UC Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures (MAPP) contains campus procedures for implementing Academic Personnel policies. These procedures are intended to supplement the policies set forth in the University of California Academic Personnel Manual (APM), and they must always be used in conjunction with that manual.

ROLE OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

The Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) is designated by the Chancellor and the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (Provost/EVC) to develop and implement academic review procedures for the Merced campus and to lead the Academic Personnel Office. The VPF facilitates all Academic Personnel actions on behalf of the Chancellor and the Provost/EVC (Chancellor’s designee) via the Academic Personnel Office (APO). All items should be addressed to the Provost/EVC and submitted to APO via the appropriate Dean’s Office.

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) provides recommendations to the Chancellor (or designee) on Academic Personnel matters. The VPF is the Chancellor’s and Provost/EVC’s designee for facilitating administrative input and advice from CAP. Duties and membership of CAP can be found here.

BYLAW 55 UNIT VOTING RIGHTS

Academic Senate Bylaw 55 governs voting rights and other issues related to Academic Personnel procedures for Senate faculty titles.
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## A. ACADEMIC SERIES OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Ladder Rank</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Eligible/Te</th>
<th>Term Limit*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Titles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Assistant Professor</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Associate Professor/Acting Professor</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor Mathematics</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Lecturer Security of Employment (SOE)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer Potential Security of Employment (PSOE) w/ 100% Appt†</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Lecturer Potential Security of Employment (OSIE) w/ &lt;100% Appt</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer/Senior Lecturer (Unit 18)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Titles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professional Researcher‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Project Scientist‡</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See **APM 133** for details regarding the Eight-Year Limit for certain academic titles
† The combined years as Lecturer PSOE and the years in the title of Lecturer/Senior Lecturer may not exceed a total of eight years of service (**APM 133**)
‡ The combined years as Assistant Project Scientist and the years in the title of Assistant Researcher may not exceed a total of eight years of service (**APM 311-17**).
## B. COMPARISON OF NON-SENATE TEACHING TITLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
<th>Visiting</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointment</strong></td>
<td>Appointments can be FT or PT. Appointment or reappointment is made with a specific ending date. Maximum terms vary by % time (&lt;51% vs. 51% +), rank, and step within rank.</td>
<td>Appointed temporarily; term not to exceed 1 year at a time for a maximum of two years (Math appointments not to exceed 3 years). No tenure or security of employment.</td>
<td>Temporary appointments with potential for Continuing Appointment after 6 years, based on curricular need &amp; Excellence Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Both Teaching and Research 1. Expected to adhere to UC Merced’s rigorous standards of scholarship; 2. May be predominantly engaged in research or in teaching, as long as he/she makes some contribution to both; 3. Also expected to engage in some University and public service</td>
<td>Both Teaching and Research 1. Has held, is on leave from, or is retired from an academic or research position at another educational institution; or 2. His/her research, creative activities or professional achievement makes appointment appropriate; Criteria for appointment same as for the corresponding Ladder-Rank faculty title</td>
<td>Teaching only; covered by MOU which specifies personnel procedures, criteria, and standards of excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Must contribute to both research and teaching</td>
<td>Should have greater teaching load than regular faculty</td>
<td>MOU specifies workload requirements and limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>Competitive recruitment process not required</td>
<td>Competitive recruitment process not required</td>
<td>Competitive recruitment required (except Summer Session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit/Promotion/Appraisal Reviews</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Adjunct Professors normally undergo a Mid-Career Appraisal.</td>
<td>Merit, promotion, appraisal reviews not applicable.</td>
<td>Reviewed upon reappointment for pre-6; every three years for post-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>No more than half of Adjunct appointment may be supported by State funds; should be primarily supported by non-State funds.</td>
<td>State-funded</td>
<td>State-funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## C. COMPARISON OF RESEARCH TITLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional Research Series</th>
<th>Project Series</th>
<th>Specialist Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Engage directly in independent research. The ability to secure funding does not automatically qualify individuals for appointments to the Professional Research series.</td>
<td>Make significant and creative contributions to a research project in the sciences or other areas such as history or art. May be ongoing members of a research team or may be employed for a limited period of time to contribute high-level skills to a specific research or creative program.</td>
<td>Provide technical or specialized expertise (e.g., with instrumentation and research equipment) in the planning and execution of a research project or projects. May be ongoing members of a research team or may be employed for a limited period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independence</strong></td>
<td>Function as independent investigators and have the major responsibility and leadership for their research programs. The ability to sustain an independent research program is a necessary but not sufficient criterion for the title of research (e.g., Physicist).</td>
<td>Not required to have or develop an independent research program, but may work independently. Ordinarily will carry out research or creative programs with supervision of a member of the Professorial or Professional Research Series.</td>
<td>Will work under the Director of an MRU/ORU or a member of the Professorial, Professional Research, or Project (e.g., Scientist) series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PI Status</strong></td>
<td>Normally will be PIs. Appointment to the title of Research (e.g., Physicist) may be made to individuals who are not PIs, if they satisfy the research qualification and accomplishments equivalent to those in the Professorial ranks. The award of PI status does not in itself justify an appointment to the Professional Research series.</td>
<td>consistent with campus policy, may not serve as PIs but may serve as Co-Pis with members of the Professorial or Professional Research series. The Chancellor may grant an exception to allow an appointee to be a PI.</td>
<td>Not expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differences Between Series</strong></td>
<td>Used for appointees who engage in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series and not for appointees whose duties are limited to making significant and creative contributions to a research project or to providing technical assistance to a research activity.</td>
<td>Do not demonstrate the same capacity for fully independent research or research leadership required of the Professional Research and Professorial series. Expected to have a broader range of knowledge and competency and a higher level of independence than appointees in the Specialist series.</td>
<td>Perform work that is technical in nature and need not have as broad a range of knowledge and competency or execute original research as do appointees in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series. The Specialist series is not an entry level into the Project series.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These rules apply to the following series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, University Professor, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential of Security of Employment (LPSOE), Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE), Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (SLPSOE), Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (SLSOE), Professional Research, Specialist, Project, Librarian.

A. FILE AND RECORD MAINTENANCE

Personnel Review File ("case file")
The personnel review file is maintained by the University. It is the collection of materials pertaining to an individual for purposes of consideration of active personnel reviews/actions. Final administrative decisions concerning personnel actions shall be based solely upon the material contained in the individual’s personnel review file.

Academic Personnel Records
The Academic Personnel Record is the individual’s official University file that is kept in the Academic Personnel Office. It includes the following two categories of materials:

1. Personnel Review Record
All materials related to past and current personnel actions from appointment through separation from UC Merced. Includes:

- Letters of evaluation received by the University with the understanding that they were confidential and not to be shown unredacted to the candidate;
- The Unit Chair’s letter setting forth a personal recommendation in connection with an academic personnel action concerning the individual; and
- Reports, recommendations, and other related documents from campus and Unit committees concerning evaluations in connection with an academic personnel action.

2. Other Academic Personnel Records
Other academic personnel records pertaining to the individual as an employee of the University may include the following materials:

- Miscellaneous correspondence
- Sabbatical records
- Documents relating to administrative appointments
- Employment history other than that contained in the personnel review file
- Retirement documents
- Payroll documents
- Academic Senate correspondence concerning the individual
- Other similar information.

Such materials shall not be referred to or considered in connection with a recommendation or decision in a personnel action involving an individual unless they are made part of the individual’s personnel review file by an appropriate administrative officer. Records regarding leaves other than sabbaticals are maintained in a separate file in APO.
B. ACCESS BY OTHER PARTIES

University policy and State and Federal laws recognize the individual’s right to privacy, as well as the public’s right to know about the governance of public institutions. In order to clarify access rights of the individual to whom academic personnel records and personnel review files pertain and third-party disclosure rights, University policy classifies information as confidential, non-confidential, personal, or non-personal.

All requests for access to information in academic personnel records should be made to the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF). This applies to all files, wherever they are maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Candidate Access Policy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Solicited internal or external student/colleague letters of evaluation requested by Candidate (usually not by formal letter)</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>May receive redacted copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsolicited internal or external letters of evaluation not submitted by Candidate</td>
<td>Not part of case discussion &amp; not placed in Case File</td>
<td>No Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Candidate- or School-suggested external letters of evaluation</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>May receive redacted copies before Unit recommendation or after final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unit letters/Case Analysis</td>
<td>Non-Confidential &amp; Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy with committee membership redacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unsolicited letters added to file by Candidate</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transmittal memo (Unit Vote)</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>May receive redacted copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dean's letter</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact after final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Qualifications of outside letter writers</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>No Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teaching Evaluations</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Request from CAP for Additional Information</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy and has opportunity to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Additional information submitted by Unit or by Chair on behalf of Unit and certified by Candidate</td>
<td>Non-Confidential &amp; Confidential</td>
<td>May receive copy of additional information submitted for further consideration; may receive copy of redacted confidential material; may request opportunity to respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CAP Report</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>May receive redacted copy after the final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Chancellor’s or Designee’s Final Decision</td>
<td>Non-Confidential</td>
<td>Receives copy after the final decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Procedural Safeguard Statement ensures that the candidate is given the opportunity to exercise his or her rights to access.
ACCESS BY ALL OTHER PARTIES

Access by University officers and employees to confidential information shall be strictly limited to those officers and employees who need such access in the performance of their officially assigned duties, provided that such access is related to the purpose for which the information was acquired. Governmental agencies have access to confidential information when required by State or Federal law.

REQUESTS FOR MODIFICATION TO ACADEMIC PERSONNEL RECORDS

An individual may request, in writing, from the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF):

- That a statement of fact in an Academic Personnel Record pertaining to that individual be corrected;
- That material be deleted if it was improperly included; or
- That a statement by the individual, in response to material in the Academic Personnel Record of the individual, be included in that record.

All requests from individuals that their own records be amended (other than routine updates, etc.) should be put in writing and should include a clear statement of the change desired and the reason for it. The statement may be sent to the VPF via the Academic Personnel Office.

Within a reasonable time period (not more than 30 calendar days), the VPF will, with advice from the Committee on Academic Personnel, determine whether the requested correction or deletion will be made. In any event, the individual has the right to have inserted into the appropriate record any statement he or she wishes in response to or commenting upon the challenged material.

D. REFERENCES: UNIVERSITY POLICY

APM 158, Rights of Academic Appointees, Including Rights Regarding Records

APM 160, Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of

APM 160, Appendix A, Supplemental Information Regarding Academic Policy 160

APM 160, Appendix B, Additional Academic Personnel Policies Pertaining to Academic Records

APM 220-80, Recommendations and Review - General Procedures
Faculty members must manage their outside professional and non-professional activities so that they do not interfere with their University obligations, ensuring in addition that their compensated outside activities do not exceed the time limits established in APM 025 (Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members).

This section describes the implementation of APM 025 on the UC Merced campus and applies to all UC Merced faculty as defined in APM 110-4(15) except those covered by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with an exclusive bargaining agent. The latter appointees should adhere to the policies and procedures set forth in the MOU.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES

Categories of compensated outside professional activities are defined in APM 025. Depending upon the category that compensated outside professional activities fall into, they may require prior administrative approval, adherence to the time limit, and/or annual reporting. The chart below summarizes the requirements of each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Provost/EVC Approval</th>
<th>Adherence to Time Limit</th>
<th>Annual Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category I</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category II</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category III</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All members of the Academic Senate are required to report annually on their participation in Category I and Category II outside professional activities, regardless of whether they engaged in such activities. This is accomplished through completion of the Annual Report of Category I and II Compensated Outside Professional Activities (APM 025 Appendix D).

The relevant Dean or designated Unit Chair must establish and maintain a procedure to request and receive an Annual Report from each faculty member by November 1 of each year, even if there is no activity to report. He or she is also responsible for maintaining the original reports and forwarding a copy to the Academic Personnel Office (APO).

In the Dean’s Recommendation Memo for any faculty member’s academic personnel advancement action, the Dean must certify that the appointee has complied with all APM 025 requirements during the review period. No advancement case will be considered unless there is certification from the Dean that the required reports have been submitted in accordance with this policy.

PRIOR APPROVAL

Faculty members must request and receive prior approval from their School’s Dean whenever activities are likely to raise issues of conflict of commitment (Category I), or when the faculty member intends to involve UC Merced students in his or her outside professional activities. Prior approval requests should be submitted via the Unit Chair to the Dean on the APM 025 Appendix B form. The Dean or designated Unit Chair must establish and maintain a procedure to request and receive prior approval forms. Copies of all reviewed forms should be forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office. Requests must be submitted to the Dean at least 30 days in advance of expected activity, and no activity may be undertaken without prior approval.
RECORD MAINTENANCE

After approval by the Dean, Annual Reports will be kept on file at the School or Unit level, and a copy will be sent to APO. When reviewing personnel cases, Deans must certify that all candidates have complied with APM-025 requirements during the review period.

Under University policy, the Annual Reports are considered to be non-confidential in nature.

As part of the implementation of APM 025, the Office of the President periodically requests summaries and conducts audits of campus reports on outside professional activities to ensure compliance.
BACKGROUND
Unit opinion on proposed academic personnel actions is in part obtained and reported by means of taking votes. These votes should be recorded in such a manner that subsequent review levels receive information about Unit opinion in a coherent and understandable form. Regulations governing Unit voting rights may be found in the Manual of the Systemwide Academic Senate under Bylaw 55. See the Standing Order of the Regents 105.1 for the organization of the Academic Senate.

SUMMARY OF BYLAW 55
Bylaw 55 stipulates that each Unit determines its own form of administrative organization, but that no Unit may be organized in a way that would deny to any of its faculty who are voting members of the Academic Senate (emeritus faculty are an exception; see “Extension of Voting Privileges” below) the right to vote on substantial Unit questions, excepting only certain personnel actions, as indicated below:

DESIGNATION OF VOTING RIGHTS
a. All tenured faculty in a Unit have the right to vote on all new Unit appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate. Prior to such a vote, all the Unit members of the Academic Senate must be afforded an opportunity to make their opinions known to the voters.

b. Professors have the right to vote on all cases of promotion to the ranks of Professor and 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.

c. Professors and Associate Professors have the right to vote on all cases of promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer SOE, and Lecturer SOE. Associate Professors may vote on merit reviews of other Associate Professors.

d. 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. (NOTE: On this campus, Acting Assistant Professors are often appointed with the intention that they be regularized as soon as they complete all PhD requirements. Therefore, the Unit vote on the original appointment is considered sufficient consultation, unless the Unit indicates otherwise at the time.)

e. All cases of non-reappointments or terminations of Assistant Professors or Lecturers PSOE and Senior Lecturers PSOE shall be voted upon by those faculty members eligible to vote on promotions to the ranks of Associate Professor or appointments to the titles Lecturer SOE and Senior Lecturer SOE, respectively.

f. In none of the instances specified above may the right to vote be delegated to a committee. The actual method of voting shall be determined by the eligible voters, subject to the provision that no voter may be denied the option to require a secret ballot.

g. The tenured faculty members of a Unit shall establish the method by which personnel matters other than those listed above are determined. The method adopted must have the approval of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) or its equivalent.

EXTENSION OF VOTING PRIVILEGES
Emeriti/ae as a class may be accorded the right to vote on all non-personnel matters within a Unit from which they have retired upon a majority vote by secret ballot of the total non-emeritus/a Academic Senate membership of that Unit. Voting privileges on personnel matters within any Unit may be extended to emergi/ae as a class and/or to other Academic Senate members (e.g., Assistant Professors) of that Unit 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 Article B of Bylaw 55 (summarized above). Any extensions of the voting privilege must remain in
effect for at least one year; thereafter, any faculty member entitled to a vote under the provisions of Article B may request reconsideration. Votes to reaffirm or to withdraw extensions of the voting privilege shall be taken by the appropriate procedure just specified above. Neither emeriti/ae nor other Academic Senate members to whom voting privileges have been extended shall participate in any vote to extend or to withdraw voting privileges with respect to personnel matters.

Emeriti/ae on Recall status retain voting rights on all academic matters except personnel matters. Voting on personnel matters may be extended to Recalled Emeriti/ae as a class by the procedures described above.

UC MERCED POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Statements made or positions taken by individual faculty members regarding personnel matters are deemed confidential. Faculty members should not reveal to anyone, whether through inadvertence or by design, any matters expected to be confidential, including the opinions of others in the Unit and the identities of external evaluators.

Unit Chairs should review Unit voting procedures as filed on the Statement of School/Unit Voting Procedures form (available from the Deans’ Offices). A new form should be submitted to the Academic Personnel Office no later than November 1 of each year. If no changes are proposed, it is not necessary to hold a vote, but a new form should be submitted to APO for the record.

The method of taking votes is at the discretion of the Unit. It is important that this be done in a way that will result in a clear picture of faculty opinion about the proposed action. That opinion must be reported in such a way that those who review the case will be able to understand it without having to send the case file back to the Unit for clarification.

Physical presence of faculty members in Academic Units is required in discussions intended to lead to a vote of the Unit on all academic personnel actions, including appointments, merits, promotions, and appraisal reviews. [Each Unit should be able to determine what is “physical presence” via their voting procedures.] Physical presence (in addition to attending the meeting in person) can be defined as: participation in real time by phone, Skype, video-conferencing, or any other technology that allows the faculty member’s voice to be “present and counted” for the deliberations, discussions, decisions, and/or voting.

Emails, written letters, or other non-real time modes of “participation” submitted after the faculty discussion should not be attached to the transmittal letter. They are allowed, however, to be submitted beforehand, when a faculty member requests that the Unit Chair approve an exception due to circumstances preventing the faculty member from being physically present for the discussion (e.g., faculty member cannot attend the meeting wherein the personnel action is to be discussed and voted upon for work-related or family emergency reasons). In these cases, the Unit Chair or proceeding will determine the accepted mode of “participation” (for example, the Chair could read the absent faculty member’s email to those “physically” present in real time).
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2011: GENERAL GUIDELINES

A. FUNDING (APM 220-16)

It is the policy of the University of California that no appointment shall be made to a title in the Professor series unless there is an appropriately budgeted provision (“FTE”) for the appointment. No appointment should be forwarded for review unless such a provision, funded at the proposed salary level, is available.

B. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

A thorough and determined search must be made both inside and outside the University for candidates, including candidates who are minorities, women, handicapped persons, disabled veterans, and Vietnam-era veterans. Unit Chairs must ensure compliance with the letter and spirit of the affirmative action policy. Formal paperwork documenting the search is required for all appointments to Senate titles.

C. EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY (APM 530)

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of November 6, 1986, requires that all employees provide verification of eligibility to work in the United States. The federal government has designated the I-9 Form, Employment Eligibility Verification, as the document to be used in this verification process.

During recruitment, special attention must be given to the employment eligibility of any foreign nationals in the pool to be sure that such candidates obtain visas which allow compensation for services. Appropriate visas can take several months to obtain, and the Search Chair should ensure that the School staff and Academic Personnel Office are notified as early as possible of a potential visa case. While an application for a visa cannot be finalized until the appointment is approved, preliminary inquiries can in some cases help in starting the visa process.

Questions should be referred to the Office of International Affairs (OIA).

D. TIMING OF OFFER

Following University policy, UC Merced policy requires that offers be made before April 1 to candidates from other UC campuses (APM 510-16.c) and by April 30 to all candidates holding faculty positions at other institutions that are members of the AAU and/or are in California (APM 500-16.c and APM 501-80.a) if they are to be effective in the following academic year (i.e., an offer must be made no later than April 30, 2011 for an appointment starting July 1, 2011). These dates are the deadlines for formal offers to be made by the University.

E. RECRUITING FROM ANOTHER UC CAMPUS (APM 510-0 and 510-80)

University policy states that it is the obligation of those involved in the consideration of an intercampus recruitment to pay due regard to the welfare of the University as a whole as well as to the wishes of the particular appointee and to the effect of the proposed transfer on the two campuses directly concerned. Prior to the initiation of negotiation for an intercampus recruitment, the Chancellors of the two campuses involved shall be informed of the proposed transfer. Ten working days before making the formal written offer of appointment to the candidate, the Chancellor of the hiring campus shall indicate such intention to the Chancellor of the campus from which the appointee will be transferring. In all cases, the Chancellor of the campus to which the appointee is transferring shall also notify the Office of the President.

In the event that any unit at UCM considers recruiting a faculty member from another UC campus, the Academic Personnel Office will coordinate the notification of the other UC campus. The Academic Personnel Office should be notified as early in the process as is reasonably possible, and certainly before any offer is made.

The salary offered by the recruiting campus can be no more than one step, or the equivalent of one step, above the faculty member’s current salary. If the faculty member’s salary is already an off-scale salary, the recruiting campus may offer the next higher step along with the same off-scale increment. If the home campus is in the process of granting a salary increase to become effective July 1, the recruiting campus may offer one step above that increase, pending approval by the home campus. The home campus is permitted to make a counter offer.
equivalent to that of the recruiting campus. If both the home and the recruiting campuses agree, higher salary offers may be made. An offer which includes a promotion is permitted if the salary offer is no more than one step above the current salary rate, including off-scale, as described above.

If the faculty member being recruited by another UC campus is also being recruited by an outside institution, then either the home and/or the recruiting UC campus may make a counter offer higher than that described above in order to compete with the outside offer.

In any proposed intercampus recruitment, either Chancellor may request mediation or intervention by the Office of the President.

