there has been a review of an Assistant Professor and the Chancellor has decided not to continue the individual’s appointment in the professorial series, the individual may not subsequently be appointed on any campus to the LSOE series (or certain other titles) for a period of five (5) years. (See APM - 133-0-a(3).)

Upon the recommendation of the department, and consistent with campus academic review processes, the Chancellor may appoint an Associate Professor or Professor to the Lecturer with Security of Employment or Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment title. This change of series requires the written consent of the faculty member.

An appointee in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series may have a change of series into the professorial series consistent with campus academic review processes and only upon satisfying recruitment compliance.

285-16 Restrictions

The following restrictions apply to the use of titles in this series:

a. In order to maintain the University’s mission for an appropriate balance between education, research, and service, the Chancellor, in consultation with the Academic Senate, may establish a cap on the number of appointments in this series. If so desired, a cap may be set for each school or department.

b. Normally, an appointment to this series is for one hundred percent (100%) time to the University.

c. Security of employment may be granted only for an appointment at more than 50 percent (50%) time unless the Chancellor, whose authority may not be redelegated, approves the appointment by special exception.

d. An initial appointment at less than one hundred percent (100%) but more than fifty percent (50%) or more time with a title in this series, or a subsequent temporary or permanent reduction in the percent time of the appointment, may be authorized under exceptional circumstances, provided the Chancellor
specifically approves the arrangement as being in the best interests of the University based on the particular situation.

A memorandum of understanding between the Chancellor and the part-time appointee shall be signed by both parties, to clarify the following:

(1) There are no implied rights to current or future full-time security of employment and the only security of employment granted with this appointment is at the agreed upon percentage; and

(2) Workload expectations are based on the specified percentage of time of the appointment.

c. Appointment and advancement of a part-time appointee shall depend on the quality of performance in teaching excellence, professional and/or scholarly achievement, including achievement and activity in creative work, and service with teaching being more highly weighted than the other two. Expectations for the quantity of performance shall be based on the percentage of time of the appointment, but expectations of the quality are the same as one hundred percent (100%) time. In all cases, when an appointee is considering a part-time appointment, or a temporary or permanent reduction in the percentage of time of an appointment, the terms of the appointment and the performance expectations shall be discussed by the dean, department chair, and the appointee at the outset and documented in a memorandum of understanding for advancement.

f. When there has been a review of a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment, Assistant Professor in the Professorial series, Assistant Professor in Residence, or Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) and the Chancellor has decided not to continue the individual’s appointment in that series, the individual may not be appointed on any campus to certain faculty titles for a period of five (5) years as set forth in APM - 133, Appendix A and also APM - 133-0-a(3) and b(3).

285-17 Terms of Service

a. Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment

(1) Term of Appointment

Each appointment and reappointment is limited to a maximum term of two (2) years with a specific end date. The total University service with this title in combination with certain other titles may not exceed eight (8) years, in accordance with APM - 133-0-b.
Appointee with Security of Employment Series

(2) Appointment for Less Than Two (2) Years

The appointment or reappointment of a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment may be for a period of less than two (2) years only under the following circumstances:

(a) An appointment or reappointment with an effective date other than July 1st shall end typically on the second June 30th following the appointment or reappointment.

(b) A promotion or merit increase may become effective on July 1st before the end of a two (2)-year term, but such advancement shall mark the beginning of a new term of appointment.

(c) Consistent with the eight-year limit, a terminal appointment for a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment may be for a period of less than two (2) years provided adequate notice has been given, as stipulated in APM - 285-17-a(4).

(3) Advancement

An appointee holding the title Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment is eligible for reappointment, merit increase, and promotion based on careful review of the appointee’s progress and achievement in meeting the criteria of the series.

(4) Notice for Non-Renewal of Appointment

When an appointment as a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment is not to be renewed, written notice shall be given by the Chancellor prior to the expiration date in accordance with the schedule below.

(a) With less than one (1) year of service as a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment by the end of the current period of appointment: at least a four (4)-month notice.

(b) With at least one (1) complete year of service and not more than two (2) years of service as a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment by the end of the current period of appointment: at least a six (6)-month notice.
(c) With more than two (2) years of service as a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment by the end of the current period of appointment: at least a twelve (12)-month notice.

(5) Termination Before the End of the Appointment Period

(a) Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment

Termination of the appointment of a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment before the expiration of the appointment shall be only for good cause, after the opportunity for a hearing before the properly constituted advisory committee of the Academic Senate in accordance with Regents’ Bylaw 40 and Senate Bylaws 336 or 337.

(b) Lecturer with Security of Employment and Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment

All appointments and promotions to the ranks of Lecturer with Security of Employment and Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment shall continue until terminated by resignation, retirement, or dismissal. An appointment with security of employment shall not be terminated except for good cause after the opportunity for a hearing before the properly constituted advisory committee of the Academic Senate, in accordance with Regents’ Bylaw 40 and Senate Bylaws 336 or 337.

285-18 Salary

The Office of the President publishes a salary scale for this series. The Lecturer with Security of Employment series will include three ranks and the same steps as the professorial series.

The Chancellor, after appropriate review, has authority to approve salaries up to and including the Indexed Compensation Level (ICL) threshold.

The Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs has authority to approve salaries exceeding the ICL threshold. (See APM - 220-85-d.)
Normative Periods of Service

The normative periods of service at rank and step in this series are shown in the published salary scales and are described below. Although these time periods indicate the usual intervals between advancements, they do not preclude more rapid advancement in the case of exceptional merit or more gradual advancement when warranted and if unrelated to a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment’s eight-year limitation. Personnel reviews that are deferred due to extending the security of employment clock (stopping the clock) for reasons as defined in APM - 133-17-g, -h, and -i or a family accommodation as defined in APM - 760 should be treated procedurally in the same manner as personnel reviews conducted at the usual intervals. All evidence produced during the probationary period, including the period of the extension, counts in the evaluation of the candidate’s review file. The file shall be evaluated without prejudice, without regard to the length of service at the Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment rank, and so stated in the department chair’s letter.

(1) For a Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment, the total period of University service in the title Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment or in this and certain other titles (see APM - 133-0) shall not exceed eight (8) years, except as provided in APM - 133-12. The normative period of service at a given step in this rank is two (2) years.

(2) For a Lecturer with Security of Employment, the normative period of service in this rank is six (6) years. The normative period of service at step is two (2) years in each of the first three (3) steps. Service at Steps IV and V is three (3) years in each step.

(3) For a Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, the normative period of service is three (3) years at step in each of the first four (4) steps. Service at Step V and above may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three (3) years of service at Step V. This involves an overall career review and will be granted on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following three (3) categories, with teaching excellence receiving primary weighting above the others: (1) extraordinary effectiveness and excellence in teaching and teaching-related tasks; (2) professional and/or scholarly achievement and activity; and (3) University and public service. Advancement from Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX, will usually not occur before three (3) years at step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.
Advancement to an Above-Scale rank involves an overall career review and is reserved only for the most highly accomplished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national or international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact on education within the discipline; (2) whose contributions to University teaching and education outcomes are excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four (4) years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX are not justification for further merit advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. A merit advancement for a candidate already serving at above-scale must be justified by continuing evidence of accomplishment commensurate with this level. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such merit advances may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will advances at intervals shorter than four (4) years be approved.

285-20 **Conditions of Employment**


b. An appointee to this series may be assigned to teach courses at any level.

c. An appointee with a title in this series is eligible to apply for sabbatical leave. (See APM - 740.)

285-24 **Authority**

Authority to approve appointments, reappointments, merit increases, and promotions to titles in this series are as follows:

a. Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment

   The Chancellor, after appropriate review. (See APM - 220-82.)

b. Lecturer with Security of Employment

   The Chancellor, after appropriate review. (See APM - 220-85.)
c. Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment

The Chancellor, after appropriate review. (See APM - 220-85.)

285-80 **Review Procedures**

The Chancellor, in consultation with the Committee on Academic Personnel, may develop local review procedures for the Lecturer with Security of Employment series. Campus procedures for review and advancement shall be modeled on the general pattern of the review process for members of the professorial series. (See APM - 220-80 and APM - 210-3.)

285-95 **Letters of Invitation and Notification**

See APM - 220-95 for model language. The term “security of employment” shall be substituted for the term “tenure.”

**Revision History**

October 1, 2018:
- Substantive revisions, including the following key revisions:
  - New and revised evaluation criteria;
  - Ability to use a working title;
  - Eligibility for sabbatical;
  - Establishment of a rank and step system; and
  - Senate membership at all percentages of appointments.

For details on prior revisions, please visit the Academic Personnel and Programs website: https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/academic-personnel-policy/policy-issuances-and-guidelines/index.html.
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285-10 Criteria

a. A candidate for appointment, merit increase, or promotion in this series shall be judged by achievements in the following areas: teaching, professional achievement and activity, and University and public service.

Criteria for examining achievement in these areas are set forth in APM - 210-3, Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE) Series.

b. The title Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (PSOE) or Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE) may be assigned to an appointee who provides services of exceptional value to the University and whose excellent teaching and professional accomplishments have made him or her a recognized leader in his or her professional field and/or in education.

c. Appointment and advancement of a part-time appointee with a title in this series shall depend on the quality of performance at a level of distinction comparable to that demanded of a full-time appointee; however, when circumstances warrant, a lesser rate of professional achievement and activity will be acceptable. Teaching assignments and departmental, committee, and other service should be in proportion to the percentage of time of the position, but the same quality of performance is expected as for a full-time appointee.

d. Transfer of appointees in the regular professorial series to the Lecturer SOE series.

(1) In cases when there has been a review of an Assistant Professor and the Chancellor has decided not to continue the individual’s appointment in the professorial series, the individual may not subsequently be appointed on any campus to the Lecturer SOE series (or certain other titles) for a period of five years. (See APM - 133-0-a(3).)

(2) Upon the recommendation of the department and following regular academic review, the Chancellor may transfer an Associate Professor or Professor to the Lecturer SOE or Senior Lecturer SOE title. This transfer requires the written consent of the faculty member.

e. When there has been a review of a Lecturer PSOE or Senior Lecturer PSOE and the Chancellor has decided not to continue the individual’s appointment in that series, the individual may not subsequently be appointed on any campus to certain faculty titles for a period of five years. For a list of these faculty titles, see APM - 133, Appendix A. (See also APM - 133-0-b(3).)
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**Policy**

The policy on sabbatical leave is established by The Regents and is set forth in Section 103.4 of the Standing Orders of The Regents, quoted below:

Sabbatical leaves are granted, in accordance with regulations established by the President, to enable recipients to be engaged in intensive programs of research and/or study, thus to become more effective teachers and scholars and to enhance their services to the University.