F. COMPETING OFFERS TO AN OUTSIDE CANDIDATE FROM TWO OR MORE UC CAMPUSES (APM 500-16-g)

University policy requires that the same level of salary will be offered by each campus with coordination of the appropriate salary level to be arranged by the Office of the President. The following procedure is to be followed to make this coordination possible: when it becomes known to any campus administrative officer that another campus of the University is also recruiting an individual for an appointment, that officer is obliged to inform the Chancellor who shall, in turn, inform the Office of the President. The latter will then consult with each of the Chancellors concerned with the matter and will arrange for the determination of a single appropriate salary.
2012: RECRUITMENT

PROCEDURES

A. FTE REQUESTS
Before recruiting can begin, the Academic Unit’s FTE request must be approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor.

B. SEARCH COMMITTEE
The Search Chair is appointed by the Unit Chair in consultation with the Dean (or designee) of the School in which the Unit resides. The Unit Chair then nominates the Search Committee members in consultation with the Search Chair. Each Unit should make provisions for soliciting input on the membership of the Committee from the faculty of the Unit. Following best practices for faculty recruitment, the Dean should verify that the composition of the Search Committee represents a diverse cross-section of the faculty. Tools for Search Committees are available on the APO website.

In cross-Unit searches, the Provost/EVC will develop a process to select a Committee made up of members from appropriate Units, in consultation with Deans and Chairs.

C. ADVERTISING
After consultation with the Chair of the Academic Unit, the Search Committee develops the Search Plan, creates advertisements, and develops an external job advertisement list that fulfills diversity goals. All Professor series appointments must be advertised nationally in suitable academic or professional publications and must allow at least 30 days following the appearance of the advertisement for interested applicants to apply.

If the Search Committee wishes to extend the position beyond the original closing date, the Search Chair must inform APO of the new closing date prior to the date the position closes. In exceptional cases, a closed search may be reopened for a period of 15 days at the request of the Search Chair, with approval from the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

Generally, advertisements should contain the following: program or Academic Unit name, position level, teaching duties (if appropriate), preferred research area, and necessary qualifications and experience as well as the following affirmative action statement:

*The University of California, Merced is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer with a strong institutional commitment to the achievement of diversity among its faculty, staff and students. The University is supportive of dual-career couples.*

The Academic Personnel Office is responsible for approving all ads and recruitments posted through AP Recruit. The Search Chair, or designee, prepares and submits the AP Recruit - Search Plan for approval. Approved ads will be posted in external journals and websites by School staff.

D. POOL OF CANDIDATES: DIVERSITY
As the search progresses, the Search Chair, Unit Chair and Dean review statistical applicant pool data throughout the search and pursue additional diversity search methods as needed. At the end of the recruiting period and prior to the beginning of the selection process, it is important to determine that the pool of candidates is in reasonable proportion to the availability and that appropriate affirmative action search measures have been taken. The authority to postpone, extend, or cancel a search for reasons of inadequate diversity lies with the Dean. Please consult the University of California Diversity website.

Additionally, all applicants must be required to submit a Statement of Contributions to Diversity.
E. SELECTION PROCESS

After the closing date of the search has passed, the formal application review process can begin when the Search Committee, in consultation with the Dean and the Unit Chair, determines that the pool composition is appropriate. Following this, the Search Committee selects a short list of candidates for campus interviews. This group of candidates should demonstrate: 1. strong qualifications consistent with the call for applications, and 2. reasonable diversity based on availability in the field or subfield. This short list is forwarded to the Dean for formal approval. The Dean, after consultation with the search committee, has the authority to postpone, extend, or cancel a search for reasons of inadequate diversity on the short list. In this event, the Dean shall provide a written justification describing the process leading up to the decision to close the search.

After the campus interviews, the Search Committee recommends a final candidate. After review of the application file, the Unit votes on the proposed appointment according to the Unit’s approved voting procedures. The Appointment File is forwarded to APO for preparation for review by the Committee on Academic Personnel, according to procedures outlined in MAPP 2013 below.

F. RETENTION OF RECORDS

Complete records of the search, including applicant files and any Search Committee documents, must be maintained for 4 years after the end of the fiscal year in which the specific recruitment activity has ended. The Search Committee Chair completes the disposition reasons for all candidates. The Academic Personnel Office is the office of record for the recruitment records.

G. WAIVER OF RECRUITMENT

Occasionally, an opportunity to hire someone of outstanding ability, or under a special circumstance, will arise. It may not be possible to comply with all affirmative action procedures. If this is clearly the case, a search waiver may be requested through AP Recruit. Such a request may be granted if a strong case can be made that there is a unique and very important opportunity for UCM at hand (e.g., a highly-distinguished faculty member, spousal hire, President’s Postdoc. See the Search Waiver Guidelines for information). Care should be exercised in requesting exceptions in order that their value does not become eroded by too-frequent use. The Chair of the Academic Unit proposing the appointment shall consult the Dean to determine if an FTE may be allocated. If there is approval from the Provost/EVC, the appointment process follows the standard procedures outlined in MAPP 2013.
2013: APPOINTMENT

An appointment (as distinguished from a reappointment, merit increase, or promotion) occurs when a person is employed with the University for the first time, or when a University employee is appointed to a title in a different personnel program or academic series. This section will cover some of the University and campus policies pertaining to the appointment of members of the Professorial series; however, all persons involved in the appointment review process must also refer to policies contained in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) and pertinent sections of this manual for more detailed statements of policies affecting the use of titles, criteria for appointment, affirmative action, the review process, etc.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT FILES

A. AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointments</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor Step I-III, including Acting</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor IV and above</td>
<td>Provost/EVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor, Professor</td>
<td>Provost/EVC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. SALARIES (APM 600)

Academic Salary Scales

Academic salaries are based on salary scales. These are issued and published by the University of California Office of the President Academic Personnel Office and can be found here.

Rank and Step

When establishing the rank and step for a proposed appointee, a Unit should give due consideration to the candidate’s experience, accomplishments, and standing relative to others at the same level in the same discipline at other UC campuses.

Off-Scale Salaries

Off-scale salaries may be used when necessary to meet competitive conditions. Per APM 620-14, all academic titles except for student titles may be eligible for off-scale salaries. Off-scale salaries for acting appointees are determined administratively in the same manner as for regular ranks. If counter offers arise during the course of negotiations, the Unit should document these offers.

Effective Date of Employment

The effective date of an appointment for purposes of payroll and other record-keeping is the first day on which salary commences. The beginning date of service for a new appointee, or of service in a new title for a continuing appointee, is the first day on which the appointee is required to be on duty under the terms of the appointment. The effective date is always either January 1 or July 1. An academic-year appointment is also known as a nine-month appointment and refers to the period in which an academic appointee renders services, i.e., the academic year, from the beginning of the Fall term through the end of the Spring term (APM 600-4-c).

C. POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

If the Search Chair and the candidate proposed for appointment are close collaborators, the Search Chair should not participate in the preparation of the appointment case file. Another independent senior faculty member should oversee the process and prepare the Case Analysis.

If a recommended appointment will result in a near relative being employed in the same Academic Unit as an existing faculty member, the existing faculty member may not participate in any academic review actions affecting the near relative. (For the definition of “near relative,” refer to APM 520: Employment of Near Relatives.) The transmittal Memo for the appointment case should state that the existing faculty member did not participate in the recruitment or vote on the appointment of the near relative, and will not participate in any future academic review decisions for the candidate if he or she is appointed.

If the Unit Chair or any faculty member contributing to the file has a financial interest in a company employing a potential faculty member, that information should be included in the file, and such individuals must recuse themselves from contributing to the appointment case file.

APPOINTMENT FILE DOCUMENTATION & PROCEDURES
The documentation required to support a recommendation for appointment to a Professorial title includes recruitment data, candidate’s documents, extramural letters of reference, the Case Analysis, the Transmittal Memo, the Dean’s Letter, and the Salary Justification Memo.

Appointment files should be documented as carefully as promotion files, addressing all relevant criteria and providing reviewers with appropriate evidence of excellence in all categories of review.

A. RECRUITMENT DOCUMENTATION

Detailed recruiting and equal opportunity and diversity procedures are described in MAPP 2012.

- A copy of the job advertisement from AP Recruit should be included with the Case File.

*Note: It is useful when the Unit includes in the Case Analysis a statement about the scope of the search.*

B. CANDIDATE’S DOCUMENTS

The candidate provides the following key documents:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Publications – Publications should be listed on the Curriculum Vitae and should be numbered in sequence to the extent possible. Copies of the most significant publications, reviews, and/or exhibits should be included whenever possible, in either printed or electronic form. For easy reference, each publication should be numbered as it is numbered on the CV.
3. Student Evaluations – Copies of individual student evaluations should be included if available.
4. Other documents requested by the Unit (e.g., Statement of Teaching Philosophy, Statement of Research).
5. Statement of Contributions to Diversity (APM 210-1.d).

C. EXTRAMURAL LETTERS

Extramural letters of evaluation should be from qualified and distinguished authorities. When letters are handwritten, the Unit is asked to prepare a typed version. Letters in foreign languages should be translated into English.

a. Soliciting Extramural Letters

The solicitation of letters for appointments is done by the School staff working with the Search Committee Chair and the Unit Chair. For appointments at the level of Assistant Professor Steps I-III, three to five letters from candidate-suggested reviewers only are required. For appointments at the levels of Assistant Professor Step IV and above (including all Associate and Full Professor levels), three to four letters from candidate-suggested reviewers and at least three letters from School-suggested reviewers are preferred. Of the School-suggested letters, at least one should be from a UC campus whenever possible. In rare cases, the candidate may identify individuals whom they prefer not to be solicited. Should the Unit decide to solicit from any individual whom the candidate has requested not be contacted, the Case Analysis should explain why that individual was contacted despite the candidate’s request (e.g., best or most knowledgeable in field).

The Search Chair should solicit evaluations from individuals who are experts in the candidate’s field and who are able to provide an objective evaluation of the candidate’s work.

For candidates just completing degree or postdoctoral work and being proposed for entry-level positions, letters from supervisors are appropriate. For appointments at higher levels, however, it is desirable to avoid excessive use of external referees whom the reviewers may not regard as objective evaluators either because they are too close to the candidate professionally (e.g., close collaborators, doctoral supervisors), or because they have a personal relationship with the candidate. Contact between the Chair and individuals from whom letters are being solicited is permissible in order to encourage response after the formal request has been sent, but great care must be taken not to bias or influence the judgement of the referee.

\[1\] Suggestions for increasing response rate for letters of reference:

a) Start soliciting letters as early as possible
b) Informal requests are encouraged
c) Send request from known personage (i.e., Dean or Unit Chair)
d) Do not wait until case materials are perfect
Letters soliciting such external evaluations must contain the following:

- A description of the nature of the position to be filled; e.g., probationary or tenured professorship,
- An explanation of the significance of the level of the position so that the referee can evaluate achievement in relation to UC criteria for appointments, especially at the top steps of the series (VI, VII, VIII and Above Scale),
- A request for analytical review of the candidate’s performance under the applicable criteria and comparison to other scholars in the field at similar rank, and
- The following confidentiality statement:

Although the contents of your letter may be passed on to the candidate at prescribed stages of the review process, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will lack the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the latter. Therefore, information that would identify you, particularly your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of the confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

Referees should be urged to provide critical evaluation and analysis. The letter soliciting evaluations must not contain leading suggestions (e.g., “we need your help to persuade our reviewers that our candidate...”)

b. Sample Letters of Solicitation

Include a sample of the letter sent soliciting outside evaluations in the Case File. If the letters soliciting evaluations from different sources (i.e., for candidate-suggested vs. School-suggested letters) are substantially different, include samples of all such letters.

Sample Solicitation Letters.

c. List of Reviewers

Extramural reviewers who have provided confidential letters of evaluation should not be identified in the case materials except by means of a coded list which indicates the names and qualifications of all those from whom letters were solicited. It is also important to list letter writers who were asked to supply an evaluation but did not respond. It should not be assumed that non-response means non-support for the candidate. When referring to a particular letter in the Case Analysis or any other case materials, the letter writer should be identified by the code assigned on the list (e.g., “Reviewer A). Sample lists of Reviewers may be found here and here.

D. CASE ANALYSIS

The Case Analysis is prepared by the Search Committee, all of whose members must sign it to certify agreement. Before preparing the Case analysis, writers should consult the “Instructions to the Review Committee” for the appropriate series (APM 210).

The Case Analysis should 1) set out and explain the recommendation of the Search Committee for appointment, and 2) should support the recommendation by evaluating analytically, not merely describing, the candidate’s performance and/or potential in each of the in each of the areas of responsibility expected from UC faculty: teaching; research and creative activity; professional competence and activity; and University and public service. The candidate’s past or potential contributions to diversity should also be addressed. (APM 210-1.d). The Case Analysis should be professional, objective, balance and concise. The assessment put forth in the Case Analysis should be supported by evidence from extramural letters, although excessive quotation, as well as rhetorical statements, are to be avoided.

The candidate’s scholarly and/or creative activities should be critically evaluated. The evaluation should provide a careful assessment of the craftsmanship, originality, significance and impact of the candidate’s work. The assessment should not merely state that the work is significant or has had impact. It should indicate what is significant about the work and the nature and extent of impact. Writers should also indicate the relative stature of the candidate in his or her field.

Performances or other creative activities should not merely be listed, they should be evaluated by the Committee. 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, the Committee should attempt to define the candidate’s merit in 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 the candidate’s creativity (APM 210-1.d). Reviews of the work and publications or other outside evaluation should be discussed and copies included in the Case File.

The placement of publications should be addressed. The quality of journals or presses in which work appears can be an important measure of the impact and quality of the candidate’s work. Where the placement is unusual, or may seem so to
reviewers outside the Unit, the Case analysis should discuss the implications of this. For those works that appear in conference proceedings, information about the publication is needed as there is large variation within and amongst disciplines. The information may include, as appropriate, the conference’s acceptance and publication rates, whether the paper was accepted on the basis of title or abstract only, and the archival status of the conference proceedings.

In assessing the types of contracts, grants, or fellowships awarded to the candidate, the Case Analysis should address the importance and the expectations of such support for the particular discipline.

Any Case Analysis proposing Professor, Step VI or above must include a discussion of the candidate’s impact and stature, including national and/or international honors received, election to distinguished societies, and other evidence of the individual’s outstanding leadership in the profession.

E. FACULTY VOTE

The Case Analysis and supporting materials are made available for faculty review for a length of time determined by the Unit, after which the Search Chair (or designee) presents the Case Analysis to the faculty in the Unit and allows for a full discussion. The discussion should focus on the academic merits of the case, and not on any extraneous issues. Affirmative Action policies should be adhered to. [UCM AA Policy and UC AA Policy]. At the conclusion of this discussion, a vote is taken according to the Unit’s bylaws and voting procedures. Comments are not permitted on the ballots, except to give a reason for abstaining (see F. below), as all points of discussion should have been raised beforehand at the group meeting.

F. TRANSMITTAL MEMO

The vote and the faculty discussion are recorded in the Transmittal Memo. The Transmittal Memo is a critical component of the appointment Case File as it is the record of faculty opinion and should include any pertinent discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the case, as well as a recommendation for the rank, step, and effective date of the proposed appointment.

In cases of abstentions or recusals, the Transmittal Memo should provide a reason for these actions whenever possible. Appropriate reasons for abstention concern the voter’s circumstances, such as a lack of familiarity with the field, being prevented from reviewing due to travel or other commitments, or a potential conflict of interest. Inappropriate reasons for abstaining include concerns with the case itself, such as “it is not a strong case,” or “this case should be postponed.”

G. DEAN’S RECOMMENDATION LETTER

The Dean assesses the Transmittal Memo, Case Analysis and other evidence provided in the Case File to ensure that the Unit’s review is fair and rigorous in maintaining University standards. The Dean’s Recommendation Letter should provide an independent evaluation of the case. In the Letter, the Dean puts forth his or her recommendation regarding the appointment and provides additional analysis as needed.

H. SALARY JUSTIFICATION MEMO

In a separate memo, the Dean provides a recommendation as to the salary associated with the proposed appointment, based on the University of California Academic Salary Scales plus any off-scale increment.

NOTE: Skip sections I. and J. if appointment to Assistant Professor Steps I-III.

I. CAP RECOMMENDATION

The entire Case File is forwarded to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) via APO and the Academic Senate Office. CAP will evaluate the case thoroughly based on the expertise of its membership, and will provide a recommendation on the proposed appointment to the Provost/EVC in the form of a memo from the Committee. The CAP memo records the vote as well as the opinion of the Committee, and is therefore a confidential document.

J. PROVOST’S DECISION/ACADEMIC REVIEW REPORT

The Chancellor has delegated final authority on all appointment decisions to the Provost/EVC, who will take into account all previous levels of review and the recommendations provided. The Provost/EVC, in consultation with the Vice Provost for the Faculty, will arrive at a final decision regarding the appointment, and this decision will be put forth in an Academic Review Report.

K. APPOINTMENT LETTER
Should the decision be a positive one, the Provost’s Office (via APO) will issue an official Appointment Letter to the candidate, which will be presented in tandem with the Dean’s Offer Letter that sets out the specific terms and conditions of the appointment.

OTHER APPOINTMENTS

A. SPLIT APPOINTMENTS

Whenever a candidate has a split appointment (with the FTE shared between two academic Units), a joint committee comprised of faculty from both Units decides which will be the lead Unit. The lead Unit will write the single Case Analysis. The Case Analysis covers the candidate’s research, teaching, professional activity, University and public service, and contributions to diversity from both Units’ perspectives. Each Unit will vote separately and prepare separate Transmittal Memos. If two Schools are involved, each Dean will write his or her own Dean’s Recommendation Letter and Salary Justification Memo.

B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS WITHOUT SALARY

An individual appointed to a faculty title in one Unit may be invited to hold a joint appointment without salary in another Unit, with the approval of the secondary Unit’s faculty. Such an appointment or reappointment requires a Transmittal Memo with the vote of the faculty of the Unit in which the without-salary appointment is held. These appointments may be renewed in tandem with the individual’s regular personnel review.

C. TRANSFER TO ANOTHER UNIT THROUGH FTE REASSIGNMENT

Instances may arise in which a faculty member requests that his or her position be transferred from one Unit to another on campus. Cases of requests to transfer an FTE will be addressed on an ad hoc basis, and decisions will be made by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor after thorough examination of the request and the potential impact on each Unit. The request for a transfer will minimally include:

- Consent of the Unit and Dean that would be receiving the transfer conveyed via Dean’s Letter and Transmittal Memo to the Provost/EVC via APO.
- Consultation with the Dean of the Unit from which the individual is transferring, if in a different School. Dean’s Letter is conveyed to the Provost/EVC via APO.
2014: MERIT, PROMOTION, APPRAISAL REVIEW

The following policies and procedures have been developed to support the University’s goal of retaining high quality faculty. It is the policy of the University to evaluate objectively and thoroughly each candidate for promotion or merit increase.

In 1977 (revised in 1992), the University adopted policies to ensure fairness in the academic review process. These policies are contained in APM 160, including Appendices A and B; APM 200, APM 220, and in the UC Merced Procedural Safeguard Statement. Unit Chairs are responsible for adherence to these policies and procedures and should provide copies of the pertinent APM and MAPP sections to each candidate. Unit Chairs are required to complete the Procedural Safeguard Statement with each candidate.

ELIGIBILITY FOR REVIEW

Faculty members are eligible for advancement or promotion each year; however, advancement usually occurs in conjunction with completion of “normal” time in step (see Chart 2014-I below). Throughout this document, the term “eligible” refers to the completion of normal time in step with the understanding that nothing precludes submission of a file during any review cycle.

The Unit Chair is responsible for making certain that there is an annual informal review of the status and performance of each faculty member in the Unit with regard to her or his time at rank and step (APM 220-80.b). Each faculty member is required to submit a current academic record (i.e., Bio-bibliography) to her or his Dean’s Office each July 15, which will in part form the basis for this review. The Academic Personnel Office is the office of record for all personnel actions, and must be notified by the Unit Chair of any upcoming actions.

Unit Chairs must review each faculty member who is at normal time in step and to make a recommendation for or against advancement. Tenured faculty members may request to defer review, but a deferral request will not be considered as fulfilling the mandatory quinquennial review (see section F below). Such requests must be approved by the Dean. Assistant Professors may not defer.

Note: Appendix 2014-A provides a description and information regarding the Mid-Career Appraisal (MCA), also known as the Formal Review, which is an assessment of an Assistant Professor’s progress toward tenure and is separate from the merit or advancement review. See Appendix 2014-B for information regarding Career Equity Reviews, which do not fall under the category of normal advancement actions.

A. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Service in an “Acting” or a “Visiting” title does not technically count toward years at rank and step, though it does count in determining years toward the eight-year limit to tenure (APM 133). This service, however, should be considered in any full-career review.

Regarding periods of leave, the issue of whether or not a particular leave counts towards time at rank or step, and/or towards the eight-year limit, needs to be resolved in consultation with APO and the Provost/EVC at the time the leave is requested. (MAPP 2015, APM 200-19) Relevant information regarding approved leaves will be recorded in Digital Measures.

B. NORMAL TIME AT STEP

“Normal” time refers to the standard rate at which the majority of faculty will progress through the ranks and steps. Normal merit increases within Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor I-V ranks, although less critical than promotions, are not automatic and do require demonstrated merit. Assistant Professors may only be appointed for two-year terms, and so must be reappointed before the termination of the two-year period. See Appendix 2014-C below for information regarding use of the Short Form for Normal Merits.
### Chart 2014-I – Normal Time in Step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Distinguished Professor</th>
<th>Normal Period of Service at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV*</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 or more years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 or more years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more years</td>
<td>3 or more years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more years</td>
<td>4 or more years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Section E below for "Postponement of Tenure Review" below for timing of the tenure review. Visiting Assistant Professor and Acting Assistant Professor appointment count toward the eight-year rule.