**Definitions and Concepts**

The following definitions concerning sabbatical leaves apply for the purposes of APM - 740:

a. **Academic-Year Appointments or Academic-Year Appointees**

   These terms refer to appointments in which the service period corresponds to the traditional academic calendar, from the beginning of the Fall term to the end of the Spring term. With the approval of the Chancellor, a faculty member may substitute the summer quarter or semester for a quarter or semester during the traditional academic year. In all cases, the academic-year faculty member works two (2) semesters or three (3) quarters including intersessions.

b. **Fiscal-Year Appointments or Fiscal-Year Appointees**

   These terms refer to appointments or appointees for a twelve (12)-month period of service.

c. **Quarter**

   A sabbatical leave quarter for an academic-year appointee begins and ends on dates for the respective service period established in the campus’ academic calendar for that quarter. (For information concerning pay periods for such service periods, refer to APM - 600.) A sabbatical leave quarter for a fiscal-year appointee is a three (3)-month period which shall be subject to the restrictions set forth in APM - 740-16-c.

d. **Semester**

   A sabbatical leave period for an academic-year appointee under the semester system begins and ends on dates for the respective service period established in the campus’ academic calendar for that semester. A sabbatical leave period
for a fiscal-year appointee is a six (6)-month period which shall be subject to the restrictions set forth in APM - 740-16-c.

e. **Recesses**

A sabbatical leave for more than one (1) quarter or one (1) semester includes any recesses which occur between the terms covered by sabbatical leave. Recesses preceding or following a scheduled sabbatical leave are not considered part of the leave period.

f. **Vacation for Fiscal-Year Appointee**

A fiscal-year appointee accrues vacation credit during a period of sabbatical leave, but such credit can be used only during the period of such leave and it lapses if not used. However, vacation credit accrued and unused prior to a sabbatical leave may be used during the leave or may be carried forward for use following the leave, subject to the provisions of APM - 730 concerning maximum accrual of such credit.

740-8 **Types**

Sabbatical leaves are of two types:

a. Regular sabbatical leave provides salary at varying percentages of regular salary, depending on the amount of accrued sabbatical leave credit and the option elected by the eligible appointee. (See Charts at the end of APM - 740.) An individual on such regular sabbatical leave is excused from all regular duties to enable full-time effort to research and/or study.

b. Sabbatical leave in residence at the University may be granted to a faculty member who is eligible for a regular sabbatical and who, in addition to a program of research and/or study, will teach at the University of California. Appointees in the Professorial series shall teach one (1) class which meets regularly at least three (3) hours each week during each term of the sabbatical period or will perform an equivalent amount of instructional service in a course or in a clinical setting regarded as essential to the program of that campus. Appointees in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series shall teach a reduced load based on overall teaching workload. A faculty member on sabbatical leave in residence who meets this teaching requirement shall be freed from all other teaching obligations and from all committee and administrative work.
The Chancellor may grant an exception to allow a faculty member to substitute significant University service for some or all of the teaching/instructional requirements described above. Requests for such substitution must be included in the application for sabbatical leave. The Chancellor shall develop guidelines for what constitutes significant service.

When a sabbatical leave is spent in residence on a campus other than the home campus, the host campus shall assume the responsibility for payment of the additional salary. (Instructions for preparation of necessary forms for this purpose are given in the Universitywide Accounting Manual section P-196-38, Payroll: Intercampus Transfers and Appointments.) For approval of such a leave by both Chancellors, see APM - 740-24.

740-11 Qualifying Service

Credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave is earned only by service in the University under the following conditions:

a. Subject to the provisions of APM - 740-11-d through 740-11-i, credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave is accrued by an academic appointee for each full quarter or semester of half-time or more service in one (1) or more of the following titles:

(1) Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Acting Professor in a law school

(2) Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment

(3) Astronomer, Associate Astronomer, Assistant Astronomer, Junior Astronomer

(4) Agronomist, Associate Agronomist, Assistant Agronomist, Junior Agronomist, and other comparable titles in the Agricultural Experiment Stations, but not including the Specialist series in the Agricultural Experiment Stations

(5) Cooperative Extension Advisor, Associate Cooperative Extension Advisor, Assistant Cooperative Extension Advisor

(6) Specialist in Cooperative Extension, Associate Specialist in Cooperative Extension, Assistant Specialist in Cooperative Extension
(7) Supervisor, Associate Supervisor, Assistant Supervisor, Junior Supervisor in Physical Education

b. Subject to the provisions of APM - 740-11-d through 740-11-i, credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave is accrued by an academic appointee for each full quarter or semester of service in one (1) or more of the following titles but only when such service at the percentage of time indicated below is followed immediately by appointment to a title conferring eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave, as listed in APM - 740-11-a and 740-11-c. (See also APM - 740-14.)

(1) Half-time or more service: Acting or Visiting prefix with a title in the Professor or Lecturer with Security of Employment series, except Acting Professor in the law school which is covered by APM - 740-11-a, Visiting prefix in the Agronomist in A.E.S. series or in the Astronomer series.

(2) Half-time or more service: Professor in Residence series and Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine) series. Such credit shall not be used until after transfer to a title carrying eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave (as indicated in APM - 740-14) and service in such a title for at least a year.

c. Subject to the provisions of APM - 740-11-d through 740-11-i, credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave is accrued by an academic appointee with a title listed in APM - 740-11-a who also holds one of the following academic administrative appointments or Senior Management appointments which, by itself or in combination with an appointment in a department of instruction and research, constitutes half-time or more service. Both academic administrative and Senior Management appointments with the Acting or Interim prefixes are included in this provision.

(1) President, Senior Vice President, Vice President, Associate Vice President, Assistant Vice President

(2) Chancellor, Assistant Chancellor, Assistant to the Chancellor, Academic Assistant to the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor, Academic Assistant to the Vice Chancellor

(3) Laboratory Director, Deputy Laboratory Director, Associate Laboratory Director

(4) University Provost, Provost, Vice Provost, Associate Provost, Assistant Provost
(5) The following officers of a school, college, or graduate division: Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, Divisional Dean, Associate Divisional Dean

(6) Dean--University Extension

(7) Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director of an Organized Research Unit

(8) Director, Associate Director of an Education Abroad Center

(9) Director, Associate Director of Relations with Schools

(10) Academic Administrator

(11) Other titles as designated by the President

d. Service with the University must be continuous to retain accrued credit toward sabbatical leave. Any separation from the University, other than by approved leave of absence, interrupts continuous service.

Credit toward sabbatical leave accrued prior to an interruption of University service is not reinstated upon the return of an appointee to qualifying service.

e. Credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave is accrued during assignments to overseas technical assistance projects administered by the University, including publicly or privately financed cooperative projects so administered.

f. Credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave is accrued during a leave of absence granted by the University for military service in the same way as if the appointee had continued in the appointee’s regular University duties. However, an appointee who has rendered no service to the University prior to the beginning of a military leave of absence shall accrue no sabbatical credit during the period of that leave of absence. (See APM - 751.)

g. Credit toward eligibility to apply for a sabbatical leave is not forfeited or otherwise affected by an intercampus transfer within the University.

h. Credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave is not accrued during a period of:

(1) sabbatical leave;
(2) a greater than half-time research appointment to a University-sponsored research institute, program, or comparable unit;

(3) a leave of absence with pay for one (1) quarter or semester or more except as authorized by the Chancellor at the time the leave is granted;

(4) any leave of absence without pay, including a leave to accept a fellowship or grant, to accept a visiting or other appointment in another university or college, to serve overseas on a technical assistance project not administered by the University, or to serve at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, or the Los Alamos National Laboratory;

(5) less than full-time service while a registered student or degree candidate on any campus of the University; or

(6) summer research or Summer Session teaching, during which the faculty member earns additional compensation. (Sabbatical leave is accrued when a faculty member serves during a summer term in place of a quarter or semester. See APM - 740-4-a.)

i. For an eligible academic appointee with qualifying service partly on an academic-year and partly on a fiscal-year basis, sabbatical leave credit is computed as follows, subject also to the terms of APM - 740-11-a, 740-11-b, and 740-11-c:

(1) When throughout the University’s fiscal year, the employment is divided unequally in percentages of time between an academic-year and a fiscal-year basis, sabbatical leave credit accrues based on the majority of the appointment.

(2) When throughout the University’s fiscal year, the employment is divided equally between an appointment on an academic-year basis and an appointment on a fiscal-year basis, sabbatical leave credit accrues based on the academic-year appointment.

(3) When during the University’s fiscal year, the employment is divided between an academic appointment on an academic-year basis and an administrative appointment on a fiscal-year basis, but during the off-duty academic term the individual holds a full-time rather than a part-time administrative appointment (with a so-called “summer differential” increment in salary), sabbatical leave credit accrues as if the appointment were held entirely on a fiscal-year basis.
740-13 Conversion of Sabbatical Leave Credit

a. Each quarter of sabbatical leave credit accrued by an eligible academic appointee on an academic-year appointment under the quarter calendar and prior to the effective date of transfer to the semester calendar shall be converted to two-thirds (2/3) of a semester of sabbatical leave credit. Any resulting number with a fraction of one-half (½) or more is adjusted to the next largest whole number, e.g., four (4) quarters, changed to two (2) and two-thirds (2/3) semesters, is adjusted to three (3) semesters of credit. Any fraction of less than one-half (½) is lost, e.g., two (2) quarters, changed to one (1) and one-third (1/3) semesters, is adjusted to one (1) semester of credit. (See Table A.)

b. Each quarter of sabbatical leave credit accrued by an eligible academic appointee on a fiscal-year appointment under the quarter calendar and prior to the effective date of transfer to the semester calendar shall be converted to one-half (½) of a six (6)-month leave period (or three (3) months) of sabbatical leave credit. Any resulting number with an extra three (3) months is adjusted to the next largest half (½)-year period, e.g., five (5) quarters equals one (1) year plus three (3) months and is adjusted to one (1) and one-half (½) years credit. (See Table A.)

740-14 Eligibility to Apply for Sabbatical Leave

Academic appointees who have accumulated sufficient qualifying service and who hold one or more of the titles listed in APM - 740-11-a and 740-11-c are eligible to apply for sabbatical leave.

740-16 Restrictions

a. Accrued University service in excess of the amount required for the current sabbatical leave may be carried forward to apply toward eligibility for the next succeeding sabbatical leave. The maximum number of credits which may be accrued is equal to the number of credits required for a maximum sabbatical leave plus one (1) year of credit. For academic-year appointees, the maximum accrual is thirty (30) quarters or twenty (20) semesters and for fiscal-year appointees the maximum accrual is forty (40) quarters or ten (10) years. The Chancellor may approve deferral beyond the above-stated maximum.

b. A sabbatical leave shall be granted only at a time when it will not disrupt the teaching program or other vital operation of the University. Whenever a
deferral under the provisions of APM - 740-16-a or an interruption under the provisions of APM - 740-16-e is requested on grounds of a personal or scholarly interest of the appointee, the request, if forwarded for administrative consideration, shall be accompanied by an analysis by the department chair, or corresponding officer, of the effect of the request on the program or operation of the University.

c. A sabbatical leave for an academic-year appointee shall be timed so that it starts and ends on dates established in the academic calendar for the beginnings and endings of quarters or semesters. The beginning and ending of a sabbatical leave for a fiscal-year appointee shall be scheduled at times reasonable and convenient to the appointee’s department or unit.

d. A sabbatical leave of absence shall be granted by the University and accepted by the recipient with the understanding that, immediately following the leave of absence, the recipient will return to active University service for a period at least equal to the period of the leave. However, with the approval of the Chancellor, the return to service may be delayed during a period of leave without pay not longer than the period of the sabbatical leave. Failure to return to regular University employment after sabbatical leave for a period at least equal to the period of the leave shall create an obligation on the part of the appointee to refund the entire salary received for the period of a regular sabbatical leave, or two-thirds (2/3) of the salary received for the period of a sabbatical leave in residence. (In case of return to regular University employment for a period less than that of the sabbatical leave, the refund requirement will be reduced in proportion to the length of the time served.) This requirement for repayment may not be waived without the approval of the Chancellor. The authority may not be redelegated.