### C. ACCELERATION

Advancement to a higher step before normal eligibility, or advancement of more than one step in one given review, constitutes an “acceleration.” The campus encourages Units to put forward deserving candidates for acceleration to reward cases of superior performance. Acceleration (such as a two-step advancement) can occur during an on-time review, or can be an early advancement to the next step or rank.

Evidence of superior performance compared to faculty at similar rank and step will depend on the field, but should consist of extraordinary achievement in at least one area of review, along with excellent performance in the other areas. Evidence of acceleration-worthy performance should demonstrate *impact*, not merely volume, although exceptional productivity may also be a factor. Examples of evidence may include:

- A substantial increase in scholarly and/or creative activities (such as research publications, exhibitions, or performances), with particular emphasis on scholarly and/or creative activities in significant venues that would have an impact beyond normal expectation. If based primarily on scholarly productivity, acceleration must be based on the activity covered by the review period. That is, for accelerated advancement for a regular merit, review must consider only that activity during the period since the last review; for career actions, the entire record should be considered. In either case, the file should demonstrate achievement commensurate with the rank and step being proposed, produced at a rate that is a multiple of what is considered “normal” (e.g., twice as much for a two-step acceleration).
• Prestigious new awards or other such evidence of peer recognition for the impact of scholarly activity, creative work, or teaching;
• Service to the discipline, University, and/or society that is transformative in nature.

The Unit and Dean are expected to explicitly address the acceleration recommendation in their letters. Multiple-year accelerations and those at the senior Professor and Above-Scale steps should be particularly well-justified. Acceleration recommendations for promotions or to or through a barrier step (Professor Step VI or Above Scale) require extramural letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 2014-II: Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (Tenure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 2014-III: Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. OVERLAPPING STEPS
The normal periods of service are described in APM 220-18-b. Overlapping steps are those in which the published salaries vary by $100. The following are overlapping steps in the Professor series:

Assistant Professor V → Associate Professor I
Assistant Professor VI → Associate Professor II
Associate Professor IV → Professor I
Associate Professor V → Professor II

E. EIGHT-YEAR RULE/TENURE
Per APM 133-0.a and Standing Order 103.9 (the so-called “Eight-Year Rule”), an Assistant Professor shall not be continued after the eighth year of service unless promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. How to calculate eight years of service.

Beginning in the AY 2016-17 review cycle, Assistant Professors on the Merced campus will not be required to go up for tenure review before the seventh year of service. The due dates listed on the Schedule for Academic Personnel Actions are absolutely firm under this schedule; no exceptions will be granted. As with any review, appointees, on the recommendation of their Unit Chairs, may elect to undergo review earlier than the seventh year if the record so warrants. If an “early” review results in a denial of tenure by the Chancellor, however, no further bids for tenure will be allowed and a terminal year will be assigned. (See below for the process for appealing a negative tenure decision). Appointees are encouraged to begin discussions regarding prospects for tenure with their Unit Chairs and mentors after the Mid-Career Assessment (MCA), if not earlier.

The Chancellor may make the decision not to reappoint or promote an Assistant Professor at the time of any pre-tenure review, following the preliminary assessment notification process.

F. MANDATORY QUINQUENNIAL REVIEW
All faculty members must be reviewed at least every five years (APM 200-0) if not reviewed at normal time in step. The purpose of this mandatory quinquennial review is to ensure that the performance of a faculty member is appraised at regular intervals, to assess the faculty member’s productivity, and to identify what more needs to be accomplished for advancement. The focus of this review should be to provide constructive feedback aimed at supporting the candidate’s future success in all areas of assessment. Accordingly, the Normal Merit Short Form may not be used for Quinquennial Reviews.

Quinquennial Reviews will follow the general procedures outlined in APM 220-80 and MAPP 2014. Candidates will be notified of the requirement to undergo review by their Unit Chairs on or about March 1 of the fourth year of service since the last review, and will follow the Schedule for AP Actions in preparing and submitting review materials. The review is to take place during the fifth year. If the candidate does not provide materials upon request, the review will proceed with the documentation available to the Unit and contained in the faculty member’s personnel file, as assembled and submitted by the Unit Chair. It is acknowledged that this documentation might not be current and could therefore affect the outcome of the review.

Based on review of the submitted materials, the reviewing entities will recommend one of three outcomes:

- **Advancement** (merit or promotion): Performance Satisfactory
- **No Advancement**: Performance Satisfactory
- **No Advancement**: Performance Unsatisfactory

If the Quinquennial Review outcome from the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is Performance Unsatisfactory, the faculty member is considered to be not in good standing for the duration of the performance improvement period, and will not be eligible for any academic leaves until the final outcome of the review has been determined by CAP to be Satisfactory. In the case of an outcome of Performance Unsatisfactory, CAP will provide information on the area(s) in which the performance is not consistent with the series, rank and step of the candidate. The Unit Chair and the candidate will be required to submit a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) that sets forth performance expectations to address those areas which have been identified as unsatisfactory. It is assumed that satisfactory performance will be maintained in all other areas. The PIP shall
generally be one year in duration, and must be submitted to the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF), with a copy to the Dean, within thirty calendar days of notification of the review outcome.

The candidate under review must submit a progress report to his or her Unit Chair one year after the PIP is approved. The Chair prepares an assessment of the progress to date and submits the entire report to the Dean’s Office. The Dean provides an assessment and submits the report to CAP via APO. CAP shall make a summary recommendation based on the accomplishments and activities during the improvement plan period. CAP’s recommendation shall consider whether the candidate, upon re-review, should be given a rating of Performance Satisfactory or Performance Unsatisfactory. CAP’s recommendation will be forwarded to the VPF who will make a recommendation to the Provost/EVC, who has final authority on all Quinquennial Reviews. If performance is Satisfactory, then the Quinquennial Review is considered complete and the candidate will be eligible for academic review in the next appropriate review cycle for his or her rank and step. If performance is Unsatisfactory, then further action that is consistent with APM 075 will be undertaken.

Upon discussion between the Unit Chair and the candidate, a change in series may be considered during the review period or subsequent period of improvement if it is determined that the candidate’s performance would satisfactorily meet the criteria in a different series (APM 075-II.A). A change of series must meet all of the relevant policy requirements. Upon approval of this request by the Provost/EVC, a Case File for the new appointment would be prepared and submitted for review. Alternatively, APM 005, “Privileges and Duties of Members of the Faculty,” provides the possibility of an increase in teaching load for faculty members who are “giving little or no time to activities of other types.”

PREPARATION OF THE CASE REVIEW FILE

**Note:** For “normal” merit reviews, use of the so-called Short Form is permissible. See Appendix 2014-C below for information.

Once a faculty member has been deemed eligible for an Academic Personnel action, he or she is expected to assemble a file of documentation supporting the proposed action. (In some cases the faculty member may be permitted to defer review; see Eligibility for Review above). This file includes: summary bio-bibliographies from the period to be reviewed; curriculum vitae; self-statement; publications or other creative work; and teaching evaluations and syllabi.

It is the candidate’s and the Unit Chair’s responsibility to prepare a file that presents the scholarly and intellectual contributions of the candidate in each area of review. Review will be based only on what is contained in the file. It is in the candidate’s interest to provide all pertinent material and information to the Unit and to be certain that the file is complete.

It is the expectation of the Deans, CAP and the VPF that all faculty having advancement cases will provide their updated material to the Unit/Dean’s Office as early as possible. Deadlines for submission of materials are established by the Schools and must be adhered to in order to meet Academic Personnel deadlines. Cooperation in providing information for one’s personnel file is a professional obligation without which the review process cannot be initiated. If a candidate does not submit materials in a timely fashion, reviewing bodies are under no obligation, except in cases of mandatory reviews, to address the case in that academic year.

A. BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHY AND DIGITAL MEASURES

**Digital Measures** is an online faculty database that assists faculty in tracking teaching, research and service activities. Once a faculty member’s data are entered into the system, she or he can extract from the database a subset of information to produce a Bio-bibliography in the format required by CAP. Use of Digital Measures, while not mandatory, is strongly encouraged. In any case, use of the CAP-approved format is required.
The Bio-bibliography should clearly indicate which new activities and publications should be credited since the last review. Articles “in press” are credited as accepted for publication and cannot be counted in later reviews as new activities. If there are joint publications, it is important that the role of the faculty member in the research be described and defined.

B. PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Copies of all publications, reviews and/or exhibits, including work in press, should be included for the period under review. Abstracts, book reviews, and letters published in professional journals should be grouped separately. In the case of “in press” or “accepted” work, an acceptance letter from the publisher should be included. For easy reference, publications must be numbered the same on the bio-bibliography as on the curriculum vitae.

For actions that do not require a career review, the general rule is that evidence may only be counted once and only in the review period to which the evidence pertains. In some instances, determining the review period is fairly straightforward; for example, a grant should be included in the review period in which it was awarded. For publications, the relevant review period can be less apparent because a research manuscript can be described in four stages: “in preparation,” “submitted,” “accepted (or in press),” and “published (or in print).” The Case File should never pay attention to or count manuscripts that are in the “in progress” or “submitted” status. Both “accepted” and “published” statuses can be relevant to a review period, but any given manuscript can only be referred to or counted in one review period. In other words, if a Case Analysis or other materials in the Case File refer to or count a manuscript when it is “accepted” in one review cycle, it may not be referred to or counted in the next, even if its status has changed to “published.”

For actions that require a career review, all scholarly, teaching and service evidence are pertinent to the review and may be addressed in the Case File. This includes materials prior to an individual’s appointment at UC Merced as well as research that has not yet been published or grants that are not yet funded. Candidates should be cautioned, however, that individual items may only be counted in one review and may not be submitted for evaluation in subsequent reviews (until the next career review). Careful consideration, therefore, should be given when determining whether to put forth materials that are in the “submitted” or “in progress” stages. Should the status of these items change to “in press,” “published,” or “funded” during the next or subsequent review period, the items will not be viewed as new work by CAP and thus will not be given any credit until the next full career review.

In their first reviews, new appointees (i.e., those undergoing their first merit reviews at UC Merced) may include materials from the period between the date of their application and the date of appointment. This is intended to capture and give due credit for work that was not included on the CV submitted with the application for appointment but that dates from the period before the actual start date of the appointment.

C. SELF-STATEMENT

The self-statement is a narrative summary of the candidate’s accomplishments in the four evaluative areas (teaching, research or creative activity, professional activity and University and public service) (APM 210-1.d) during the review period. It should be viewed as a supplement to or enhancement of the information contained in the Bio-bib and curriculum vitae, not merely a recap of material provided elsewhere. The self-statement is an opportunity for the candidate to interpret and contextualize his or her career for all reviewers.

D. TEACHING MATERIALS

Unit chairs must gather and present sufficient evidence to ensure thorough, competent review of teaching. At a minimum, student evaluations for regularly scheduled classes, course syllabi, and an evaluation of graduate student mentoring by the candidate’s Graduate Group chair(s) should be included in the Case File. Other evidence of teaching, such as peer evaluations, assessment of learning outcomes, or other assessments may be included. Participation in program learning outcome assessment is a teaching activity; therefore, evidence of a
faculty member’s contributions should be included in a discussion of teaching. Candidates are encouraged, in their self-statements, to highlight any use of formal or informal assessment practices to refine teaching activities, curriculum design, pedagogy, or other aspects of instruction or the instructional environment.

E. EXTRAMURAL LETTERS

If the proposed action requires solicitation of extramural letters of reference from experts in the candidate’s field, the eligible faculty member should submit a list of proposed referees to the School’s AP staff by the end of Spring Semester. Letters of reference are required for all appointments and promotions, and for advancement to Professor, Step VI and Professor, Above Scale. The Unit Chair shall then solicit letters from the candidate-suggested list as well as from a list of School-suggested reviewers. Schools should obtain, at the very least, three letters from the candidate’s list of potential external reviewers and three letters from the School’s own list of potential external reviewers.

Extramural reviewers should be selected from academic or research institutions with standards comparable to the University of California. Preferably, two or more letters should come from individuals at UC campuses. The reviewers should normally be full Professors or of equivalent stature, although occasionally it may be appropriate to ask an Associate Professor to provide a letter for an Assistant Professor coming up for tenure. For promotions to the highest levels, such as Professor Step VI and Above Scale, as well as for accelerations, it is helpful to have some letters from within the UC system that speak directly to the issue of the appropriateness of the step and/or the magnitude of the acceleration proposed. Individuals outside the system may not be familiar with the criteria for the highest levels in the UC system. Of course, non-UC letters are also expected because the highest levels require distinction at the national and international level. For normal merit increases up to Professor Step V, the Case Analysis is the primary source of essential evaluative information and letters of reference are generally inappropriate and unnecessary.

Letters soliciting such external evaluations, sent from the School, should contain the following: 1) explanation of the proposed action (essential with Step VI and Above Scale); 2) request for analytical review of the candidate’s performance under the applicable criteria and comparison with other scholars in the field at similar rank; and 3) the following confidentiality statement:

> Although the contents of your letter may be passed on to the candidate at prescribed stages of the review process, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will lack the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the latter. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly your relationship to the candidate, should be placed below the signature block. In any legal proceeding or other situation in which the source of confidential information is sought, the University does its utmost to protect the identity of such sources.

Samples of all solicitation letters sent should be included in the case materials forwarded to APO. **Sample Solicitation Letters.**

The selection of extramural referees for candidates above the Assistant Professor level requires considerable care. Those persons suggesting names of reviewers should keep in mind that letters from former mentors, collaborators, or other persons with whom the candidate has had close associations tend to carry less weight than those from less closely-tied persons. Referees should not be individuals who are known family members or who are business or professional partners. Contact between the Unit Chair and individuals from whom letters are being solicited is permissible in order to encourage response, but care must be taken not to bias or influence the judgment of the referee.

Extramural reviewers who have provided confidential letters of evaluation should not be identified in the case materials except by means of a coded list, included in the Case Review File, which indicates the names and qualifications of all those from whom letters were solicited. It is important to also list potential letter writers who were asked to supply an evaluation but did not respond. When a particular letter is evaluated in the Case Analysis or any other case materials, the letter writer should only be identified by the code assigned on the list (e.g., “Reviewer A”). Sample Lists of Reviewers may be found [here](#) and [here](#).
F. UNSOLICITED LETTERS

Unsolicited letters of evaluation that are added to the file by the candidate are not considered confidential and should be classified as “supplemental material.” Unsolicited letters not submitted by the candidate shall not be part of the case discussion nor placed in the appointment case file. In rare instances where unsolicited letters may be viewed as relevant to the case, they shall be reviewed by the Vice Provost for the Faculty on a case-by-case basis.

G. REQUESTS TO EXCLUDE REVIEWERS

The UC Merced Procedural Safeguard Statement allows candidates for review to request the exclusion of certain persons who might not provide objective evaluations. According to APM 220-80-c, “any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the personnel review file.” Due to UC Merced’s small faculty base and unique campus climate, however, the following directives are to be followed on this campus with regards to this process:

In the vast majority of cases, the Unit honors the request to exclude a certain number of potential letter writers or reviewers. In rare circumstances, when the Unit is not able to honor this request, the list will be forwarded to CAP. For example, a faculty member may be in a field of research represented by a small nationwide community, and the Unit may have no option but to request an evaluation from a person on the list. The list provided by the faculty member would become part of the review file and would go to CAP for information.

A request to exclude an internal faculty member will be sent to the next highest level of review. For example, if the faculty member lists his or her Unit Chair as a person who may not provide an objective evaluation, then the request is shared with the school Dean or Vice Provost for the Faculty. The list would not become part of the review file or go to CAP but, depending on the circumstances, the Vice Provost for the Faculty may decide to discuss the list with the CAP Chair and/or the Provost/EVC.

H. CASE ANALYSIS (AP REVIEW COMMITTEE)

The Case Analysis is prepared by the AP Review Committee, whose members should consult the “Instructions to Review Committees” for the appropriate series. For “normal” merit cases that use the Short Form, the AP Review Committee may when necessary consist of only one member, though this is not preferable. For all other actions (merits which do not use the Short Form, accelerations, MCA cases and promotions), AP Review Committees should consist of more than one member. If a Unit has only one eligible voter for a particular case, then the Committee can be expanded with members from other Units at UC Merced or from other UC campuses.

The Case Analysis should 1) set out and explain the recommendation of the Review Committee for action on a personnel case, and 2) support the recommendation by evaluating analytically, not merely describing, the candidate’s performance in each of the areas of responsibility: teaching; research and creative activity; professional competence and activity; and University and public service. The Case Analysis should be objective, professional, balanced, and concise. The assessment put forth in the Case Analysis should be supported by evidence from the extramural letters, if any, as well as from all of the materials submitted by the candidate, although excessive quotation is to be avoided.

The candidate’s scholarly and/or creative activities should be critically evaluated. The evaluation should provide a careful assessment of the craftsmanship, originality, significance and impact of the candidate’s work. The Analysis should not merely state that the work is significant or has had impact; it should indicate what is significant about the work and the nature and extent of the impact. Writers should also indicate the relative stature of the candidate in his or her field. APM 210-1-d-2 provides specific guidance on discussing and evaluating creative works in particular.

If there is collaborative research, the Case Analysis should describe the relative contributions of the person under review. In addition, the placement of publications should be addressed. The quality of journals or presses
in which work appears can be an important measure of the impact and quality of a candidate’s work. In cases in which the placement is unusual, or may seem so to reviewers outside the discipline, the Case Analysis should discuss the implications of this. For those works that appear in conference proceedings, information about the publication is needed as there is great variation within and amongst the disciplines. The information may include, as appropriate, the conference’s acceptance and publication rates, whether the paper was accepted on the basis of title or abstract only, and the archival status of the conference proceedings.

In assessing the types of contracts, grants or fellowships awarded to the candidate, the Case Analysis should address the importance and the expectations of support for the particular discipline.

Any Case Analysis proposing Professor, Step VI or above must include a discussion of the candidate’s professional impact and stature, including national and/or international honors received, election to distinguished societies, and other evidence of the candidate’s outstanding leadership in the profession. Proposals for accelerated actions must likewise explicitly address the grounds for the acceleration.

I. TRANSMITTAL LETTER (FACULTY VOTE)

The Case Analysis and supporting materials are made available to the appropriate Unit’s faculty for a length of time specified in each Unit’s voting procedures (typically five days). At the conclusion of this review period, the Unit Chair (or designee) presents the Case Analysis to the faculty and allows for a full discussion. This discussion should focus only on the merits of the case materials provided. The discussion culminates in a vote of all eligible voting members, according to the Unit’s bylaws and voting procedures.

The vote and the faculty discussion are recorded in the Transmittal Letter. The Transmittal Letter is a critical component of the Case File and should include any pertinent arguments regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the case, as well as a recommendation for the step and effective date of the proposed action. Dissenting Unit members have the right to have a minority report included with the Transmittal Memo; however, a minority report should not be submitted unless, after good-faith efforts by all parties, the minority believes that its views are not accurately represented in the Transmittal Memo.

Academic Units should develop policies that encourage the maximum number of faculty members to participate in the evaluation of candidates (See MAPP 1005 for policy on physical presence for voting). Participation in shared governance is a primary expectation of University of California faculty members, and excessive abstentions or a small number of votes relative to the total number of faculty eligible to vote are likely to raise concerns in other reviewers evaluating the file. In cases of abstentions or recusals, the Transmittal Letter should provide a reason for these actions whenever possible. Appropriate reasons for abstention/recusal concern the voter’s circumstances, such as a lack of familiarity with the field, being prevented from reviewing due to travel or other commitments, or a potential conflict of interest. Inappropriate reasons for abstaining include concerns with the case itself, such as “It is not a strong case,” or “this case should be postponed.”

J. DEAN’S RECOMMENDATION LETTER

After the faculty vote, the Dean assesses the Transmittal Letter, Case Analysis and other evidence provided in the Case File to ensure that the Unit’s review is fair and rigorous in maintaining University standards. The Dean’s Letter should be an independent assessment of the case. In the Letter, the Dean provides his or her recommendation regarding the proposed action and supplies additional analysis as needed.

K. SALARY JUSTIFICATION

In a separate memo, the Dean provides a recommendation as to the salary associated with the proposed appointment or advancement, including any off-scale increment, based on the University of California Academic Salary Scales. This salary should be justified in terms of prevailing norms within the Unit, School, University and discipline. Proof of any competing offers should be provided with the case.
L. HIGHER LEVELS OF REVIEW

Upon completion of the Case File, it is forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office where it is reviewed for completeness, accuracy, and compliance with policy. APO then routes the File to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) via the Academic Senate Office. After careful and rigorous review, CAP prepares a recommendation regarding the proposed action, which is then forwarded to the VPF and Provost/EVC. Should the Provost/EVC disagree with CAP’s recommendation, he or she will consult with CAP before issuing a final decision. The Provost/EVC has final authority on all merit, promotion and appraisal actions except for non-reappointment of an Assistant Professor (see section A. Non-Reappointment below) and advancement to Above Scale salary beyond the Regental compensation threshold (see APM 220-85.d).

UNFAVORABLE OUTCOMES

A. NON-REAPPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

A proposal for non-reappointment of an Assistant Professor may originate with the Unit Chair as a result of Unit review during consideration of reappointment or promotion to tenure (APM 220-84). Should the Unit vote for non-reappointment:

1. The candidate will be apprised of the Unit’s recommendation by the Unit Chair during the second Procedural Safeguard meeting.