Sabbatical leave shall not be granted to an individual who plans to retire immediately following the sabbatical. For an individual who unexpectedly retires immediately after the sabbatical leave, see the repayment requirement described above.

e. Normally, a sabbatical leave of more than one (1) quarter/semester is taken in consecutive terms. However, the Chancellor may authorize interruption of a sabbatical leave. In general, an interruption would be for no more than one (1) quarter/semester except in unusual circumstances. Sabbatical leave credit may be accrued during the period of such interruption only as described in APM - 740-11.

f. A sabbatical leave shall not be approved for an individual who has been issued a notice of non-reappointment or termination of appointment. A sabbatical leave shall not be approved for an individual if there is strong evidence that the individual’s appointment will be terminated prior to what would otherwise be
the closing date of the period of a sabbatical leave plus the period of return to service, as required in the paragraph above. Such cases must be examined carefully by the appropriate academic administrative officers.

g. An academic appointee recalled to active service after retirement is not eligible for a sabbatical leave.

h. When sabbatical leave is granted to an eligible academic appointee who also holds an appointment in a research unit, State-supported sabbatical leave replacement funds shall not be used to employ a temporary replacement in the research unit concerned.

740-17 Periods of Sabbatical Leave

The periods of sabbatical leave are determined by the appointment status (academic-year or fiscal-year) of the recipient and by the amount of credit accrued within a period of continuous qualifying service.

a. A regular sabbatical leave or a sabbatical leave in residence may be granted by the Chancellor to an eligible appointee in accordance with the service/credit information and at the varying percentages of salary provided in the Charts at the end of APM - 740.

b. A regular or in residence sabbatical leave for an appointee shall never exceed one (1) year at full salary, regardless of the amount of credit accrued. Full salary eligibility shall be in accordance with the service/credit information provided in the Charts at the end of APM - 740.

740-18 Compensation During Sabbatical Leave

a. Regular Salary

Sabbatical leave salary shall be based on the rate of the appointee’s regular salary for the appointment held during the period for which the leave is scheduled or at varying percentages of such regular salary as specified in the Charts at the end of APM - 740.

When sabbatical leave is for more than one (1) term, campuses may develop guidelines to provide that the salary specified in the Charts is an average which may be paid unequally in different terms of the leave.

For purposes of this section, regular salary is defined as including any of the following:
(1) That portion which immediately prior to the leave is derived from extramurally financed projects other than those of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, or the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

(2) An appointee who holds an administrative position may be eligible for an administrative leave with pay in lieu of sabbatical leave. See APM - 758.

(3) The entire Strict Full-Time salary of an academic appointee on a Strict Full-Time appointment in the health sciences.

(4) Faculty paid under the Health Sciences Compensation Plan are compensated during sabbatical leave in accord with provisions of that Plan.

b. **Funding From Two (2) or More Sources**

The sabbatical leave salary of an eligible appointee who holds an appointment permanently budgeted between two (2) or more funding sources (excluding the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and the Los Alamos National Laboratory) shall be paid on a proportionate basis by each funding source.

The sabbatical leave salary of an eligible appointee who holds an appointment temporarily budgeted between two (2) or more funding sources shall be paid from the home department’s general funds, unless an exception is approved by the Chancellor.

c. **Additional Salary for Research**

Upon approval of the Chancellor, a recipient of a sabbatical leave at less than full salary may receive additional salary for research from the University, from other universities, and/or from national laboratories. The Chancellor may grant exceptions to permit additional salary from other research institutions. This additional salary is subject to the following restrictions:

(1) The research must promote the purpose of the leave, and the additional salary must be approved as part of the sabbatical leave application;

(2) The combined sabbatical leave pay and additional salary for such research must not exceed the recipient’s regular salary; and
The ability of the recipient to meet his or her obligations under University intellectual property policies must be preserved. When an academic appointee proposes to receive additional salary for service on a research project administered by an institution other than the home campus, the details of the proposed relationship and any associated intellectual property obligations must be disclosed in advance and approved as part of the application for sabbatical leave. See APM - 740-24 and 740-94 for information regarding the application for and approval of sabbatical leave.

The additional salary must be allowable under the terms of any relevant research contracts, grants, or other sponsored projects. When an appointee receives additional salary for service on a research project administered through the University, the additional salary shall be budgeted and charged to project funds according to the proportion of time and effort actually expended on the project, to the extent that the policy of the contracting or granting agency permits, except only for such amount as may be necessary as a contribution from University funds to assist meeting any cost-sharing commitment applicable to the project. Such direct salary charges must be supported as specified in Accounting Manual Chapter P-196-13.

Sabbatical leave compensation not charged to project funds, as provided above, may be claimed as a cost-sharing contribution to a Federal research project to the extent that it represents compensation for time and effort actually expended on the project. Such contributed salary costs must be supported as specified in the Policy and Procedure Manual for Contract and Grant Administration.

d. Approved research activities for which the appointee receives additional salary in accordance with APM 740-18-c do not count toward the limit on days of compensated outside professional activities under APM - 025.

740-19 Other Employment During Sabbatical Leave

Sabbatical leave shall not be used as a means of augmenting personal income. Except as provided in APM - 025 and APM - 740-18, an individual shall not accept gainful employment during a sabbatical leave. (See APM - 025 for guidance on outside professional activities and APM - 740-18-c for policy related to additional compensation from research for appointees on sabbatical leave at less than full salary. Health Sciences Compensation Plan participants, see APM - 671.)

This restriction on extra income does not apply to the acceptance of a fellowship, personal grant, or government-sponsored exchange lectureship for the period.
covered by the leave if such acceptance promotes the accomplishment of the purpose of the leave and is approved in advance by the Chancellor.  (A fellowship or grant given to an individual in recognition of the individual’s distinguished achievement without stipulation as to work or service expected is to be distinguished from the stipend or compensation for service performed on a research project.)

For purposes of APM - 025 and APM - 670, a sabbatical leave on partial pay is considered a full-time University appointment in determining the limits on outside professional activities that may be undertaken during the sabbatical leave.

740-24 Authority

a. The Chancellor and the Vice President Agriculture and Natural Resources have authority to approve, deny, or defer requests for sabbatical leave, consistent with the sabbatical leave policies and requirements established by The Regents and the President, and as outlined in APM - 740.

b. A sabbatical leave in residence on another UC campus shall require the approval of the Chancellors of both campuses.

740-94 Application

An application for sabbatical leave shall be submitted through appropriate channels to the Chancellor.  Sabbatical leaves are not granted as a matter of individual right. Leaves are accorded to individuals in good standing to enable them to further their research or other creative activities and in doing so, to enhance their service to the University.  The application form shall be accompanied by a statement providing in detail the following information:

a. A brief history of the project, from inception through progress to date and projection as to completion date.  This history shall include a description of the applicant’s preparation and any significant contributions already made in the field of activity with which the project is concerned.

b. Significance of the project as a contribution to knowledge, to art, to a particular profession, or as an expected contribution to the applicant’s increased effectiveness as a teacher and scholar.

c. Name(s) of the location(s) or institution(s) where the project will be carried out, and the names of colleagues, if any, with whom it will be conducted.
d. Assurances of cooperation, or authorization to conduct the project, received from individuals, institutions, or agencies.

e. Description of all financial support expected during the sabbatical leave for professional activities, except as provided in APM - 025 and APM - 670. Description of any fellowship, grant and/or government-sponsored exchange lectureship. Description of any proposed arrangement under which the appointee would receive additional salary for research in accordance with APM - 740-18-c, any associated intellectual property-related issues, and actions proposed to assure that all obligations under the University intellectual property policies are preserved.

f. Description of University service which will be provided if the applicant proposes to substitute significant University service for some or all of the teaching/instructional requirements of a sabbatical leave in residence. (See APM - 740-8-b.)

740-97 Report of Results

Within ninety (90) calendar days following return from leave, the recipient of a sabbatical leave shall submit to the Chancellor a concise report of the results of the leave, to include the following:

a. Account of activities during the leave, including travel itineraries, institutions and locations visited, persons with whom there was extensive consultation or collaboration, and any formal lectures delivered.

b. Statement of progress made on the project as proposed in the application.

c. Explanation of any significant changes from the initial approved proposal.

d. Appraisal of the relationship between the results anticipated in the leave project statement and those actually achieved.

a. Summary of any intellectual property issues.

f. Statement of future activity related to the project, including plans for completion of the project and publication of results.

The report shall become a part of the supporting materials submitted with any proposal for subsequent promotion or merit increase.
Revision History

October 1, 2018:
  • Substantive revisions to support revisions made to APM - 285.
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Conversion of Sabbatical Service Credit  
from the Quarter System to the Semester System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic-Year Appointees¹</th>
<th>Fiscal-Year Appointees²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarters</td>
<td>Semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See APM - 740-13-a  
² See APM - 740-13-b

*Fiscal-year appointees accrue sabbatical leave in half-yearly (6 months) intervals.

Rev. 7/1/96
Sabbatical Leave Credit for Academic-Year Appointees
Quarter System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifying Service**</th>
<th>Sabbatical Leave Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Qtr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quarters</td>
<td>0.67 Salary*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Quarters</td>
<td>Regular Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Quarters</td>
<td>0.67 Salary*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Quarters</td>
<td>0.83 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Quarters</td>
<td>Regular Salary or 0.67 Salary*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Quarters</td>
<td>0.78 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Quarters</td>
<td>0.89 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Quarters</td>
<td>Regular Salary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Or regular salary if sabbatical leave is taken in residence.

** Academic-year appointees accrue three quarters of sabbatical leave credit per calendar year, excluding periods of leave of absence without salary.

*** Salary is an average which may be paid unequally in different terms of leave.
Sabbatical Leave Credit for Fiscal-Year Appointees
Quarter System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifying Service**</th>
<th>Sabbatical Leave Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Qtr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quarters</td>
<td>0.67 Salary*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Quarters</td>
<td>Regular Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Quarters</td>
<td>0.67 Salary*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Quarters</td>
<td>0.83 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Quarters</td>
<td>Regular Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Quarters</td>
<td>0.78 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Quarters</td>
<td>0.89 Salary or 0.67 Salary*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Quarters</td>
<td>Regular Salary or 0.75 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Quarters</td>
<td>0.83 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Quarters</td>
<td>0.92 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Quarters</td>
<td>Regular Salary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Or regular salary if sabbatical leave is taken in residence.

** Fiscal-year appointees accrue four quarters of sabbatical leave credit per calendar year, excluding periods of leave of absence without salary.