2. The candidate will have five business days to notify the Unit Chair of his or her intention to appeal the decision, and an additional five business days to submit the written appeal to the Unit.

Should the recommendation for non-reappointment be issued by the Dean after a positive or negative recommendation by the Unit:

1. The Dean shall notify the Unit Chair and the candidate.

2. After receipt of the notice of a negative recommendation from the Dean, the candidate will have five business days to notify the Unit of his or her intention to appeal the decision, and an additional five business days to submit the written appeal to the Dean’s Office.

Should the recommendation for non-reappointment be issued by CAP after a positive or negative recommendation from the School and the preliminary assessment by the Provost/EVC is for non-reappointment:

1. The Vice Provost for the Faculty shall notify the Dean.

2. The Unit Chair and the candidate will be notified in writing by the Provost/EVC of the CAP recommendation and preliminary assessment and redacted copies of all confidential materials, if any, added to the candidate’s personnel file after the School’s recommendation will be provided.

3. After receipt of the notice of a negative CAP recommendation and preliminary assessment, the candidate will have five business days to notify the Provost/EVC or Unit Chair of his or her intention to appeal the decision, and an additional ten business days to submit the written appeal to the Provost/EVC.

In cases in which non-reappointment is considered, the appeal, if any, shall be considered by CAP. An ad hoc committee shall be appointed if the Provost/EVC or CAP requests it.

The Chancellor is responsible for a decision not to reappoint an Assistant Professor. This authority may not be redelegated.

B. DENIAL OF TENURE

Should promotion to Associate Professor with tenure be denied by the Chancellor to an Assistant Professor, this decision is final and no further tenure reviews will be allowed. Those who do not achieve tenure are given a final year notice, during which they may pursue an appeal of the decision. The appeal process is the same as that detailed in A. Non-Reappointment above.
C. APPEAL OF ADVANCEMENT DECISION

If a candidate should wish to appeal the final decision in a post-tenure advancement review, she or he will have ten calendar days after notification of the decision to submit the written appeal to the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF). The appeal shall consist of the candidate’s written statement and any relevant evidence. Grounds for appeal will include evidence that the committee’s review was insufficiently thorough, competent, objective and/or flexible (APM 210-1.a, 210-1.d). The VPF will review the appeal. If she or he determines that the appeal shows that it is more likely than not that one or more of these standards has not been met, the VPF will submit the names of potential members for an ad hoc appeal review committee for approval of the Provost/EVC. The committee will submit a recommendation regarding the appeal to the Provost/EVC, endorsing either approval of the appeal, denial of the appeal, or a request for further information. The Provost/EVC will make a final decision.

D. NEGATIVE MERIT REVIEW

Should a merit review have an unfavorable outcome, the next review will consider all materials from the review periods since the most recent successful advancement review. The Case Analysis should address the most recent CAP recommendation as well as the record from the latest review period.

After a negative merit review, a new letter of eligibility will not be issued by the Dean’s office until the normal period of service has passed for another merit review. Should the faculty member choose to put forward a case for advancement before the normal period has elapsed, this will not in itself be considered an acceleration.

APPENDIX 2014-A: MID-CAREER APPRAISALS

The Mid-Career Appraisal (APM 220-83), or “MCA,” is a formal evaluation, which is conducted in order to arrive at a preliminary assessment of an Assistant Professor’s prospect for eventual promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. Normally occurring in the fourth year of service to the University under the Eight-Year Rule, the purpose of the MCA is to provide the Assistant Professor with a careful, considered analytical evaluation of his or her performance to date in the areas of teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and University and public service, and to make a candid prediction concerning the probability or improbability of a favorable promotion decision based upon the evidence.

The list of case materials for the MCA is analogous to that provided for other types of personnel actions, although the MCA is a substantially different type of assessment from that done for the normal merit review and this should be reflected in the content of the documents prepared. All scholarly, teaching and service evidence pertains to the MCA and all relevant materials may be included, regardless of status. Confusion on the part of reviewers may result, however, when materials for a merit review and an MCA are submitted together, as is typically the case since these reviews normally occur simultaneously. In the case of a merit review, only work published or in press is counted. Maintaining a distinction between the MCA and merit reviews will allow Units/Deans/CAP to properly consider the full range of ongoing research activities as part of the mid-career assessment, and to make recommendations on merit increases based on review of in-press and published papers. Outside letters may be obtained for the MCA but are not required if members of the Unit have sufficient expertise to make the assessment.

The case for the MCA, therefore, should examine the complete record-to-date (including work in progress), and it should carefully and frankly assess the prospects for the individual to achieve promotion based on continuation of the current trajectory. The appraisal should note specific areas of weakness, if any, and should recommend actions to be taken by the individual and/or the Unit and Chair.

The MCA should clearly designate an outcome from the list below. Categories of possible outcomes are broadly defined as follows:

- **Favorable**: Promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining the current trajectory of excellence and on appropriate external evaluation.
LADDER-RANK FACULTY AND OTHER ACADEMIC SENATE TITLES

PROFESSORIAL SERIES (PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE, ASSISTANT)

- **Favorable with Reservations**: Promotion is likely if the candidate addresses identified weaknesses, deficiencies, or imbalances in the record.
- **Questionable**: Promotion is uncertain given significant weaknesses in the record, but possible if these are adequately addressed.
- **Unfavorable**: Promotion is unlikely given major weaknesses in the record.

Because the MCA is directed primarily toward the candidate, it is in the best interest of the candidate and the Unit that the appraisal be careful, cautious and candid, addressing problems where they exist while there is still time for adjustment and improvement. It is important that the faculty member is made thoroughly aware, in a formal way, of her or his situation with regard to eventual promotion.

The MCA file should be forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office through the appropriate Dean’s Office. The Committee on Academic Personnel will review the file and forward its recommendation to the Provost/EVC for final approval.

APPENDIX 2014-B: CAREER EQUITY REVIEWS

Career Equity Reviews (CERs) permit tenured faculty members to request a special review to determine whether they are correctly calibrated at rank and step. They are intended to supplement regular academic reviews, and they neither replace nor affect existing procedures for regular reviews.

A. OBJECTIVE

On rare occasions, a Senate faculty member may be at a rank and step seriously inconsistent with his or her attainments. For example, an appointment may have been made at a rank or step lower than suggested based on merit, and/or accomplishments that would warrant accelerated advancement may not have been identified. The CER is designed to examine those cases in which normal personnel actions, from the initial hiring onward, may have resulted in an inappropriate rank and/or step, and, when warranted, to allow placement of faculty members at the appropriate rank and step consistent with prevailing UCM standards.

A CER is not a substitute for a normal merit, promotion, or acceleration review. It functions as a supplemental process to correct a substantial inequity, typically a product of multiple past actions, not as a means of appeal for, or expression of disagreement with, a single personnel decision.

Because the purpose of a CER is to assess rank and step, recommendation of a bonus off-scale salary award in lieu of recalibration is inappropriate.

B. ELIGIBILITY FOR AND INITIATION OF REVIEW

A Senate faculty member who has held an eligible title (e.g., an academic employee in the Professor, or Lecturer SOE series, excluding those at the LPSOE, Assistant, or Above Scale levels) for at least one year may initiate a CER by submitting a written request to the appropriate Unit Chair or Dean. If the request is submitted to a Unit Chair, a copy should also be submitted to the Dean. Once receipt of the request form is acknowledged by candidate the Dean, and, optionally, the Unit Chair, the request is forwarded via APO to the Vice Provost for the Faculty for review. If the request is approved by the VPF, the candidate may move forward in assembling a Case File for submission to the School.

The decision to initiate a CER rests with the candidate, but he or she may request that the Dean’s office designate a confidential ad hoc committee to provide an analysis and recommendation on whether to proceed with the CER. The recommendation of the ad hoc committee will be forwarded along with the original request to the VPF via APO. The candidate may receive a redacted copy of the recommendation.

C. CONTENT AND CRITERIA
A request for CER must contain justification for recalibration. Possible justification for a CER may include, but is not limited to, the following assessments: 1) the cumulative record warrants higher placement on the academic ladder even though no one review period did; 2) the rank/step was inappropriately low at the time of initial hiring; 3) particular work and contributions have been overlooked or undervalued by the Unit and/or other reviewing bodies.

The candidate must identify the specific area(s) of the record that he or she believes were not previously evaluated properly, or the area(s) of the record that indicate that he or she was not hired at a rank and step commensurate with his or her accomplishments. This process will be supported by an “expanded file” in which the candidate’s entire record, up to and including the last review, may be considered. The candidate may submit selected publications from earlier review periods that he or she considers relevant to the CER request.

The Unit Chair will develop an academic review file that will address the candidate’s entire academic record. The file will include the request for a CER. If the CER request involves advancement to or through a “barrier” step (promotion to Full Professor or advancement to Professor, Step VI, or to Professor, Above Scale), the Unit must seek external letters addressing the barrier step advancement for inclusion in the file. An exception to this rule is allowable when the CER is requesting a review of the appointment case only, as when it is argued that the rank/step at initial hiring was inappropriate. In such cases, the original case materials, including external letters, from the initial appointment case will be re-reviewed.

D. TIMING OF THE CAREER EQUITY REVIEW

The CER review shall be separate from a normal review, but should address the candidate’s overall record using the University’s established criteria for the rank and step requested. The CER file may be submitted at the same time as a regular advancement case, or it may be submitted in an “off-cycle” year. The due dates will follow those of the quinquennial review. Schedule for Academic Personnel Actions.

E. FILE REVIEWERS

The appropriate Dean and CAP will consider all CERs. (In rare cases, if it is believed that there is insufficient expertise at any level of review, the Provost/EVC may recommend to CAP that an ad hoc committee be formed to advise CAP.) The Provost/EVC makes the final determination of the outcome of the review.

There are two ways in which consideration of a CER may proceed:

- If the candidate submits the request for a CER to a Unit Chair, following Unit review/analysis and vote, the Chair (or designee) will write the Unit Transmittal Memo regarding the CER request. It will subsequently be forwarded to the Dean for review and recommendation. The entire Case File is then forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office, which will refer the file to CAP for its recommendation.

- If the candidate submits the request for a CER to the Dean, the Dean may recommend someone other than the Unit Chair to interact with the Unit Reviewers and write the Case Analysis. The Provost/EVC must approve the Dean’s selection. Further review of the file will then proceed as described above.

F. FREQUENCY

A CER may be requested once at the Associate Professor level, once at the Full Professor level prior to advancement to Professor, Step VI, and once after advancement to Professor, Step VI, up to Above Scale, but no more than once every six years.

G. FINAL DETERMINATION

If the CER decision leads to an adjustment of rank and/or step, the candidate’s salary at the new rank and/or step will include the same off-scale increment as the salary before the review. Any decision for an adjustment to rank and/or step will be effective the following July 1. Another possible outcome is the confirmation that the candidate has been appropriately placed at rank and step. This outcome will in no way affect current or future
actions proposed during the regular academic personnel process. Retroactive action to the original action will not be approved. All CER actions become part of the academic personnel file.

If a candidate should wish to appeal the final determination, she or he will have ten calendar days after notification of the decision to submit the written appeal to the Vice Provost for the Faculty. The appeal shall consist of the candidate’s written statement and any relevant evidence. Grounds for appeal will include evidence that the committee’s review was insufficiently thorough, competent, objective and/or flexible (APM 210-1.a, 210-1.d).

The Vice Provost for the Faculty will submit the names of potential members for an ad hoc appeal review committee for approval of the Provost/EVC. The committee will submit a recommendation regarding the appeal to the Provost/EVC, endorsing either approval of the appeal, denial of the appeal, or a request for further information. The Provost/EVC will make a final decision.

APPENDIX 2014-C: SHORT FORM FOR NORMAL MERIT REVIEWS

Normal merit increases within Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor I-V ranks, although less critical than promotions, are not automatic and do require demonstrated merit.

For many merit reviews where the record seems clear and there is expected to be essentially unanimous agreement in the Unit regarding the proposed action, UC Merced has adopted the Short Form to simplify the preparation of the Case File. It should be noted that a Case File that reveals issues of concern or potential controversy regarding the proposed action will not be indicative of a “normal merit,” and thus is ineligible for use of the Short Form. The Short Form should likewise not be used for accelerated actions or mandatory quinquennial reviews. Use of the Short form is not mandatory and is subject to the discretion of the AP Chair.

The Short Form may be used for the following normal merit reviews:

Assistant Professor: First, second and third merit reviews (does not include MCA)

Associate Professor: Every other merit review within rank, exclusive of promotion

Full Professor: Every other merit review within rank, exclusive of barrier steps.

Above Scale: Every other merit review.
A. SABBATICAL LEAVE

Please refer to APM 740 for comprehensive information about sabbatical leaves, including special appendices for calculating credits.

PURPOSE

A sabbatical leave is a privilege accorded to qualified faculty members to enable them to engage in intensive programs of research and/or study, and thus to become more effective teachers and scholars and enhance their service to the University (Standing Orders of the Regents 103.4).

TYPES OF SABBATICAL

There are two types of sabbatical leave:

- **Regular Sabbatical** is leave from all regular University duties to enable the individual to devote her- or himself full-time to research and/or study.

- **Sabbatical in Residence** requires the individual to teach in addition to engaging in a program of research and/or study at UC Merced or another University of California campus. The individual is expected to teach a regularly scheduled class that meets at least three hours per week. In exceptional cases significant University service may be substituted for all or part of the instructional requirement. Service must be at the campus or University-wide level and must require a time commitment equivalent to teaching a regularly scheduled class. Such exceptions are granted by the Provost/EVC.

ELIGIBILITY & ACCRUAL

Appointees in the following titles are eligible for sabbatical leaves, providing they have accumulated enough credits:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

Credit toward eligibility to apply for sabbatical leave is earned through each semester of half-time or more service in a ladder-rank faculty title at the University. Credit is earned during service as an Acting or Visiting ladder-rank faculty member if such service is followed immediately by appointment to a regular ladder-rank title.

*Note: Refer to APM 740-11 for information regarding qualifying academic administrative and Senior Management positions. See also Senior Management Personnel Policy II-50.*

An individual in an eligible title accrues one sabbatical credit for each full semester of service at 50% time or more. Service must be continuous, with no break in University employment. The maximum number of credits that may be accrued is equal to the number of credits required for a maximum sabbatical leave (one year at full salary), plus one year of credit; e.g., twenty credits (APM 740-16.a). Once the maximum accrual is reached, the balance will be capped until some credits are used for a leave. Faculty members may contact personnel in the Dean's Office or Academic Personnel Office with questions regarding sabbatical credit accrual.

Sabbatical credits are not accrued during periods of:

- Sabbatical leave
- Leave without pay
• Leave with pay for one semester or more
• Appointment to a university-sponsored research program at more than 50% time
  Summer research or Summer Session teaching

RESTRICTIONS
Sabbatical leaves will be granted only when they will not disrupt the teaching program or operation of the University. A faculty member should not commence a sabbatical leave until the Dean and the Provost/EVC have granted formal approval.

Immediately following a sabbatical leave, the faculty member must return to active service at UC Merced for a period at least equal to the period of the leave. Failure to return from sabbatical leave will create an obligation on the part of the individual to refund to the University the entire salary received during the leave. In case of a 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 time served.

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 semesters.

A sabbatical leave shall not be approved for an appointee who has been issued a notice of non-renewal or termination of appointment. For individuals who have had two or more reviews resulting in non-advancement, a sabbatical leave should only be granted if the leave is part of the individual’s plan for re-engaging in research or creative activity.

Sabbatical leave shall not be used as a means of augmenting personal income. Except as provided in APM 740-18 and APM 025, an individual shall not accept gainful employment during a sabbatical leave. This restriction does not apply to acceptance of a fellowship, personal grant, or government-sponsored exchange lectureship for the period of the leave, if such acceptance promotes the accomplishment of the purpose of the leave and is approved in advance by the Dean and the Provost/EVC; or to acceptance of nominal honoraria in connection with lectures delivered as part of the sabbatical leave project.

REQUESTING SABBATICAL LEAVE
Application for sabbatical leave requires submission of a completed Leave of Absence Request Form (UCM AP 901) and a project statement providing information outlined in APM 740-94. These documents must be reviewed and approved by the Dean, and then forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office for review and submission to the Provost/EVC for final approval.

SABBATICAL LEAVE REPORT
Within ninety calendar days of returning from leave, the faculty member will submit to the Dean a concise report of the results of the leave, including an account of progress made and plans for the completion of research and publication of the results. Detailed information regarding the required elements of the report can be found in APM 740-97. The report will become a part of the supporting documentation included in the next academic personnel review file; the review file will not be processed unless the report is included.
2016: DISCIPLINE

GENERAL GUIDELINES

The following serves to implement the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline at UC Merced. While the Faculty Code of Conduct applies to all faculty members, both Senate and non-Senate, these procedures apply exclusively to members of the Academic Senate (as identified in the Standing Order of the Regents 105.1). No disciplinary sanction for professional misconduct of a member of the Merced Division of the Academic Senate shall be imposed except pursuant to the procedures specified herein and consistent with Academic Senate Bylaw 336. No faculty member’s right to a hearing before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure under Academic Senate Bylaws 335, 336, and 337, or Standing Orders of the Regents 103.9 and 103.10, shall be abridged in any way by these procedures.

With respect to the imposition of disciplinary sanctions, the Faculty Code deals only with professional conduct or misconduct. Faculty members, however, in common with all other members of the University community, are subject to the general rules and regulations of the University, such as those pertaining to parking, library privileges, health and safety, and use of University facilities. Faculty members are subject to appropriate sanctions for failure to comply with such rules and regulations. Senate faculty members holding administrative appointments may be subject to disciplinary action under the Faculty Code for professional misconduct that falls within the types of unacceptable conduct set forth in the Faculty Code. In addition, the Chancellor and Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor may take administrative actions (e.g., removal from the administrative position), which need not adhere to the disciplinary procedures outlined herein.

The authority to discipline faculty members derives from The Regents. The Regents have made the Chancellor of each campus responsible for administering discipline on that campus, and there is to be no re-delegation of the Chancellor’s authority to impose disciplinary sanctions; however, in any case of discipline of a Senate faculty member, the Chancellor will normally delegate to the Provost/EVC the authority to initiate disciplinary action (i.e., to initiate and monitor the investigation of the complaint and the process to determine probable cause). In the event that the Provost/EVC recuses him- or herself from a disciplinary case at any stage, the Chancellor may delegate his or her authority to a person or persons whom the Chancellor judges to be appropriate. The Chancellor will discuss the selection of this person or persons with the Chair of the Academic Senate.

University procedures afford safeguards against arbitrary or unjust disciplinary actions, including provisions for hearings and appeal. Senate faculty members may accept the disciplinary sanctions as proposed by the Chancellor, or they may request a hearing before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure of the Merced Division of the Academic Senate. The role of this Committee is to take under consideration complaints against or by members of the Academic Senate. The Committee holds hearings and advises the administration. The Chancellor will not appoint any current member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure as an investigator.

Discipline is defined to include the following actions: written censure; reduction in salary; demotion; suspension; denial or curtailment of emeritus status; and dismissal from the employ of the University (APM 16 Section II). More than one disciplinary sanction may be imposed for a single act of misconduct; e.g., a demotion and a suspension. Any disciplinary action must begin within three years of the time when the Chancellor knew or should have known about the alleged violation of the Faculty Code.

When a complaint has been made, all faculty members, campus officers and agencies shall treat the identities of the complainant and the faculty member against whom the complaint is made (herein referred to as “respondent”) as a matter of utmost confidentiality.
INITIATING THE COMPLAINT PROCESS

A complaint may be brought under these procedures by any student, staff member, or faculty member of the University of California. Systemwide policy statements clearly indicate that the investigation of faculty misconduct should be an administrative function, while holding hearings on such charges is an Academic Senate function to be carried out by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

A. INFORMAL COMPLAINT

In some circumstances, informal means of resolution may be appropriate as a first resort. Such efforts may include discussion with the faculty member as well as the pursuit of all available administrative actions. Informal complaints may be heard by the relevant Unit Chair, Dean, Associate or Assistant Dean, Human Resources, Academic Personnel Office, the VPF, or the complainant’s immediate supervisor. Informal complaints may also be referred to the Provost/EVC to assist in the informal resolution of the complaint.

Any recipient of an informal complaint may in all cases listen to the complaint without informing the accused faculty member of it. If the recipient of the complaint, or any campus officer or agency, begins to investigate the merits of the complaint, beyond what can be established by talking to the complainant, the accused faculty member shall at that stage have a right to notification. Should the complaint be resolved informally or not pursued further, all documents, notes, or other evidence shall be destroyed or returned to the complainant.

If the recipient of the informal complaint deems it to be appropriate, and if procedures for informal resolution are either unsuccessful, unacceptable to the complainant, or deemed inappropriate by the campus officer or agency involved, then that officer or agency shall refer the complainant to the Provost/EVC via the VPF. The VPF will keep the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure apprised of all such actions. At this stage of the process, the Provost/EVC’s office is not required to notify the faculty member against whom the complaint has been made.

B. FORMAL COMPLAINT

If the complainant wishes to file a formal complaint, the following procedures must be followed.

Allegations of violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct against a Senate faculty member shall be addressed to the Provost/EVC and shall normally be submitted in the form of a written, signed letter from the complainant. The complainant must include a written explanation of any attempts made to resolve the matter prior to the filing of the formal complaint. The complainant should, whenever possible, identify the section(s) of the Faculty Code of Conduct alleged to have been violated. It is important that the complainant submit supporting documentation sufficient to substantiate the allegations of misconduct.