*** Salary is an average which may be paid unequally in different terms of leave.

Rev. 8/1/89
Sabbatical Leave Credit for Academic-Year and Fiscal-Year Appointees
Semester System

Regular Sabbatical (Off-Campus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifying Service</th>
<th>Sabbatical Leave Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Semester or 2 Semesters or 3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6 Months*) or (or** 1 Year*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Semesters or 2 Years</td>
<td>.44 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semesters or 2 1/2 Years</td>
<td>.56 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Semesters or 3 Years</td>
<td>.67 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Semesters or 3 1/2 Years</td>
<td>.78 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Semesters or 4 Years</td>
<td>.89 Salary or .50 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Semesters or 4 1/2 Years</td>
<td>Regular Salary or .50 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Semesters or 5 Years</td>
<td>.56 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Semesters or 5 1/2 Years</td>
<td>.61 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Semesters or 6 Years</td>
<td>.67 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Semesters or 7 Years</td>
<td>.78 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Semesters or 8 Years</td>
<td>.89 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Semesters or 9 Years</td>
<td>Regular Salary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fiscal-year appointees accrue sabbatical leave in half-yearly intervals, excluding periods of leave of absence without salary. Six months or 1 year sabbatical leave credits apply to fiscal-year appointees only.

** Salary is an average which may be paid unequally in different terms of leave.
Sabbatical Leave Credit for Academic-Year and Fiscal-Year Appointees
Semester System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifying Service</th>
<th>Sabbatical Leave Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(or 6 Months*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Semesters or 2 Years</td>
<td>.67 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Semesters or 2 1/2 Years</td>
<td>.83 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Semesters or 3 Years</td>
<td>Regular Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Semesters or 3 1/2 Years</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Semesters or 4 Years</td>
<td>.67 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Semesters or 4 1/2 Years</td>
<td>.75 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Semesters or 5 Years</td>
<td>.83 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Semesters or 5 1/2 Years</td>
<td>.92 Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Semesters or 6 Years</td>
<td>Regular Salary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fiscal-year appointees accrue sabbatical leave in half-yearly intervals, excluding periods of leave of absence without salary. Six month or 1 year sabbatical leave credits apply to fiscal-year appointees only.

** Salary is an average which may be paid unequally in different terms of leave.
Policy on Sabbatical Leaves of Absence
Approved by The Regents on November 16, 1962
Revised July 17, 2003

The Regents of the University of California, having been advised that questions have been raised with respect to the nature and incidents of sabbatical leaves of absence, hereby reaffirm the following principles:

1. Research and scholarly endeavor are and have long been recognized as essential to the furtherance of the educational purposes for which the University of California exists;

2. The University can succeed in accomplishing such purposes only if it can maintain an able and proficient faculty;

3. Ability and proficiency in university teaching and scholarly endeavor require that present knowledge and skills be supplemented by continuing research, deliberation, and experimentation;

4. At the University of California sabbatical leaves of absence are not and have not been granted as a matter of individual right; rather they are and have been accorded to qualified members of the academic staff to enable them to enhance their service to the University and thereby increase its distinction.

5. At the University of California sabbatical leaves are granted and in the past have been granted to permit faculty members to maintain and improve teaching skills and scholarly ability and proficiency by engaging in periodic and intensive programs of research and study;

6. Sabbatical leaves of absence have been and continue to be granted in recognition of the fact that they are appropriate, helpful and necessary to enable faculty members to fulfill their professional obligations to the University; and

7. Research or other academic accomplishment is and has long been expected of those members of the academic staff of the University of California who are given sabbatical leaves of absence.
Title VI. Rights and Authority of Senate Members

- 55. Departmental Voting Rights
  
  A. General Provisions
  1. According to the Standing Orders of the Regents, ". . . the several departments of the University, with the approval of the President, shall determine their own form of administrative organization . . ." No department shall be organized in a way that would deny to any of its non-emeritae/i faculty who are voting members of the Academic Senate, as specified in Standing Order 105.l(a), the right to vote on substantial departmental questions, excepting only certain personnel actions as detailed in Article B of this Bylaw. [See Legislative Ruling 5.67 ] (Am 4 May 95)
  2. In all matters other than those specified in paragraphs 1 to 5 of Article B of this Bylaw, the right to vote may be delegated to duly elected committees.

  B. Designation of Voting Rights
  1. All tenured faculty in a department have the right to vote on all new departmental appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate. Prior to such a vote, all the non-emeritae/i departmental members of the Academic Senate must be afforded an opportunity to make their opinions known to the voters. (Am 4 May 95)
  2. Professors have the right to vote on all cases of promotion to the ranks of Professor, Professor-in-Residence, and Professor of Clinical (e.g. Medicine). Professors and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment (SOE) have the right to vote on all cases of appointment or promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer (SOE). (Am 5 May 88)
  3. Professors and Associate Professors have the right to vote on all cases of promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor, Associate Professor-in-Residence, and Associate Professor of Clinical (e.g. Medicine). Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Lecturers (SOE) and Lecturers (SOE) have the right to vote on all cases of appointment to the rank of Lecturer (SOE). (Am 5 May 88)
  4. For voting purposes, all cases that involve the removal of the Acting modifier from the title of a member of the Academic Senate shall be treated as promotions to the rank in question.
  5. All cases of nonreappointments or terminations of Assistant Professors, Assistant Professors-in-Residence, and Assistant Professors of Clinical (e.g. Medicine), or Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, shall be voted upon by those faculty eligible to vote on promotions to the ranks of Associate Professor, Associate Professor-in-Residence, Associate Professor of Clinical (e.g. Medicine), or appointments to the titles Lecturer (SOE) and Senior Lecturer (SOE), respectively. (Am 5 May 88)
  6. All cases of advancement within any rank that confers membership in the Academic Senate shall be voted upon by those persons entitled to vote on
promotion or nonreappointment to the rank in question under the provisions of Paragraphs 2 to 5 of this Article B. (En 4 May 1995)

7. In none of the instances specified in Paragraphs 1 to 5 of this Article B may the right to vote be delegated to a committee. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters; subject, however, to the provision that no voter may be denied the option to require a secret ballot. In cases of advancement within rank, the eligible voters for each rank in question shall either follow the same procedures used for promotions and non-reappointment or may, by two thirds majority vote and subject to the approval of the divisional Committee on Academic Personnel or its equivalent, delegate the authority for such actions to a duly elected committee or other agency, or adopt some other method acceptable to the divisional Committee on Academic Personnel or its equivalent. Any such method or delegation of authority shall remain in effect for at least one calendar year (twelve months). Thereafter, upon the request of any faculty member entitled to a vote on the cases in question under the provisions of Paragraph 6 of this Article B, the eligible voters shall reconsider the question of how such cases shall be handled. (Am 4 May 1995)

8. The tenured faculty members of a department shall establish the method by which personnel matters other than those listed in Paragraphs 1 to 6 of this Article B are determined. The method adopted must have the approval of the divisional Committee on Academic Personnel or its equivalent.

C. Extension of Voting Privileges to non-Emeritae/i Faculty

Voting privileges on personnel matters within any department may be extended to one or more of the classes of non-Emeritae/i Academic Senate members of that department, as a class, who are not otherwise entitled to vote under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw, upon at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw. Any extensions of the voting privilege under this Article C must remain in effect for at least one calendar year (twelve months); thereafter, any faculty member entitled to a vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw may request reconsideration. Following a request for reconsideration, and prior to any subsequent vote on the cases in question, the Chair or other appropriate departmental officer shall put the question of renewal of privileges to a vote. An extension of voting privileges will be renewed only upon at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw. (Am 4 May 95)[See Legislative Ruling 5.67 ]

D. Rights and Privileges of Emeritae/i Faculty (En 4 May 95)

1. Emeritae/i members of the Academic Senate retain membership in the departments to which they belonged at the time of their retirement. They do not have the right to vote on departmental matters, except as provided in this Article D.
2. With the exception of personnel actions, Emeritae/i members of the department have the right to receive the same notice of meetings as other Academic Senate members. They have the right of access to materials relevant to those meetings, the privilege of the floor at those meetings, and the right to make their opinions known to the voting members.

3. Emeritae/i, while recalled to service in a department from which they have retired, regain voting rights on all departmental matters, except personnel matters, during the period of such service. They may be accorded voting privileges on personnel matters only as a class consisting of all recalled Emeritae/i and only as specified in paragraph 4.c of this Article D.

4. Additional privileges in a department from which they have retired may be extended, either to all Emeritae/i as a class of the whole, or to all Emeritae/i recalled to active service, during the period of such service, as follows.

   a. Voting privileges on all non-personnel matters may be extended to all Emeritae/i upon a majority vote by secret ballot of the total non-Emeritae/i Academic Senate membership of that department.

   b. The privilege of notice of meeting on personnel actions, access to materials, and/or privilege of the floor may be extended to Emeritae/i upon at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw.

   c. Voting privileges on personnel matters may be extended to Emeritae/i upon at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw.

      i. Any extensions of privilege to Emeritae/i under paragraph 4 of this Article D must remain in effect for at least one calendar year (twelve months); thereafter, any faculty member entitled to a vote on the question of an extension of privilege under the provisions of paragraph 4 of this Article D may request reconsideration. Following a request for reconsideration, and prior to any subsequent vote on the cases in question, the Chair or other appropriate departmental officer shall put the question of renewal of privileges to a vote. An extension of privilege will be renewed only under the procedures specified for the initial extension of voting privileges by paragraph 4 of this Article D.

   a. Other Units. In Divisions or schools or colleges where the term "department" is not used, this Bylaw refers to those units from which academic appointments and promotions are recommended to administrative officers. (Am 2 Dec 81)
Dear Chair Dickson:

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the Academic Senate of the University of California (UCRJ) renders the following response regarding the interpretation of Senate Bylaw 55. The question posed was:

Is Security of Employment equivalent to Tenure for the purposes of UC systemwide Bylaw 55, which states that "all tenured faculty in a department have the right to vote on all new departmental appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate?"

The answer must turn in part on the nature of the vote. As Bylaw 55 states explicitly in subsection B.2., “Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment have the right to vote on all cases of appointment or promotion to that rank.” Similarly, under subsection B.3., “Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment and Lecturers with Security of Employment have the right to vote on all cases of appointment to the rank of Lecturer with Security of Employment.” Therefore, if the context of the question is a vote on an appointment to the rank of Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment or Lecturer with Security of Employment, then the answer is yes.

However, Bylaw 55 does not explicitly resolve the question of whether Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment must be allowed to vote on appointments to ranks other than Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment and Lecturer with Security of Employment, and whether Lecturers with Security of Employment must be allowed to vote on appointments to ranks other than Lecturer with Security of Employment. We conclude that the answer to both questions is no, Security of Employment is not equivalent to tenure for voting eligibility in these cases.

The fact that the Bylaws explicitly define which ranks vote on appointments to those ranks makes clear that had granting more extensive voting rights to faculty with Security of Employment been intended, the Bylaws would have been drafted accordingly. This is not to say that a department could not decide to extend the voting rights of faculty with Security of Employment, because Bylaw 55.B.8. appears to contemplate just such a possibility. But Bylaw 55 does not mandate such extension of voting rights.

Membership in the Academic Senate is defined in Regents Standing Order 105.1, which encompasses both members of the faculty with tenure and members of the faculty who have Security
of Employment. However, Regents Bylaw 40.3 draws a distinction between the two ranks, and we conclude that the distinction must have significance.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further information or clarification.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Glater, Chair
University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Cc: Hilary Baxter, UC Academic Senate Executive Director
UCRJ