The Provost/EVC shall review the complaint to ensure that it conforms to these requirements, and to a reasonable standard of conciseness and order. The Provost/EVC may also consult with the appropriate School Dean as necessary. The Provost/EVC may, at his or her discretion, reject any complaint that does not meet these requirements. In this event, the complaint will be returned to the complainant who shall have the opportunity to correct the stated deficiencies, and then return the complaint for consideration.

The Provost/EVC will conduct a preliminary inquiry to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct may have occurred. The Provost/EVC may appoint additional internal or external faculty members or administrators to conduct the informal, preliminary inquiry. The respondent will be notified by the Provost/EVC that a formal complaint has been filed against him or her, and he or she will receive a copy of the complaint with all supporting documentation.

If there is apparent merit to the complaint, the Provost/EVC shall designate an Academic Senate faculty member (or a committee of up to four faculty members) as an Investigative Officer (or Investigative Committee) to investigate and provide a determination as to whether there is probable cause that a violation has occurred (APM 15, Part III.A.4).
The Investigative Officer will advise the Provost/EVC:

- Whether any of the allegations in the formal complaint, if true, would constitute a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct;
- If so, whether there is probable cause to warrant the initiation of disciplinary action by the administration; and
- If there has been a finding of probable cause, what specific disciplinary sanction(s) are recommended by the Investigative Officer.

The Investigative Officer may discuss procedural and interpretive questions with the Provost/EVC at any stage of the investigation and may seek legal interpretation. In addition, the Investigative Officer has the Provost/EVC’s authority to seek further information (normally in writing, but also in person as deemed appropriate) from individuals who may have relevant information. The Investigative Officer should advise individuals who have been consulted that the University will do all in its power to assure that information will be kept confidential to the extent allowable by law and University policy. Additionally, all parties involved will be instructed of the strict confidentiality of the review.

Following its investigation of the formal complaint, the Investigative Officer shall write a final report to the Provost/EVC. The report shall include the ‘Officer’s assessment of the evidence, a recommendation to dismiss the complaint or to initiate disciplinary action, and a recommendation of the type of disciplinary sanction(s) proposed, if any. It is expected that the Investigative Officer will conclude his or her work within 90 calendar days from receipt of the complaint, unless an extension is granted by the Provost/EVC.

INITIATING THE DISCIPLINE PROCESS

A. INFORMAL RESOLUTION

As an alternative to formal disciplinary procedures, the respondent and the administration may explore informal resolutions at any point in the disciplinary process. Upon written agreement by both the Provost/EVC and the respondent, the Provost/EVC may agree to waive the proposed disciplinary sanction(s) on the condition that the respondent performs some specified action(s) designed to address the violation and/or to prevent future harm or continued violation. Such actions may include, but are not limited to, monetary restitution, repayment of misappropriated resources, compliance with a commitment not to repeat the misconduct, or other action to remedy the harm caused by the respondent.

Respondents who are interested in pursuing an informal resolution may negotiate directly with the administration or may request the involvement of the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Respondents should contact the Provost/EVC and/or the Chair of Privilege and Tenure to discuss this option further or to propose an informal resolution.

If an informal resolution is reached with the administration at any point in the disciplinary process (with or without the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure), the Chancellor shall report to the entire Committee on Privilege and Tenure for informational purposes, and without using the respondent’s name, a statement of the charges and the negotiated resolution.

B. INVOLUNTARY LEAVE

The Provost/EVC may initiate involuntary leave with pay prior to the initiation of disciplinary action if it is determined that there is a strong risk that the respondent’s continued assignment to regular duties or presence on campus will cause immediate and serious harm to the campus community or impede the investigation of his or her alleged wrongdoing, or in situations in which the respondent’s conduct represents a serious crime or felony that is the subject of investigation by a law enforcement agency.
Such action does not represent the imposition of a disciplinary sanction; however, the respondent’s return to University premises without written permission from the Provost/EVC may create independent grounds for disciplinary action.

The Provost/EVC must mandate such investigatory leave in writing, including the reasons for and expected duration of the leave, to the respondent and must initiate disciplinary procedures by bringing charges against the respondent within ten working days after the imposition of involuntary leave.

C. INFORMING THE RESPONDENT OF THE INTENT TO DISCIPLINE

Upon receipt of the Investigative Officer’s report, the Provost/EVC will determine whether there is probable cause for undertaking disciplinary action against the accused faculty member. If so, the findings of the Investigative Officer will be transmitted to the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, together with a written notice of intent to discipline from the Provost/EVC describing the reasons for undertaking the proposed action and the type of sanction(s) that are recommended. The Chancellor may not impose a type of discipline more severe than that set forth in this notice.

At this stage, the name of the respondent, the nature of the charges, and the proposed discipline shall be confidential information, limited to the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and not known to the other members of the Committee.

The notice of intent to discipline, along with a copy of the report of the Investigative Officer shall normally be presented to the respondent in person or, if not feasible, the notice and report shall be sent to the respondent’s campus address and last known home address using a proof of service form.

D. DISCIPLINARY HEARING

At the time the notice is personally delivered to the respondent, or within three working days if the notice is mailed, the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall make known to the respondent his or her Senatorial right to a hearing pursuant to Academic Senate Bylaw 336 before disciplinary sanctions can be imposed. The Chair shall also provide information about the nature of Privilege and Tenure hearings, as well as information about the options available to the respondent. These options include accepting the proposed discipline or negotiating an informal resolution directly with the administration.

The respondent shall have 21 calendar days from the date of receipt of the notice in which to file a written response with the Provost/EVC indicating that he or she accepts the findings and proposed sanctions, or to inform the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure that he or she waives the Senatorial right to a formal hearing before the Committee. Absent any such written response, a hearing shall be conducted as specified by Academic Senate Bylaw 336.

In connection with hearings before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (or any properly constituted hearing panel subcommittee), a respondent will be entitled to all procedural privileges and protections specified in the Standing Orders of the Regents (103.9 and 103.10) and in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 15 and APM 16). All investigations and hearings will be treated as confidential and open only to those persons directly involved.

Every effort shall be made to conform to a reasonable time frame in the implementation of all procedures. Consistent with Academic Senate Bylaw 336.B.3, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall consider the matter within 21 calendar days after receipt of a response or after the deadline for receipt of a response if none is received. Pursuant to APM 15 Section 3.B.7, a hearing should commence within 90 days of the date on which the respondent was informed of the intention to initiate a disciplinary proceeding. A hearing shall not be postponed because the respondent is unavailable or unwilling to cooperate.

The Chancellor has final authority to determine and execute appropriate sanctions, except in those cases of dismissal or demotion in which final authority rests with the President or the Regents (APM 16 Section II). The Chancellor will inform the accused faculty member in writing of his or her final decision. The complainant shall
be informed in writing by the Provost/EVC that the investigation has been concluded and that appropriate action has been taken, but the details of any action shall not be shared with the complainant.

**COMPLAINT FILE**

Upon final resolution of the formal complaint, the complaint file will be maintained only in the Academic Personnel Office. The complaint file shall include the following:

- The original formal complaint and all accompanying documentation;
- The letter from the Provost/EVC forwarding the complaint to the Investigative Officer for its probable cause investigation;
- The Investigative Officer’s final report;
- The Provost/EVC’s written notice of intent to initiate disciplinary action, if any;
- A copy of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure’s hearing report, if any;
- A copy of the Chancellor’s letter communicating his or her decision to the respondent; and
- A copy of the Provost/EVC’s communication to the complainant notifying him or her of the closing of the investigation.

In the event that the allegations against the respondent are not sustained; all materials related to the claim shall be destroyed after a period of three years. All other files shall be maintained for ten years after separation of the respondent from UC Merced and then destroyed.
2017: GRIEVANCE PROCESS

See UC Senate Bylaw 335
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2051: GENERAL GUIDELINES

A. TITLES, DESCRIPTION, ELIGIBILITY

Titles in this series are:

- Lecturer with Security of Employment (Lecturer SOE)
- Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (Senior Lecturer SOE)
- Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (Lecturer PSOE)
- Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment (Senior Lecturer PSOE)

[Note: Appointments in the titles Lecturer and Senior Lecturer (both Continuing and "pre-six") are not part of this series but are part of Unit 18, which is discussed separately in MAPP Chapter 3 Section 10. See also the Memorandum of Understanding for the Non-Senate Instructional Unit.]

Appointees in the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series specialize in meeting long-term instructional needs (APM 285-0). Potential appointees should show clear evidence of teaching ability of exceptional quality and promise of future growth. Appointees in this series engage in teaching, professional activities, and University and public service (APM 285-4.a, 210-3.b). Appointment in this series does not require responsibility to engage in research. Appointees may teach courses at any level, with the expectation that they will carry heavier instructional responsibilities than those in the Professorial series.

Full-time appointees in this series are members of the Academic Senate (Standing Order of the Regents 105.1). As such, they are expected to participate in the shared governance of the campus and the University (Standing Order of the Regents 105.2). Refer to Bylaw 55 for information regarding voting rights for appointees.

A registered student or candidate for higher degree at the University of California is not eligible for appointment to this series.

B. TERMS OF SERVICE

Typically, an appointment to this series is for full-time service to the University; an appointment made at less than full-time to any title in this series is exceptional and requires approval by the Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor. Such authorization will not normally be granted when the individual’s professional commitment is to be divided between the University and another institution or organization.

Lecturer PSOE or Senior Lecturer PSOE:

- An appointment at the PSOE rank may be viewed as a “security of employment-track” position, in the same way that an Assistant Professor appointment is a “tenure-track” position.
- All appointments to the ranks of Lecturer PSOE and Senior Lecturer PSOE are for specified terms.
- Lecturers/Senior Lecturers PSOE are appointed for a period of two years and are subject to the Eight-Year Limit.
- The initial term of appointment of an LPSOE or Senior LPSOE ends on the second June 30th after the effective date of the appointment.
- A new two-year term commences effective with merit advancement.
- Periods of approved leave with or without salary count as part of a two-year term.
- In order to make clear to an appointee that the appointment is for a specified term, all correspondence for such appointees must reflect the specific ending date of the term.

Lecturer SOE or Senior Lecturer SOE:
• Security of employment may be granted only for an appointment at more than half time (Standing Order of the Regents 103.10).
• Security of employment is not a reward for length of service but is based upon appraised and recognized merit.
• Appointments with SOE are continuous until terminated by resignation, retirement or dismissal for cause.

C. SALARY

Individuals appointed as a Lecturer (PSOE or SOE) are compensated at a rate on the Academic Salary Scale for this series.

Salaries for Lecturers PSOE will normally begin at a close equivalent to the salaries for Assistant Professors. Academic personnel review will occur every two years. Promotion to Lecturer SOE will normally occur during the seventh year of service as Lecturer PSOE or a combination of other eligible titles (APM 133-0.b).

Salaries for Lecturers SOE will normally begin at a close equivalent to the salaries for Associate Professors, with academic personnel review occurring every two years. If a Lecturer SOE is being paid at a salary equivalent to that of a Professor, the academic review will occur every three years. Senior Lecturers SOE may not receive less than the rate for Professor, Step I.

Senior Lecturers SOE may be appointed with a salary level above the top of the salary range (“Above-Scale”), upon evidence of great distinction, recognized nationally and/or internationally. The honorary title “Distinguished Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment” may be conferred upon Senior Lecturers SOE with a salary above the top of the range, to denote distinction equivalent to the title of “Distinguished Professor.”
2052: RECRUITMENT

All policies and procedures for recruitment in this series shall follow those outlined in MAPP 2012.
2053: APPOINTMENT

Full-time Lecturer titles that have or lead to Security of Employment are Senate faculty positions (Standing Orders of the Regents 105.1.a). These appointments are subject to the Instructions for Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series (APM 210-3) and will follow the policies and procedures detailed in MAPP 2013 except as otherwise indicated in this Section.

A. AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPSOE, pre-MCA</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPSOE, MCA and after</td>
<td>Provost/EVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOE, Sr. LSOE</td>
<td>Provost/EVC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. CRITERIA

Appointment as a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer SOE/PSOE requires achievement in three areas: teaching, professional competence and activity, and University and public service. Some types of possible documentary evidence are outlined in MAPP 2054 below.

Teaching:

Excellent teaching is an essential criterion for appointment. Clear documentation of ability and effectiveness in teaching is required. The candidate’s case file should show evidence of the extent and skill of the candidate’s participation in the general guidance, mentoring and advising of students. APM 210-3.c.1 provides points to consider in judging the effectiveness of a candidate’s teaching.

Student and peer evaluation of teaching is normally central to the review process, but evidence will also be sought of significant contributions to teaching through development of superior teaching materials, programs for teaching improvement, and other activities related to teaching.

Professional Competence and Activity:

An appointee in the LSOE series is expected to maintain currency in the profession and pedagogy. The candidate’s file must provide evidence of professional achievement and activity, and the candidate’s professional activities should be reviewed for evidence of achievement and leadership. Evidence may include documentation of such activities as:

- Making presentations of teaching improvements at professional conferences.
- Election to significant offices of professional or learned societies.
- Invitations to lecture, present papers, etc.
- Awards, grants or honors bestowed by organizations or foundations.
- Requests for consultative service.
- Publication of works related to pedagogy or in the candidate’s field of discipline.

University and Public Service:

The candidate must demonstrate service to the Unit, campus and University and/or the public. Particular attention should be paid to that service which is directly related to the candidate’s professional expertise and achievement.
2054: MERIT, PROMOTION, APPRAISAL REVIEW

A. OVERVIEW

The academic advancement processes for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers PSOE/SOE follow procedurally those detailed for the Professor series in MAPP 2014, including use of the Short Form and negative review outcomes. Lecturers in this series are guaranteed the same rights as ladder-rank faculty, as codified in the Procedural Safeguard Statement. Certain details particular to the Lecturer SOE series are recorded here.

Lecturers with Potential for Security of Employment (LPSOEs) are subject to academic review for reappointment and potential advancement every two years. Reappointments are for a two-year term; however, an LPSOE may be reappointed without a promotion or advancement (APM 285-8.c). Similar to the Professorial series, in the fourth year of appointment a comprehensive review known as a Mid-Career Appraisal (MCA) is conducted to assess an LPSOE’s potential for promotion to Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE). The MCA for the Lecturer series will be conducted with the same degree of rigor used in evaluating ladder-rank faculty, modified appropriately to address the requirements of this series (see MAPP Appendix 2014-A). Review for promotion to Lecturer SOE will normally occur during the seventh year of appointment as LPSOE.

[Note: Per APM 133-0.b, service in certain titles other than Lecturer/Senior Lecturer PSOE on any University of California campus counts toward the eight-year limit or “clock” for LPSOE. These titles include Unit 18 Lecturers, Assistant Professors, Acting Professors, and Visiting Professors.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review and Appraisal Schedule for LPSOE/SOE Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title and Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPSOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment and Potential Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment, Potential Merit and MCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment, Potential Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Merit Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Review*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior LSOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Merit Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Promotion to Senior LSOE is not normally expected, but may occur when warranted. A Lecturer SOE will become eligible for promotion after not less than six years of service as Lecturer SOE.

**Senior LSOEs should normally be reviewed every three years, until they have reached a salary level equivalent to Professor Step V, after which reviews will not occur after less than four years.
Lecturers/Senior Lecturers SOE may choose to defer review, but they are subject to the same quinquennial review requirements as faculty in the professorial series. (APM 200-0). Lecturers PSOE may not defer.

B. CRITERIA/DOCUMENTATION

The three criteria required for appointment to the Lecturer SOE series, described in MAPP 2053 above, also apply to all advancement actions. Salary advancement in this series will be based on demonstrated growth in the value of services the candidate provides; it is recognized that this rate of growth will be more variable, and in some cases slower, than for those in Professorial positions (APM 285-18). What follows is guidance as to the types of evidence that may be submitted with the case file and/or analyzed in the Case Analysis, Transmittal Memo, and Dean’s Recommendation to support an advancement proposal.

Teaching:

Teaching is the primary area of review in the Lecturer SOE series. Documentation of teaching should include an accounting of the candidate’s teaching load for the review period with all available teaching evaluations. Teaching activities may include instruction-related activities such as conducting training, supervision of Teaching Assistants or Unit 18 Lecturers, course development and/or revision, curricular planning, directing or participating in graduate student dissertation work (if allowed by the graduate group’s bylaws), directing reading groups, seminar and symposium presentations, independent study endeavors, as well as the writing of textbooks and software. Other significant types of evidence may include:

- Analysis of course materials such as the syllabus and reading lists, a description of the course and its goals, and a self-statement on the achievement of these goals by the candidate.
- Information about time spent on supervision and mentoring of peers or students, leading non-credit bearing educational programs, being available to and guiding students outside class, preparing for classes, undertaking courses not taught before, and improving instructional methods. Opinions of colleagues, particularly if based on class visits, observations of lectures, or knowledge of student performance in courses subsequent to those taught by the candidate.
- Opinions of current and former students, including opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success.
- Information about the reception of lectures given by the candidate before professional or learned societies.
- Documentation of any teaching awards received.
- Input from colleagues in team-teaching situations.
- Evidence of attention to student learning/learning outcomes.

UC Merced neither expects nor requires graduate-level mentoring and teaching for merit or promotion in this series.

[Note: Individuals asked to provide opinions on teaching should be solicited in writing and provided the University’s Confidentiality Statement.]

Professional Competence and Activity:

The candidate’s professional activities should be reviewed for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated innovation in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems. Evidence may include documentation of such activities as:

- Making presentations of teaching improvements at professional conferences.
- Election to significant offices of professional or learned societies.
- Invitations to lecture, present papers, etc.
- Awards, grants or honors bestowed by organizations or foundations.
- Requests for consultative service.
- Publication of works related to pedagogy or in the candidate’s field of discipline.
University and Public Service:
Academic appointees play an important role in the administration of the University and the formulation of its policies. Consideration should therefore be given to whether candidates are participating effectively and imaginatively in faculty government, University committees, and the development of Unit, School, campus, and University policies. Services to the community, state, and nation are also to be recognized. Documentary evidence may include such activities as:

- Service in Unit, Academic Senate, and administrative capacities (including committee service).
- Contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisors to student organizations.
- Activities related to the improvement of elementary and secondary education.
- Appointment or election to office in a professional organization, on a professional publication, or within a community, state, national, or international organization.
- Requests to edit or review for professional journals.
2055: SABBATICAL AND OTHER LEAVES

A. EDUCATIONAL LEAVE

Lecturers in the SOE series are eligible for Educational Leave. Educational Leave is granted for the purpose of allowing Lecturers in the SOE series to engage in intensive programs of study and/or professional development, thus to become more effective teachers and scholars and to enhance their services to the University.

Leave credit accrual and usage will follow the policies for accrual and use of Sabbatical Leave credits (APM 740 Charts III-IV, MAPP 2015). An appointee in the SOE series whose start date is prior to July 1, 2016 will receive \( \frac{1}{2} \) credit per semester of service prior to that date, up to a maximum of nine credits. Also effective July 1, 2016, appointees may transfer half of the credits earned in a different series (i.e., Professor series) up to a maximum of nine credits. It is preferred that appointees in this series take Educational Leave in non-consecutive one-semester increments due to the instructional need of the Schools for their services. A return to University service, equal to the time period of the leave, will be required. Failure to return to service will create an obligation on the part of the Lecturer to refund the entire salary received during the leave.

Within ninety calendar days of returning from Educational Leave, the Lecturer will submit to the Dean a concise report of the results of the leave, including an account of progress made. The report will become part of the supporting documentation included in the next academic personnel review file; the review file will not be processed unless the report is included.

B. “STOP-THE-CLOCK”

For determining service toward the eight-year limit, the combined total of periods of leave unrelated to academic duties and time off the clock may not exceed two years (APM 133-17.g).
2056: DISCIPLINE

All policies and procedures for discipline in this series shall follow those described in MAPP 2016.
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3021: GENERAL GUIDELINES

In many ways the Adjunct Professor series parallels the Professor series. While the Adjunct title does not confer Senate membership, this campus-affiliated faculty is expected to adhere to UC Merced’s rigorous standards of scholarship, making significant contributions to its research and teaching endeavors. Academic personnel policy and procedures for the Adjunct title generally mimic those for the Professor title. Distinctions are described in this section but, when appropriate, a reader is referred to MAPP Chapter 2 (Professor Series).

A. RANKS & CRITERIA

Appointments in this series are made to individuals who are affiliated with UC Merced through their participation in the campus’ research and teaching activities. Appointees may be predominantly engaged in research or in teaching, as long as they make some contribution to both. If research ceases to be a part of the appointee’s duties, the individual should be considered for transfer to an instruction-only title. Appointees are also to engage in University and public service consistent with their assignments. Please refer to APM 210-1-d for a description of the teaching, research, and service criteria.

Adjunct Professor appointment and advancement cases must clearly state the assigned duties and responsibilities for review at all levels of the AP process (APM 280-4 and 280-10). An Adjunct faculty member needs to be apprised at the time of appointment of the nature of the appointment, and relevant duties and responsibilities.

It is expected that an appointment in the Adjunct Professor series be made at a certain percentage (full-time, or part-time), whether for pay or not. The Case Analysis is then expected to analyze the Adjunct faculty member’s performance relative to both the appointment percentage and the agreed-upon duties and responsibilities.

Titles for the Adjunct series are listed below. Ranks and steps in this series correspond with those in the Professor series. An appointment or reappointment should be made at a level that is appropriate for the candidate’s scholarly and creative productivity and achievement.

Adjacent Professor Titles
- Assistant Adjunct Professor
- Associate Adjunct Professor
- Adjunct Professor

B. FUNDING

Appointments made to the Adjunct series should be supported primarily by non-State funds, and no more than one half of the Adjunct appointment may be supported by State funds (19900 – 19999).

Authority to grant exceptions to this policy belongs only to the Chancellor and cannot be redelegated. Requests for exceptions must be written, addressed to the Chancellor, provide clear justification for the exception, and adhere to the eight-year limitation as stated in APM 280-16-b (2). The requests originate with the relevant Unit Chair or Dean and have the Dean’s approval via her or his signature. Once submitted to APO, the request will be forwarded to the Chancellor for approval. All exceptions must be approved prior to commencing the appointment process.

C. SALARY

Appointments may be made with or without salary. For appointments with salary, the academic salary scales for the regular Professor series shall apply, subject to the terms of the compensation plan and adjusted to reflect percentage time.

Appointments may be made at full-time or part-time. The assigned percentage time should accurately reflect the expected workload carried with an appointment to this title. It should not be confused with salary rate. For
example, an appointee may make research and teaching contributions to UC Merced that are consistent with a 20 percent time appointment, even though the appointment was made without salary.

D. TERMS OF SERVICE

An appointment or a reappointment to an Adjunct title is made with a specified ending date. This is communicated to the appointee in the Appointment Letter or the Reappointment Letter.

Maximum terms for appointments and reappointments are provided below; when appropriate, recommended terms may be shorter. Reappointments may be made to the same rank and step, i.e., without a merit increase or promotion. Effective beginning and ending dates of an appointment generally coincide with the University’s fiscal calendar, which begins on July 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Max. Appt. Term</th>
<th>Service Limit(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Adjunct Professor (50% time or less)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Adjunct Professor (51% time or more)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(See Section E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Adjunct Professor, Steps I, II and III</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Adjunct Professor, Steps IV and V</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. NORMAL PERIOD AT STEP & LIMITATIONS OF SERVICE

In computing time for the Adjunct title, only those semesters at more than 50 percent time count. The normal periods of service at each step in this series coincide with those of the Professor series as described in APM 220-18-b.

An eight-year limitation of service applies to appointees who hold the Assistant Adjunct Professor title, either in that title alone or when combined with those titles listed in APM 133-0-c. Assistant Adjunct Professors normally undergo a Mid-Career Appraisal.
3022: RECRUITMENT

A. RECRUITMENT DATA

Unless a competitive affirmative action search takes place, recruitment data do not pertain to the appointment and are thus not included in the appointment case file. If a competitive affirmative action search takes place, refer to MAPP 2012 for pertinent policies and procedures.
3023: APPOINTMENT

Because Adjunct appointees are considered to be affiliated faculty of UC Merced, the same academic personnel procedures and standards of excellence for the Professor series apply to the Adjunct series. For general appointment processes and guidelines, please refer to MAPP 2013, taking into consideration the exceptions and additions listed below.

A. CASE ANALYSIS
The Case Analysis should make a clear justification for the proposed appointment or reappointment. It should address the recommended rank and step, providing solid evidence that supports the level of the appointment or reappointment.

B. TRANSMITTAL LETTER & DEAN’S RECOMMENDATION LETTER
Both the Transmittal Letter and the Dean’s Recommendation Letter should articulate specific justification for each appointment in order to gain the support of the Committee on Academic Personnel and the approval of the Provost/EVC.

Towards that goal, the letters should address the following:

1. The quality of the candidate and her/his specific ability to contribute to the unit, the program, and/or the campus;
2. The value added to the program/unit mission not currently afforded by the ladder-rank and other faculty;
3. Whether the recommendation is without salary and the proposed percentage of time of the appointment;
4. The appropriate funding source. Special and additional permission is required if there is a proposal to use State funds (19900-19999);
5. The beginning and specific ending date of the appointment;
6. The specific assignment of duties and responsibilities. Evaluation and subsequent reviews of the candidate shall be based upon the candidate’s specific assignment and be consistent with APM 280;
7. The specific appropriateness of the candidate’s abilities and background with respect to the assigned duty and responsibilities.

C. APPOINTMENT LETTER
The Appointment or Reappointment Letter must indicate the ending date of the appointment and include the following text:

“University policy requires that you be informed of the following: appointments to the title of <rank> Adjunct Professor are self-terminating (no further notice of non-reappointment will be forthcoming) and do not create an obligation on the part of the university to either extend or renew the appointment.”

D. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PATENT POLICY
All Adjunct faculty participating in research as employees or otherwise, with or without salary, shall execute a University of California Patent Policy as a condition of receiving their adjunct faculty appointment. Notwithstanding the above, an individual acknowledges that he or she is bound by the University of California Patent Policy by accepting or continuing University employment or by using University resources, facilities, or interacting with University faculty and staff. Failure to sign the Policy shall result in the appointment not being granted.
Section Under Construction: Please refer to MAPP 2014 for information on merit, promotion and appraisal review.
3026: DISCIPLINE

This policy provides the standards and procedures for instituting corrective action or dismissal of non-Senate academic appointees. Corrective action or dismissal may be instituted for good cause, including but not limited to: misconduct, unsatisfactory work performance, or dereliction of academic duty. For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, demotion and dismissal for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process. Such peer review shall be advisory to the administrator authorized to institute the demotion and dismissal action.

RESPONSIBILITY

Unit Chairs, supervisors and other appropriate administrative authorities have the responsibility to ensure that each appointee has the appropriate training and mentoring opportunities in order to successfully carry out the job duties and responsibilities of his or her position. It is expected that each aforementioned supervisor will ensure that timely communications, documentation and performance review have occurred prior to initiating corrective action and/or any recommendation for dismissal.

PRIOR TO INSTITUTING ACTION

Prior to instituting corrective action and/or dismissal as described in the sections that follow, efforts to resolve the problem should be attempted.

For performance-related issues, supervisors are responsible for counseling individuals as deficiencies in job duties occur. If deficiencies continue, counseling memos should be issued to the appointee. The documentation, in the form of a counseling memo should clearly identify the problem area(s), the expected standards, and refer to any previous discussions the supervisor has had with the appointee. The supervisor should follow up with the appointee at an appropriate interval, informing him or her whether the deficiency has been corrected or further improvement is required.

Performance reviews should appropriately address any deficiencies that required documentation. If during the course of the performance review it is determined that previously acknowledged deficiencies still exist or performance continues to be unsatisfactory, corrective action should be instituted.

For actions that involve serious misconduct, such as those involving the health and safety of other University employees, or that may involve the misuse of University property, it may be appropriate to initiate corrective action and/or dismissal immediately.

TYPES OF CORRECTIVE ACTION AND DISMISSAL

Corrective actions include written warning with consequence, written censure, suspension without pay, or demotion. Corrective action shall normally be taken in progressive steps, beginning with a written warning, except when corrective action is the result of conduct which an appointee knows or reasonably should have known was unsatisfactory. Unsatisfactory conduct may include but is not limited to dishonesty, theft or misappropriation of University property, fighting on the job, insubordination, acts endangering others, sexual harassment or other serious misconduct.

Written warning is a formal communication that informs the appointee of a deficiency in performance or an incident of misconduct. A written warning contains not only the specifics of the performance or an incident, but also a method for correction and a clear statement of the probable consequence if the deficiency or misconduct is not corrected.

Written censure is a formal reprimand that conveys institutional rebuke. It may be issued to an appointee for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. Written censure informs the appointee of the serious nature of the event. A written notice of intent must precede the issuance of a written censure.
Suspension is debarment without pay from the appointee’s responsibilities for a stated period of time. An appointee may be suspended for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. A written notice of intent to suspend must precede the issuance of a written notice of suspension.

Demotion is a temporary or indefinite reduction in rank, step, and/or salary. An appointee may be demoted for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. A written notice of intent to demote must precede the issuance of a written notice of suspension.

For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, demotion for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process.

Dismissal is the termination of employment initiated by the University prior to the ending date of appointment. An appointee may be dismissed for continued poor performance as a consequence of a previous written warning. An appointee may also be dismissed without previous written warning or as a result of conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was unsatisfactory or inappropriate. In both cases, a written notice of intent to dismiss must precede the issuance of a written notice of dismissal. For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, dismissal for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process.

PROCEDURES

Corrective action or dismissal as defined by this policy is subject to review and approval of the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

A. INVESTIGATORY LEAVE

An appointee may be placed on an immediate investigatory leave with pay without prior written notice for the purpose of reviewing or investigating charges of misconduct or dereliction of duty, which, in the judgment of the supervisor, requires removal of the appointee from responsibilities and/or University premises. Such investigatory leave must be confirmed in writing to the appointee normally within five working days after the leave is effective. The notice shall include the reasons for and the expected duration of the leave.

B. WRITTEN WARNING

A written warning issued under this policy as a result of continued poor performance, a less than satisfactory performance review, or due to inappropriate or unsatisfactory conduct must state the serious nature of the performance or conduct and a probable consequence appropriate to the circumstance.

C. WRITTEN NOTICE OF INTENT

A written notice of intent shall be provided to the appointee prior to initiating a written censure, suspension without pay, demotion, or dismissal. Notice of intent is not required for a written warning. The notice of intent shall provide:

- the serious nature of the deficiency or conduct;
- the intended action, including any salary consequence of the action;
- proposed effective date;
- reason for the action and or basis of the charges, including copies of pertinent material upon which the intended action was based;
- the appointee’s right to respond either orally or in writing within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written notice of intent;
- the name of the person to whom the appointee should respond.
D. WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION
Following the review of an appointee’s oral or written response, if any, to the notice of intent, a written notice of action shall be issued to the appointee. The notice of action shall be issued within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written notice of intent. Such notice of action shall:

- notify the appointee of the corrective action or dismissal to be taken;
- notify the appointee of the effective date of the action;
- notify the appointee of the right to grieve the action under APM 140.

The notice of action may specify corrective action less severe than that described in the notice of intent, or it may specify that no corrective action will be taken; however, the notice of action may not include an action more severe than that described in the notice of intent.

E. REPRESENTATION
An appointee may be self-represented or may be represented by another person at any stage of the corrective action or dismissal process.

F. EXTENSION OF TIME
Prior to the expiration of any time limit, extensions may be granted for good cause by the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

G. RECORDS
A copy of the written warning, written censure, suspension, demotion, dismissal, the written notice of intent, and a copy of all supporting documents upon which the decision to take corrective action or dismissal was based shall be placed in the appointee’s official personnel file. Such materials may be considered in connection with a recommendation or decision in a personnel action involving the individual if the materials are made part of the personnel review by the Vice Provost for the Faculty. An appointee shall have the right to have inserted into the personnel file any statement or response to these materials in accordance with APM 160-30.

H. NOTICE PROCEDURES
Any notice to the appointee pursuant to this procedure shall be deemed conclusive by delivery to the appointee’s last known address.
3027: GRIEVANCE PROCESS

A non-Senate academic appointee is entitled to select only one grievance review mechanism (APM 150-40). For a non-Senate academic appointee with a term appointment, if the hearing has not commenced by the ending of the appointment, the dismissal becomes a non-reappointment effective at the end of the appointment. The appointee has 30 days from the ending date of the appointment to grieve the non-reappointment (APM 137, APM 140). The grievance should be submitted in writing to the Vice Provost for the Faculty.
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3031: GENERAL GUIDELINES

A. RANK & CRITERIA

The Visiting prefix is used in conjunction with the Professor title to designate one who:

- Is appointed temporarily to perform the duties associated with the Professor title as stated in APM 220;
- Either has held, is on leave from, or is retired from an academic or research position at another educational institution; or whose research, creative activities or professional achievement makes a visiting appointment appropriate.

Ranks and steps in this series parallel those in the Professor series. A Visiting Professor who is on leave or retired from another institution will normally be appointed at the same rank and step as the individual’s title at the home educational institution. Because appointments in this series are temporary, reasonable flexibility may be employed in the application of the first criterion above.

Appointment to this series does not confer membership in the Academic Senate.

B. SALARY

Tenure or security of employment is not granted in association with appointment to the visiting series.

Appointments may be made with or without salary. Salaries shall be determined according to the special circumstances of the case, with due consideration given to the appointee’s regular salary or professional income. In some cases, it may be appropriate to separate considerations of rank from those of salary. Appointees’ travel expenses are not to be incorporated in the salary and reimbursement of such expenses should be made in accordance with University policy.

Appointments may be made at full-time or part-time. The assigned percentage time should accurately reflect the expected workload carried with an appointment to this title.

C. TERMS OF SERVICE

An appointment or a reappointment to the Visiting Professor series is made for a specified term not to exceed one year. This is communicated to the appointee in the Appointment Letter or the Reappointment Letter. The total period of consecutive service with a Visiting title shall not exceed two years, unless a longer period is approved by the Provost/EVC. In the case of Visiting Assistant Professor Programs in Mathematics, the total period of consecutive service shall not exceed three years, unless a longer period is approved by the Chancellor.

D. LIMITATIONS OF SERVICE

If an appointee is later considered for transfer to a corresponding appointment in the regular series, the proposal for such transfer shall be treated as a new appointment subject to full customary review.

If an appointee is transferred to a corresponding appointment in the regular series, the following shall apply:

- Certain removal expenses may be allowed as provided in APM 560-14-d.
- Prior service in the Visiting Assistant Professor title will be credited under the “eight-year” rule (APM 133).
- Sabbatical leave credit will be accrued as described in APM 740-11-b.
3032: RECRUITMENT

A. RECRUITMENT DATA

Unless a competitive affirmative action search takes place, recruitment data do not pertain to the appointment and are thus not included in the appointment case file. If a competitive affirmative action search takes place, refer to MAPP 2012 for pertinent policies and procedures.
A. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT

The same criteria and standards of excellence for the Professor series apply to the Visiting Professor series. For general appointment processes and guidelines, please refer to MAPP 2013, taking into consideration the exceptions and additions listed below.

1. DEAN’S RECOMMENDATION LETTER

The Dean’s Recommendation Letter should articulate specific justification for each appointment in order to gain the approval of the Provost/EVC. Towards that goal, the letters should address the following:

- The quality of the candidate and her/his specific ability to contribute to the unit, the program, and/or the campus;
- The value added to the program/unit mission not presently afforded by the ladder-rank and other faculty;
- If the recommendation is without salary and the proposed percentage of time of the appointment;
- The appropriate funding source;
- The beginning and specific ending date of the appointment;
- The specific assignment of duties and responsibilities, which must include teaching and research. Subsequent evaluations of the candidate shall be based upon the candidate’s specific assignment and be consistent with APM 230;
- The specific appropriateness of the candidate’s abilities and background with respect to the assigned duties and responsibilities.

2. APPOINTMENT LETTER

The Appointment or Reappointment Letter must indicate the ending date of the appointment and include the following text:

*University policy requires that you be informed of the following: appointments to the title of Visiting Professor are self-terminating (no further notice of non-reappointment will be forthcoming) and do not create an obligation on the part of the University to either extend or renew the appointment.*
3034: MERIT, PROMOTION, APPRAISAL REVIEW

A. MERIT, PROMOTION, APPRAISAL REVIEW

Merit, promotion, and appraisal reviews are not applicable to the Visiting Professor series.
3035: SABBATICAL AND OTHER LEAVES

Sabbatical leave and credit will be accrued as described in APM 740-11-b.
3036: DISCIPLINE

This policy provides the standards and procedures for instituting corrective action or dismissal of non-Senate academic appointees. Corrective action or dismissal may be instituted for good cause, including but not limited to misconduct, unsatisfactory work performance, or dereliction of academic duty. For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, demotion and dismissal for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process. Such peer review shall be advisory to the administrator authorized to institute the demotion and dismissal action.

RESPONSIBILITY

Unit Chairs, supervisors and other appropriate administrative authorities have the responsibility to ensure that each appointee has the appropriate training and mentoring opportunities in order to successfully carry out the job duties and responsibilities of his or her position. It is expected that each aforementioned supervisor will ensure that timely communications, documentation and performance review have occurred prior to initiating corrective action and/or any recommendation for dismissal.

PRIOR TO INSTITUTING ACTION

Prior to instituting corrective action and/or dismissal as described in the sections that follow, efforts to resolve the problem should be attempted.

For performance-related issues, supervisors are responsible for counseling individuals as deficiencies in job duties occur. If deficiencies continue, counseling memos should be issued to the appointee. The documentation, in the form of a counseling memo should clearly identify the problem area(s), the expected standards, and refer to any previous discussions the supervisor has had with the appointee. The supervisor should follow-up with the appointee at an appropriate interval, informing him or her whether the deficiency has been corrected or further improvement is required.

Performance reviews should appropriately address any deficiencies that required documentation. If during the course of the performance review it is determined that previously acknowledged deficiencies still exist or performance continues to be unsatisfactory, corrective action should be instituted.

For actions that involve serious misconduct, such as those involving the health and safety of other University employees, or that may involve the misuse of University property, it may be appropriate to initiate corrective action and/or dismissal immediately.

TYPES OF CORRECTIVE ACTION AND DISMISSAL

Corrective actions include written warning with consequence, written censure, suspension without pay, or demotion. Corrective action shall normally be taken in progressive steps, beginning with a written warning, except when corrective action is the result of conduct which an appointee knows or reasonably should have known was unsatisfactory. Unsatisfactory conduct may include but is not limited to dishonesty, theft or misappropriation of University property, fighting on the job, insubordination, acts endangering others, sexual harassment or other serious misconduct.

Written warning is a formal communication that informs the appointee of a deficiency in performance or an incident of misconduct. A written warning contains not only the specifics of the performance or an incident, but also a method for correction and a clear statement of the probable consequence if the deficiency or misconduct is not corrected.

Written censure is a formal reprimand that conveys institutional rebuke. It may be issued to an appointee for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. Written censure informs the appointee of the serious nature of the event. A written notice of intent must precede the issuance of a written censure.
Suspension is debarment without pay from the appointee’s responsibilities for a stated period of time. An appointee may be suspended for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. A written notice of intent to suspend must precede the issuance of a written notice of suspension.

Demotion is a temporary or indefinite reduction in rank, step, and/or salary. An appointee may be demoted for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. A written notice of intent to demote must precede the issuance of a written notice of Suspension.

For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, demotion for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process.

Dismissal is the termination of employment initiated by the University prior to the ending date of appointment. An appointee may be dismissed for continued poor performance as a consequence of a previous written warning. An appointee may also be dismissed without previous written warning or as a result of conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was unsatisfactory or inappropriate. In both cases, a written notice of intent to dismiss must precede the issuance of a written notice of dismissal.

For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, dismissal for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process.

PROCEDURES

Corrective action or dismissal as defined by this policy is subject to review and approval of the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

A. INVESTIGATORY LEAVE

An appointee may be placed on an immediate investigatory leave with pay without prior written notice for the purpose of reviewing or investigating charges of misconduct or dereliction of duty, which, in the judgment of the supervisor, requires removal of the appointee from responsibilities and/or University premises. Such investigatory leave must be confirmed in writing to the appointee normally within five working days after the leave is effective. The notice shall include the reasons for and the expected duration of the leave.

B. WRITTEN WARNING

A written warning issued under this policy as a result of continued poor performance, a less than satisfactory performance review, or due to inappropriate or unsatisfactory conduct must state the serious nature of the performance or conduct and a probable consequence appropriate to the circumstance.

C. WRITTEN NOTICE OF INTENT

A written notice of intent shall be provided to the appointee prior to initiating a written censure, suspension without pay, demotion, or dismissal. Notice of intent is not required for a written warning. The notice of intent shall provide:

- the serious nature of the deficiency or conduct;
- the intended action, including any salary consequence of the action;
- proposed effective date;
- reason for the action and or basis of the charges, including copies of pertinent material upon which the intended action was based;
- the appointee’s right to respond either orally or in writing within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written notice of intent;
- the name of the person to whom the appointee should respond.
D. WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION

Following the review of an appointee’s oral or written response, if any, to the notice of intent, a written notice of action shall be issued to the appointee. The notice of action shall be issued within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written notice of intent. Such notice of action shall:

- notify the appointee of the corrective action or dismissal to be taken;
- notify the appointee of the effective date of the action;
- notify the appointee of the right to grieve the action under APM 140.

The notice of action may specify corrective action less severe than that described in the notice of intent, or it may specify that no corrective action will be taken; however the notice of action may not include an action more severe than that described in the notice of intent.

E. REPRESENTATION

An appointee may be self-represented or may be represented by another person at any stage of the corrective action or dismissal process.

F. EXTENSION OF TIME

Prior to the expiration of any time limit, extensions may be granted for good cause by the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

G. RECORDS

A copy of the written warning, written censure, suspension, demotion, dismissal, the written notice of intent, and a copy of all supporting documents upon which the decision to take corrective action or dismissal was based shall be placed in the appointee’s official personnel file. Such materials may be considered in connection with a recommendation or decision in a personnel action involving the individual if the materials are made part of the personnel review by the Vice Provost for the Faculty. An appointee shall have the right to have inserted into the personnel file any statement or response to these materials in accordance with APM 160-30.

H. NOTICE PROCEDURES

Any notice to the appointee pursuant to this procedure shall be deemed conclusive by delivery to the appointee’s last known address.
3037: GRIEVANCE PROCESS

A non-Senate academic appointee is entitled to select only one grievance review mechanism (APM 150-40). For a non-Senate academic appointee with a term appointment, if the hearing has not commenced by the ending of the appointment, the dismissal becomes a non-reappointment effective at the end of the appointment. The appointee has 30 days from the ending date of the appointment to grieve the non-reappointment (APM 137, APM 140). The grievance should be submitted in writing to the Vice Provost for the Faculty.
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3051: GENERAL GUIDELINES

Project series titles are given to those appointees who make significant and creative contributions to a research or creative project in any academic discipline. Appointees may be ongoing members of a research team or may be employed for a limited period of time to contribute high-level skills to a specific research or creative program. They are not required to carry out independent research or develop an independent research reputation, nor are they expected to demonstrate the capacity to do so. Ordinarily, appointees will carry out research or creative programs with supervision by a member of the Professor or Professional Research Series. Nevertheless, those who hold a Project title are expected to have a broader range of knowledge and competency and a higher level of independence than appointees in the Specialist series, whose appointment and advancement depend on the technical contributions that they make to the work of the research team.

Though an appointee in the Project series does not usually serve as a Principal Investigator, the Vice Chancellor for Research has the authority to grant exceptions. Any request for and approval of an exception to this policy must be in writing and must be made prior to any offer of employment. Exceptions are generally required when the candidate lacks the full requirements for a Professional Research title.

A. CRITERIA

Candidates for a title in this series must have earned a doctorate or its equivalent.

In judging a candidate for appointment or promotion to a position in this series, the two criteria outlined and described below are used. An evaluation of the candidate’s achievement in both criteria is required, though reasonable flexibility may be exercised in balancing heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another area. Project titles do not require appointees to participate in University and public service, though doing so is encouraged.

Project Scientists do not have any teaching responsibilities. Project series appointees, however, may be involved in the training and mentorship of undergraduates and graduate students. Appointees in this series who teach must hold concurrently an appropriate instructional title, following campus review procedures for such appointment.

Significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project

This can be documented by one or more of the following:

- Publications that acknowledge the appointee’s significant and meaningful contribution to the work.
- Publications on which the appointee is an author.
- Other evidence (e.g., letters from collaborators or Principal Investigators) that work done by the appointee contributed to publishable research.
- Active dissemination of information (beyond the boundaries of the campus) through informal instruction, presentations, or other means stemming from the appointee’s research accomplishments.
- Other evidence of recognized expertise may include formal documentation of intellectual effort and participation in publishable research activities, first authorship on publications/patents, presentation of research at regional/national meetings, invitations to review grant proposals and/or journal articles, invitations to participate in research projects, and/or service on advisory panels.

Research publications and other creative accomplishments will be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in research activity of scholarly quality and significance within the defined area of expertise and specialization, contributing broad knowledge and competency at a high level of independence to a research or creative program.
Professional competence and activity

Project series appointees are expected to engage in professional activities that are directly related to their professional expertise and achievement. The appointee’s professional activities will be examined for evidence of achievement and leadership in their field of expertise and for demonstrated progression in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems.

Such activities may include:

- Participating in appropriate professional/technical societies or groups and other educational and research organizations.
- Reviewing research proposals.
- Reviewing journal manuscripts and other publications related to the area of expertise.

B. RANK

Appointments

The initial rank (Assistant, Associate, or Full) of an appointee to the Project series is dictated by:

- The specialization, productivity, and experience of the candidate;
- The complexity and quality of the research for which the candidate will be responsible;
- The level of independence with which the candidate will work (working independently does not mean that the candidate has an independent program); and
- The specialized research assignments/tasks the candidate will assume.

Advancements

As an academic appointee, advancement of a candidate in this series is based on individual qualifications and meritorious performance/scholarly achievement and is not automatic or based on length of service. Advancement through the ranks requires measurable growth in the candidate’s research efforts/activity with respect to quality, productivity, scope, reputation, and impact within the research field.

Promotion to the next rank requires continued scholarly achievement and professional growth, resulting in publishable research and other evidence of productivity, as well as increased professional recognition.

C. SALARY

Appointees to the Project series are compensated according to the Academic Salary Scales issued by the Office of the President on a fiscal year basis. Off-scale components are allowable in this series (See APM 620).

Appointees may serve full-time, part-time, or without salary. Project titles may be supported by State and non-State funds. Funding sources used to compensate the Project series must permit research and be approved by either the Dean or Sponsored Projects.

D. TERMS OF SERVICE

An appointment or a reappointment to the Project series is made with a specified ending date. This is communicated to the appointee in the Appointment Letter or the Reappointment Letter.

Maximum terms for appointments and reappointments are provided below; when appropriate, recommended terms may be shorter. Reappointments may be made to the same rank and step, i.e., without a merit increase or promotion.

The Provost/EVC has the authority to approve above-scale salary levels up to and including the Regental compensation threshold. For salaries beyond the Regental compensation threshold, authority rests with The
Regents on recommendation of the President, after appropriate review and as prescribed in Section 101.2 (a)(2) of the Standing Orders of The Regents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Max. Appt. Term</th>
<th>Normal Periods of Service</th>
<th>Service Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Project I, II, III, IV, V, VI</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 Years per Step</td>
<td>8 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(APM 311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Project I, II, III</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 Years per Step</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Project IV, V</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 Years per Step</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project I, II, III, IV</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 Years per Step</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project V, VI, VII, VIII, IX and Above Scale</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. NORMAL PERIOD AT RANK AND/OR STEP

Normal periods of service at each step are listed in the table above. Six months or more of service, with or without salary, in any fiscal year counts as one full year of service. Titles of Assistant Project V and VI, and Associate Project IV and V are used only in exceptional situations and with proper justification. When service at Assistant Project V is followed by service at Associate Project I, the normal period of combined service with both titles at the steps indicated is two years. This applies for combined service at Assistant Project VI and Associate Project II, at Associate Project IV and Project I, and at Associate Project V and Project II.
3052: RECRUITMENT

A. OPEN RECRUITMENT

The recruitment procedure should not begin until a funding source for the proposed appointment has been identified.

The recruitment process begins with the posting of a draft job advertisement in AP Recruit by School staff. The job ad must be approved in AP Recruit by the PI and by an APO representative. External ads are encouraged, but not required. The ad must remain open for at least thirty days before any scheduled interviews may occur. The PI should work in consultation with the School staff to prepare the ad, which provides a job description and requirements and indicates what supporting documentation is requested from the candidates.

Supporting documents typically include, but are not limited to:

- Cover Letter
- CV
- Statement of Research
- List of References

During recruitment, PIs must pay attention to the employment eligibility of any international applicants. Appropriate visas can take several months to obtain, and the PI should notify School staff and APO as early as possible of a potential visa case. While an application for a visa cannot be finalized until the appointment is approved, preliminary inquiries can often help in starting the visa process. Questions should be referred to the Office of International Affairs (OIA). (see APM 530)

B. WAIVERS OF RECRUITMENT

It is understood that circumstances exist in which a Waiver of Recruitment is appropriate. Such circumstances include, but are not limited to:

- A new appointee relocates his or her laboratory to UC Merced and brings individuals who are currently funded by the project. Since the job is moving, the individuals employed on the project are moving with the job.
- A candidate is a faculty member’s advisee and agrees to remain at UC Merced in a post-graduation appointment to complete the work on an ongoing project and/or to write the results for publication of the completed research.

A request for Waiver of Recruitment can be submitted via AP Recruit to be routed to the appropriate approving authorities, with the final decision resting with the Vice Provost for the Faculty. The request should include:

- candidate’s name
- proposed title, step, annual salary, percentage, appointment begin and end date
- a description of how the candidate was identified
- an explanation of the reason for waiving the open recruitment (i.e., appointee is employed in a relocated lab)

See the Search Waiver Guidelines for Academic Employees for more information.

C. REAPPOINTMENT

An open recruitment is not required in order to reappoint an individual when that individual was previously recruited for the same position.
3053: APPOINTMENT

The Project series is used for academic appointees who are expected to have a broad range of knowledge and competency and a high level of independence while engaging in research or contributing to a creative program or project. Candidates must have earned a doctorate degree or its equivalent.

A. CRITERIA

Project series appointments are made to provide research projects with necessary skills, experience, and knowledge. Individuals appointed to the series are expected to have specialized education, training and a high level of independence. At the Assistant level, the appointee contributes to the research efforts of existing projects with a level of independent participation. At the Associate and Full levels, the appointee provides considerable input in the planning and execution of research projects, moving towards independent project development. Providing specialized skills in support of research, rather than conducting research as the principal responsibility, is also allowable in this series.

B. PROCESS

The Principal Investigator will prepare an appointment file for the selected candidate to be forwarded to the appropriate Dean. The appointment file should contain an updated curriculum vitae, verification of funding, and a completed AP-611 form, which provides the following information:

- candidate’s name
- proposed title, step, annual salary, percentage, appointment begin and end date
- information regarding any current UC employment to verify that candidate is not currently in a represented position
- specific qualifications that apply to the Project series
- outline of expected duties and contributions

Non-confidential letters of recommendation or other supporting documents may be included.

The Dean’s office will forward the appointment file to APO for review. Following review by APO and approval of the Dean, the Dean’s office will issue an appointment letter to the candidate. The completed file will be forwarded to APO as Office of Record for academic appointments.
3054: MERIT, PROMOTION, APPRAISAL REVIEW

Appointments in this series are made at the normal period of service at the step to which the candidate is appointed, or for less time. There are no limits on years of service in this series. Please refer to the Academic Salary Scales for the normal periods at each step.

The Dean is responsible for making certain that eligible candidates are reviewed and are eligible for merit review after service at the normal period in step.

Appointees in the Project series are assessed on their demonstrated significant, original, and creative contributions to a research or creative program or project; advancement of knowledge in the discipline; professional competence and activity; and their University and public service, if applicable. This assessment should be documented in the recommendation for reappointment. The reappointment process otherwise follows the appointment process outlined above.
3056: DISCIPLINE

This policy provides the standards and procedures for instituting corrective action or dismissal of non-Senate academic appointees. Corrective action or dismissal may be instituted for good cause, including but not limited to misconduct, unsatisfactory work performance, or dereliction of academic duty. For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, demotion and dismissal for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process. Such peer review shall be advisory to the administrator authorized to institute the demotion and dismissal action.

RESPONSIBILITY

Unit Chairs, supervisors and other appropriate administrative authorities have the responsibility to ensure that each appointee has the appropriate training and mentoring opportunities in order to successfully carry out the job duties and responsibilities of his or her position. It is expected that each aforementioned supervisor will ensure that timely communications, documentation and performance review have occurred prior to initiating corrective action and/or any recommendation for dismissal.

PRIOR TO INSTITUTING ACTION

Prior to instituting corrective action and/or dismissal as described in the sections that follow, efforts to resolve the problem should be attempted.

For performance-related issues, supervisors are responsible for counseling individuals as deficiencies in job duties occur. If deficiencies continue, counseling memos should be issued to the appointee. The documentation, in the form of a counseling memo, should clearly identify the problem area(s), the expected standards, and refer to any previous discussions the supervisor has had with the appointee. The supervisor should follow-up with the appointee at an appropriate interval, informing him or her whether the deficiency has been corrected or further improvement is required.

Performance reviews should appropriately address any deficiencies that require documentation. If during the course of the performance review it is determined that previously acknowledged deficiencies still exist or performance continues to be unsatisfactory, corrective action should be instituted.

For actions that involve serious misconduct, such as those involving the health and safety of other University employees, or that may involve the misuse of University property, it may be appropriate to initiate corrective action and/or dismissal immediately.

TYPES OF CORRECTIVE ACTION AND DISMISSAL

Corrective actions include written warning with consequence, written censure, suspension without pay, or demotion. Corrective action shall normally be taken in progressive steps, beginning with a written warning, except when corrective action is the result of conduct which an appointee knows or reasonably should have known was unsatisfactory. Unsatisfactory conduct may include but is not limited to dishonesty, theft or misappropriation of University property, fighting on the job, insubordination, acts endangering others, sexual harassment or other serious misconduct.

Written warning is a formal communication that informs the appointee of a deficiency in performance or an incident of misconduct. A written warning contains not only the specifics of the performance or an incident, but also a method for correction and a clear statement of the probable consequence if the deficiency or misconduct is not corrected.

Written censure is a formal reprimand that conveys institutional rebuke. It may be issued to an appointee for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. Written censure informs the appointee of the serious nature of the event. A written notice of intent must precede the issuance of a written censure.
Suspension is debarment without pay from the appointee’s responsibilities for a stated period of time. An appointee may be suspended for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. A written notice of intent to suspend must precede the issuance of a written notice of suspension.

Demotion is a temporary or indefinite reduction in rank, step, and/or salary. An appointee may be demoted for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. A written notice of intent to demote must precede the issuance of a written notice of demotion. For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, demotion for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process.

Dismissal is the termination of employment initiated by the University prior to the ending date of appointment. An appointee may be dismissed for continued poor performance as a consequence of a previous written warning. An appointee may also be dismissed without previous written warning or as a result of conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was unsatisfactory or inappropriate. In both cases, a written notice of intent to dismiss must precede the issuance of a written notice of dismissal.

For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, dismissal for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process.

PROCEDURES
Corrective action or dismissal as defined by this policy is subject to review and approval of the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

A. INVESTIGATORY LEAVE
An appointee may be placed on an immediate investigatory leave with pay without prior written notice for the purpose of reviewing or investigating charges of misconduct or dereliction of duty, which, in the judgment of the supervisor, requires removal of the appointee from responsibilities and/or University premises. Such investigatory leave must be confirmed in writing to the appointee normally within five working days after the leave is effective. The notice shall include the reasons for and the expected duration of the leave.

B. WRITTEN WARNING
A written warning issued under this policy as a result of continued poor performance, a less than satisfactory performance review, or due to inappropriate or unsatisfactory conduct must state the serious nature of the performance or conduct and a probable consequence appropriate to the circumstance.

C. WRITTEN NOTICE OF INTENT
A written notice of intent shall be provided to the appointee prior to initiating a written censure, suspension without pay, demotion, or dismissal. Notice of intent is not required for a written warning. The notice of intent shall provide:

- the serious nature of the deficiency or conduct;
- the intended action, including any salary consequence of the action;
- proposed effective date;
- reason for the action and or basis of the charges, including copies of pertinent material upon which the intended action was based;
- the appointee’s right to respond either orally or in writing within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written notice of intent;
- the name of the person to whom the appointee should respond.
D. WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION

Following the review of an appointee’s oral or written response, if any, to the notice of intent, a written notice of action shall be issued to the appointee. The notice of action shall be issued within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written notice of intent. Such notice of action shall:

- notify the appointee of the corrective action or dismissal to be taken;
- notify the appointee of the effective date of the action;
- notify the appointee of the right to grieve the action under APM 140.

The notice of action may specify corrective action less severe than that described in the notice of intent, or it may specify that no corrective action will be taken; however, the notice of action may not include an action more severe than that described in the notice of intent.

E. REPRESENTATION

An appointee may be self-represented or may be represented by another person at any stage of the corrective action or dismissal process.

F. EXTENSION OF TIME

Prior to the expiration of any time limit, extensions may be granted for good cause by the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

G. RECORDS

A copy of the written warning, written censure, suspension, demotion, dismissal, the written notice of intent, and a copy of all supporting documents upon which the decision to take corrective action or dismissal was based shall be placed in the appointee’s official personnel file. Such materials may be considered in connection with a recommendation or decision in a personnel action involving the individual if the materials are made part of the personnel review by the Vice Provost for the Faculty Provost for the Faculty. An appointee shall have the right to have inserted into the personnel file any statement or response to these materials in accordance with APM 160-30.

H. NOTICE PROCEDURES

Any notice to the appointee pursuant to this procedure shall be deemed conclusive by delivery to the appointee’s last known address.
3057: GRIEVANCE PROCESS

A non-Senate academic appointee is entitled to select only one grievance review mechanism (APM 150-40). For a non-Senate academic appointee with a term appointment, if the hearing has not commenced by the ending of the appointment, the dismissal becomes a non-reappointment effective at the end of the appointment. The appointee has 30 days from the ending date of the appointment to grieve the non-reappointment (APM 137, APM 140). The grievance should be submitted in writing to the Vice Provost for the Faculty.
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3061: GENERAL GUIDELINES

The Specialist series is used for an academic appointee who has an identified area of technical specialization and provides technical or specialized expertise (e.g., with instrumentation and research equipment or with social science research methods) in the planning and execution of a research project or projects. At the Junior and Assistant levels, the appointee enables research as part of a team. At the Associate and Full levels, the appointee provides considerable independent input into the planning and execution of research. Normally, Specialists do not have Principal Investigator (PI) status, but may obtain permission by exception and/or collaborate with a PI in preparing research proposals for extramural funding. Specialists do not have any teaching responsibilities.

A Specialist differs from a Staff Research Associate title (or any other staff title) in that Specialists are required to be actively/significantly involved in publishable research activities as documented through publications or other methods; are required to maintain/enhance their professional competence; are required to show leadership in their technical expertise; and as is the case in other academic series, mere length of service and continuous meritorious performance are not sufficient justification for advancement.

Appointees in the Specialist series are assessed on their professional competence and activity, their University and public service, and the value and impact of their contributions to their areas of research and their advancement of knowledge in the discipline as judged by other academics and scientists through a process of peer review (APM 330).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks and Steps for Specialist Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Specialist I, II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Specialist I, II, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Specialist I - IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist I – IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist V, Above Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3062: RECRUITMENT

Specialists can be hired either through Open Recruitment (3062.A) or with a Waiver of Recruitment (3062.B). The recruitment procedure should not begin until a funding source for the proposed appointment has been identified.

A. OPEN RECRUITMENT

The recruitment process begins with the posting of a draft job advertisement in AP Recruit by School staff. The PI should work in consultation with the School staff to prepare the ad, which provides a job description and requirements and indicates what supporting documentation is requested from the candidates. Supporting documents typically include, but are not limited to:

- Cover Letter
- CV
- Statement of Research
- List of References

The job ad must be approved in AP Recruit by the PI and by an APO representative. External ads are encouraged, but not required. The ad must remain open for at least thirty days before any scheduled interviews may occur.

During recruitment, PIs must pay attention to the employment eligibility of any international applicants. Appropriate visas can take several months to obtain, and the PI should notify School staff and APO as early as possible of a potential visa case. While an application for a visa cannot be finalized until the appointment is approved, preliminary inquiries can often help in starting the visa process. Questions should be referred to the Office of International Affairs (OIA). (see APM 530)

B. WAIVERS OF RECRUITMENT

It is understood that circumstances exist in which a Waiver of Recruitment is appropriate. Such circumstances include, but are not limited to:

- A new appointee relocates his or her laboratory to UC Merced and brings individuals who are currently funded by the project. Since the job is moving, the individuals employed on the project are moving with the job.
- A candidate is a faculty member’s advisee and agrees to remain at UC Merced in a post-graduation appointment to complete the work on an ongoing project and/or to write the results for publication of the completed research.

A request for Waiver of Recruitment can be submitted via AP Recruit to be routed to the appropriate approving authorities, with the final decision resting with the Vice Provost for the Faculty. The request should include:

- candidate’s name
- proposed title, step, annual salary, percentage, appointment begin and end date
- a description of how the candidate was identified
- an explanation of the reason for waiving the open recruitment (i.e., appointee is employed in a relocated lab)

See the Search Waiver Guidelines for Academic Employees for more information.

C. REAPPOINTMENT
An open recruitment is not required in order to reappoint an individual when that individual was previously recruited for the same position.
3063: APPOINTMENT

A. TERMS OF SERVICE

An appointment or reappointment to a Specialist title is normally made with a specified ending date. Appointments may be made on a full- or part-time basis. Reappointments may be made to the same rank and step; i.e., without a merit increase or promotion. There is no limit on service at any rank or step in this series.

B. CRITERIA

In judging a candidate for appointment in this series, the following criteria are provided as guidelines and may be used flexibly where deemed necessary. For possible forms of evidence for these criteria, see APM 330-10.

- Performance in research in specialized areas
- Professional competence and activity
- University and public service

Particular attention should be paid to the analytical evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments.

General guidelines for initial appointment requirements are as follows (APM 330-11):

- **Junior Specialist**: Recent bachelor’s degree related to proposed responsibilities or equivalent research experience
- **Assistant Specialist**: Bachelor’s degree related to proposed responsibilities or up to five years’ relevant experience.
- **Associate Specialist**: Bachelor’s or master’s degree (or equivalent); or five to ten years’ relevant experience. Advancement beyond Associate Specialist I requires meritorious performance and a growing record of accomplishment and independence.
- **Specialist**: Master’s or doctorate (or equivalent); or more than ten years’ relevant experience; significant expertise and record of accomplishments. Advancement beyond Specialist I requires meritorious performance and a growing record of accomplishments and specialized contributions that have a major impact on the project(s).

In addition, appointment levels reflect the candidate’s expertise in the given specialty. The initial rank of an appointee is determined by:

- the specialization and experience of the candidate;
- the complexity of the research for which the candidate will be responsible;
- the level of independence with which the candidate will work (working independently does not mean that the candidate has an independent program); and
- the specialized research duties the candidate will assume.

C. SALARY

- Individuals appointed to this series are compensated on the Academic Salary Scale for the Specialist series on a fiscal year basis
- Salaries are subject to range adjustments
- Each funding source for this series must permit research
- Appointments without salary are allowable in this series
D. PROCESS

1. The Principal investigator (PI) will prepare an appointment file for the selected candidate to be forwarded to the appropriate Dean. The appointment file should contain an updated curriculum vitae, verification of funding, and a completed AP-611 form, which provides the following information:

- candidate’s name
- proposed title, step, annual salary, percentage, appointment begin and end date
- information regarding any current UC employment to verify that candidate is not currently in a represented position
- specific qualifications that apply to the Specialist series
- outline of expected duties and contributions

Non-confidential letters of recommendation or other supporting documents may be included.

The Dean’s office will forward the appointment file to APO for review. Following review by APO and approval of the Dean, the Dean’s office will issue an appointment letter to the candidate. The completed file will be forwarded to APO as Office of Record for academic appointments.
3064: MERIT, PROMOTION, APPRAISAL REVIEW

All advancement cases are based on the individual’s achievements and the availability of funding. Normal advancement will occur after one year at step at the Junior level, two years at step at the Assistant and Associate level, and after three years at step at the Specialist level. Merit advancements are based on the academic record since the last review while promotions are based on the career academic record.

The Dean is responsible for making certain that eligible candidates are reviewed and are eligible for merit review after service at the normal period at step.

Additionally, the case file for merit or promotion should include an evaluation of the candidate’s work and his or her contributions to the group effort, if relevant. This assessment should be documented in the recommendation for reappointment. The reappointment process otherwise follows the appointment process outlined above.
### 3066: DISCIPLINE

This policy provides the standards and procedures for instituting corrective action or dismissal of non-Senate academic appointees. Corrective action or dismissal may be instituted for good cause, including but not limited to misconduct, unsatisfactory work performance, or dereliction of academic duty.

For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, demotion and dismissal for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process. Such peer review shall be advisory to the administrator authorized to institute the demotion and dismissal action.

### RESPONSIBILITY

Unit Chairs, supervisors and other appropriate administrative authorities have the responsibility to ensure that each appointee has the appropriate training and mentoring opportunities in order to successfully carry out the job duties and responsibilities of his or her position. It is expected that each aforementioned supervisor will ensure that timely communications, documentation and performance review have occurred prior to initiating corrective action and/or any recommendation for dismissal.

### PRIOR TO INSTITUTING ACTION

Prior to instituting corrective action and/or dismissal as described in the sections that follow, efforts to resolve the problem should be attempted.

For performance-related issues, supervisors are responsible for counseling individuals as deficiencies in job duties occur. If deficiencies continue, counseling memos should be issued to the appointee. The documentation, in the form of a counseling memo should clearly identify the problem area(s), the expected standards, and refer to any previous discussions the supervisor has had with the appointee. The supervisor should follow up with the appointee at an appropriate interval, informing him or her whether the deficiency has been corrected or further improvement is required.

Performance reviews should appropriately address any deficiencies that required documentation. If during the course of the performance review it is determined that previously acknowledged deficiencies still exist or performance continues to be unsatisfactory, corrective action should be instituted.

For actions that involve serious misconduct, such as those involving the health and safety of other University employees, or that may involve the misuse of University property, it may be appropriate to initiate corrective action and/or dismissal immediately.

### TYPES OF CORRECTIVE ACTION AND DISMISSAL

Corrective actions include written warning with consequence, written censure, suspension without pay, or demotion. Corrective action shall normally be taken in progressive steps, beginning with a written warning, except when corrective action is the result of conduct which an appointee knows or reasonably should have known was unsatisfactory. Unsatisfactory conduct may include but is not limited to dishonesty, theft or misappropriation of University property, fighting on the job, insubordination, acts endangering others, sexual harassment or other serious misconduct.

Written warning is a formal communication that informs the appointee of a deficiency in performance or an incident of misconduct. A written warning contains not only the specifics of the performance or an incident, but also a method for correction and a clear statement of the probable consequence if the deficiency or misconduct is not corrected.

Written censure is a formal reprimand that conveys institutional rebuke. It may be issued to an appointee for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. Written censure informs the appointee of the serious nature of the event. A written notice of intent must precede the issuance of a written censure.
Suspension is debarment without pay from the appointee’s responsibilities for a stated period of time. An appointee may be suspended for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. A written notice of intent to suspend must precede the issuance of a written notice of suspension.

Demotion is a temporary or indefinite reduction in rank, step, and/or salary. An appointee may be demoted for performance or conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was inappropriate or unsatisfactory. A written notice of intent to demote must precede the issuance of a written notice of demotion. For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, demotion for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process.

Dismissal is the termination of employment initiated by the University prior to the ending date of appointment. An appointee may be dismissed for continued poor performance as a consequence of a previous written warning. An appointee may also be dismissed without previous written warning or as a result of conduct the appointee knows or reasonably should have known was unsatisfactory or inappropriate. In both cases, a written notice of intent to dismiss must precede the issuance of a written notice of dismissal.

For non-Senate academic appointees who are subject to peer review for performance evaluation, dismissal for unsatisfactory work performance shall involve the regular peer review process.

PROCEDURES
Corrective action or dismissal as defined by this policy is subject to review and approval of the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

A. INVESTIGATORY LEAVE
An appointee may be placed on an immediate investigatory leave with pay without prior written notice for the purpose of reviewing or investigating charges of misconduct or dereliction of duty, which, in the judgment of the supervisor, requires removal of the appointee from responsibilities and/or University premises. Such investigatory leave must be confirmed in writing to the appointee normally within five working days after the leave is effective. The notice shall include the reasons for and the expected duration of the leave.

B. WRITTEN WARNING
A written warning issued under this policy as a result of continued poor performance, a less than satisfactory performance review, or due to inappropriate or unsatisfactory conduct must state the serious nature of the performance or conduct and a probable consequence appropriate to the circumstance.

C. WRITTEN NOTICE OF INTENT
A written notice of intent shall be provided to the appointee prior to initiating a written censure, suspension without pay, demotion, or dismissal. Notice of intent is not required for a written warning. The notice of intent shall provide:

- the serious nature of the deficiency or conduct;
- the intended action, including any salary consequence of the action;
- proposed effective date;
- reason for the action and or basis of the charges, including copies of pertinent material upon which the intended action was based;
- the appointee’s right to respond either orally or in writing within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written notice of intent;
- the name of the person to whom the appointee should respond.
D. WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION

Following the review of an appointee’s oral or written response, if any, to the notice of intent, a written notice of action shall be issued to the appointee. The notice of action shall be issued within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written notice of intent. Such notice of action shall:

• notify the appointee of the corrective action or dismissal to be taken;
• notify the appointee of the effective date of the action;
• notify the appointee of the right to grieve the action under APM 140.

The notice of action may specify corrective action less severe than that described in the notice of intent, or it may specify that no corrective action will be taken; however, the notice of action may not include an action more severe than that described in the notice of intent.

E. REPRESENTATION

An appointee may be self-represented or may be represented by another person at any stage of the corrective action or dismissal process.

F. EXTENSION OF TIME

Prior to the expiration of any time limit, extensions may be granted for good cause by the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

G. RECORDS

A copy of the written warning, written censure, suspension, demotion, dismissal, the written notice of intent, and a copy of all supporting documents upon which the decision to take corrective action or dismissal was based shall be placed in the appointee’s official personnel file. Such materials may be considered in connection with a recommendation or decision in a personnel action involving the individual if the materials are made part of the personnel review by the Vice Provost for the Faculty. An appointee shall have the right to have inserted into the personnel file any statement or response to these materials in accordance with APM 160-30.

H. NOTICE PROCEDURES

Any notice to the appointee pursuant to this procedure shall be deemed conclusive by delivery to the appointee’s last known address.
3067: GRIEVANCE PROCESS

A non-Senate academic appointee is entitled to select only one grievance review mechanism (APM 150-40). For a non-Senate academic appointee with a term appointment, if the hearing has not commenced by the ending of the appointment, the dismissal becomes a non-reappointment effective at the end of the appointment. The appointee has 30 days from the ending date of the appointment to grieve the non-reappointment (APM 137, APM 140). The grievance should be submitted in writing to the Vice Provost for the Faculty.
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3071: GENERAL GUIDELINES

The following policies and procedures are intended to supplement the Memorandum of Understanding with the Postdoctoral Unit and the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 390) and have been developed to support the University’s goal of recruiting the highest quality research team by ensuring appointments are based on the essential job functions of the position.

Postdoctoral Scholars contribute to the educational and research mission of the University. The creativity and expertise provided by these individuals support scientific and scholarly advances.

A Postdoctoral appointment is a temporary appointment designed to give individuals the opportunity to conduct research under the guidance of a faculty mentor. The time spent as a Postdoctoral Scholar is in preparation for a permanent position in academe, industry, government, or the nonprofit sector. For many, Postdoctoral work is a critical step in securing future employment.

A. DEFINITION

A Postdoctoral Scholar is an individual who:

- Has been awarded a doctoral degree (or equivalent) within the past ten years.
- Will pursue a full-time program of advanced training and research under the direction of a Principal Investigator (PI) with an appointment in an academic School or Organized Research Unit (ORU).
- Will be supported by campus research grants or contracts, by fellowships administered by the campus, or by other approved fund sources.
- Has not previously been a Postdoctoral Scholar for more than 5 years combined (this includes all institutions, domestic and international, as well as UC Merced).
- Has not previously held a tenured/tenure-track faculty position.

B. CATEGORIES OF POSTDOCTORAL APPOINTMENTS

Postdoctoral Scholar appointments differ with respect to compensation, benefits, and taxation. The source of support determines the category of the Postdoctoral Scholar. Members of all categories work with faculty mentors.

a. Postdoctoral Scholar - Employees (3252)

Paid a salary which may be supported by a) sponsor's research grants or contracts; b) general funds or opportunity funds; or c) other University discretionary funds (by exception only).

b. Postdoctoral Scholar - Fellows (3253)

Receives a stipend or fellowship from an extramural agency, administered through the University on behalf of the Fellow or the Fellow’s faculty sponsor (e.g., NIH training grant).

c. Postdoctoral Scholar - Paid Direct (3254)

Has been awarded a fellowship or traineeship for postdoctoral study by an extramural agency. The agency pays the fellowship or traineeship directly to the Postdoctoral Scholar, rather than through the University.

d. Postdoctoral Scholar – Interim (3256)

An individual who recently graduated from UC Merced with a PhD degree or equivalent and who needs a short-term appointment to complete an existing project from his or her graduate educational program before moving on to other employment.

The maximum time a postdoc can be in this title is 12 months.
Postdoctoral Scholars may be assigned to more than one Postdoctoral Scholar title concurrently, depending on University and extramural funding agency requirements. The total of the combined appointments may not exceed 100% time.
3072: RECRUITMENT

The University of California is an equal opportunity employer committed to excellence through diversity. In order to promote equal opportunity, an open recruitment must be conducted for Postdoctoral Scholars. The recruitment and selection process must be fully documented, reviewed, and approved before a proposed appointment will be acted upon. The Principal Investigator (PI) should work with the appropriate School staff member for assistance and confirmation of the recruitment process.

RECRUITMENT PROCEDURE

The recruitment procedure should not begin until a funding source for the proposed appointment has been identified. If a funding source has been identified, but actual funding is not yet secured (if a submitted grant proposal has not yet been funded, for example), the job advertisement must indicate that fulfillment of the postdoctoral position is dependent upon attainment of sufficient funding.

The recruitment process begins with the posting of a draft job advertisement in AP Recruit by School staff. The PI should work in consultation with the School staff to prepare the ad, which provides a job description and requirements and indicates what supporting documentation is requested from the candidates. Supporting documents typically include, but are not limited to:

- Cover Letter
- CV
- Statement of Research
- List of References

The job ad must be approved in AP Recruit by the PI and by an APO representative. External ads are encouraged, but not required. The ad must remain open for at least thirty days before any scheduled interviews may occur.

WAIVERS OF RECRUITMENT

It is understood that circumstances exist in which a Waiver of Recruitment is appropriate. Such circumstances include, but are not limited to:

- A new appointee relocates his or her laboratory to UC Merced and brings individuals who are currently funded by the project. Since the job is moving, the individuals employed on the project are moving with the job.
- A candidate is a faculty member’s advisee and agrees to remain at UC Merced in a post-graduation appointment to complete the work on an ongoing project and/or to write the results for publication of the completed research.

A request for Waiver of Recruitment can be submitted via AP Recruit to be routed to the appropriate approving authorities, with the final decision resting with the Vice Provost for the Faculty. The request should include:

- candidate’s name
- proposed title, step, annual salary, percentage, appointment begin and end date
- a description of how the candidate was identified
- an explanation of the reason for waiving the open recruitment (i.e., unique qualifications or appointee is employed in a relocated lab)

See the Search Waiver Guidelines for Academic Employees for more information.
3073: APPOINTMENT

A. TERMS OF SERVICE
Postdoctoral Scholar appointments are intended to provide a full-time program of advanced academic preparation and research training. Their terms of service are governed by a Memorandum of Understanding between the University of California and the United Auto Workers (UAW). These terms include:

a. Initial appointments are of at least one year’s duration, are temporary and have fixed end dates.

b. Notice of appointment should be provided to the Postdoctoral Scholar no later than 30 days prior to the start of the appointment.

c. Total duration of an individual’s postdoctoral service may not exceed five years, including postdoctoral service at other institutions.

d. It is within the University’s sole discretion to appoint, reappoint, or not reappoint a Postdoctoral Scholar.

B. APPOINTMENT FILE DOCUMENTATION & PROCEDURES
Upon final selection of a candidate, the PI, in conjunction with the School staff, will prepare an appointment request file, which will include:

- Completed Postdoctoral Scholar Appointment Form
- Postdoctoral Scholar Personal Data Form completed by the candidate
- Verification of PhD degree
- Copy of the candidate’s curriculum vitae
- Confirmation of availability of funding

The request file shall be forwarded to the appropriate Dean for approval of the appointment. The completed file shall be forwarded to APO as Office of Record for personnel actions.

C. SALARY
Postdoctoral Scholars have an experienced-based salary scale, in accordance with the NIH rates. See Table 23 for the current salary scale.

An individual Postdoctoral Scholar’s level of pay is determined by calculating the total number of months of prior postdoctoral experience at any institution.

All new Postdoctoral Scholar appointments must be at or above the salary level appropriate to the candidate’s experience.

If a Postdoctoral Scholar’s salary/stipend amount is above the appropriate experience level at the time of reappointment, or on their anniversary date for Postdoctoral Scholars with multi-year appointments, the Postdoctoral Scholar shall receive an increase to at least the minimum of the next appropriate salary/stipend experience level, or at least a two percent (2%) salary increase, whichever is greater.

A PI may offer a Postdoctoral Scholar a rate above the minimum salary if desired. In such instances, a salary justification should be included in the appointment request file if the salary is more than one level above the required salary rate.
BENEFITS

Postdoctoral Scholars in all title codes (3252, 3253, 3254, 3256) must have health benefits coverage while employed at UCM. Please consult the MOU between UC and UAW for information.
A Postdoctoral Scholar may be reappointed up to a maximum of five years total. The first reappointment shall be for a minimum of two years; it may be for less than two years only under circumstances that include:

- Lack of two years of funding. For example, a PI may be waiting for renewal, but without confirmation of award, is advised to only appoint for the period he or she has funding.
- Continuation of the project is less than two years.
- Work Authorization limitations.
- Exhausted eligibility as a Postdoctoral Scholar.
- Change in PI.

The University is only obligated to grant one two-year appointment (unless the above applies). For example, if an initial appointment was for two years, any subsequent reappointment need not necessarily be for two years.

Subsequent reappointments should be for at least one year; they may be for less than one year only under circumstances that include:

- Lack of a full year of funding.
- Continuation of the project is less than one year.
- Work Authorization limitations.
- Exhausted eligibility as a Postdoctoral Scholar.

**PROCESS**
Should a PI wish to reappoint a particular Postdoctoral Scholar, within the five-year limit, the PI, in conjunction with the School staff, will prepare an appointment request file, which will include:

- Completed Postdoctoral Scholar Appointment Form
- Postdoctoral Scholar Annual Review Summary
- Confirmation of available funding

The request file shall be forwarded to the appropriate Dean for approval of the reappointment. The completed file shall be forwarded to APO as Office of Record for personnel actions. Notice of reappointment must be provided to the Postdoctoral Scholar no less than 30 calendar days prior to the start of the appointment.
A. POSTDOCTORAL SCHOLARS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR:

1. **Personal Time Off (PTO)**
   
   Postdoctoral Scholars with 100% 12-month appointment are eligible to use up to twenty-four (24) work days of personal time off with pay at any time, with appropriate approvals, within each 12-month period. For more information, please refer to Article 17 of the current agreement.

2. **Sick Leave**

   Postdoctoral Scholars are eligible for sick leave, without loss of compensation, for up to twelve days per twelve-month appointment period. All twelve (12) work days are available for use on the first day of appointment.

   Appointees with less than 12-month appointments are eligible for sick leave in proportion to the appointment period; for example, a Postdoctoral Scholar with a six-month appointment is eligible for up to six days of sick leave.

   For more information, please refer to Article 23 of the current MOU.

3. **Other leaves**

   Subject to the provisions of Article 12, leaves of absence may be with or without pay, may be for medical purposes and/or non-medical reasons, and are subject to the approval of the University. Approved leaves do not continue beyond the predetermined end date of the Postdoctoral Scholar’s appointment.

B. TYPES OF LEAVE:

- Family Care/Medical Leave
- Pregnancy Disability Leave
- Personal Leave of Absence without Pay
- Bereavement Leave
- Jury Duty
- Military Leave
- Other leaves – Military Caregiver, Qualifying Exigency, Military Spouse/Domestic Partner

For more information, please refer to Article 12 of the current agreement.
3076: DISCIPLINE

It is essential that any concerns about a Postdoctoral Scholar’s performance be addressed in a timely manner. Complete documentation is essential and required. If any concerns develop, the PI should immediately reference Article 5 of the current collective bargaining agreement.
3077: GRIEVANCE PROCESS

Postdoctoral Scholars may file a grievance if they believe the University has violated a specific provision in the current bargaining agreement. If a grievance is filed, the United Auto Workers (UAW) which represents the Postdoctoral Scholars may notify the University’s Labor Relations (LR) or Academic Personnel Office (APO). If LR or APO contacts a PI about a grievance, they should respond to the inquiry or request for information as soon as possible. For more information, please refer to Article 6 of the current agreement.
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3091: GENERAL GUIDELINES

A. DEFINITION, TITLES, AND TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

The titles in this series (the “AUL Series”) are used for academic appointees who provide top-level professional and administrative services to the University Library as officers assisting the University Librarian. (APM 365)

The AUL Series includes Assistant University Librarians, Associate University Librarians, and Deputy University Librarians, including those with the prefixes “Interim” or “Acting.”

There are no steps within ranks in the AUL Series.

Appointment in this series will be for an indefinite term.

The effective date of merits and promotions is July 1.

Salaries must be within the established ranges on the published Academic Salary Scale. Exceptions above the maximum will require further review and approval by the Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor. Salaries are subject to range adjustment.

Appointees accrue vacation and sick leave in accordance with APM 710 and APM 730.
3092: RECRUITMENT

A thorough and determined search should be made both inside and outside the University for candidates. The letter and the spirit of the affirmative action policy should be followed in all recruitment activities. Special attention must be given to legal requirements regarding the recruitment and hiring of foreign nationals to ensure that they hold visas and employment authorization that allow compensation for services. Library staff and the Academic Personnel Office should be notified as early as possible of a potential visa case. Questions should be referred to the Office of International Affairs.

Available positions must at a minimum be advertised using the AP Recruit system.
3093: APPOINTMENT

A. CRITERIA
The candidate will normally hold a professional degree from a library school and have considerable subsequent experience as a professional librarian. Demonstrated superior professional ability and attainment are indispensable qualifications for appointment in this series. Appointees may be assigned authority for management of a section of the Library or of a major functional area of library administration.

An appointee as Assistant University Librarian will have major responsibility for assisting with planning and managing Library operations.

An appointee as Associate University Librarian will have high level responsibility in the planning and management of the operation of the Library. An Associate University Librarian is expected to be capable of functioning as deputy for the University Librarian when needed.

B. PROCESS
The candidate should provide the following documents:

1. Self-Statement of qualifications and experience
2. Current curriculum vitae
3. Any supporting or supplemental documentation that the candidate deems relevant (i.e., publications, evidence of presentations or other such materials).

The University Librarian has the option to solicit letters of reference for the candidate, in which case he or she should request a list of potential referees from the candidate. The University Librarian may also solicit letters from persons of his or her own choosing, who are qualified to comment on the candidate’s credentials and/or past performance.

The University Librarian will prepare a letter of recommendation for or against appointment, including a salary recommendation. This letter, with the complete appointment file, will be forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office. APO will review the file for compliance with policy and procedures and forward to the Provost/EVC, who will provide a final decision regarding the proposed appointment.
3094: MERIT, PROMOTION, APPRAISAL REVIEW

A. CRITERIA FOR ADVANCEMENT

Consistent with the provisions of APM 365-4 and 365-10.a, and the substance of APM 360-10.b, reviews will be based on criteria including the following:

1. Qualifications and accomplishments consistent with the planning and management of operations of the University Library
2. Professional competence and quality of service within the Library;
3. University and public service; and professional activities outside the Library;
4. Research and other creative activity.

Merit increases are not automatic and must be justified by the quality of professional and administrative service rendered by the appointee (APM 365-18).

Promotion from Assistant University Librarian to Associate University Librarian must be justified not only by excellence of service and attainment, but also by demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of greater responsibility (APM 365-10.a).

B. INITIATION OF A REVIEW

It is the responsibility of the University Librarian to consider for review each Assistant University Librarian and Associate University Librarian. APM 365-18.c. provides that there is no “normal” period of service at either title, but as a general practice, appointees shall be considered for merit increases at two-year intervals. At UC Merced, a merit review will normally be held biennially for an appointee to the Assistant University Librarian title and triennially for an appointee to the Associate University Librarian title. When the candidate is already at the top of the salary range for his or her title, and no promotion is under consideration, the University Librarian and the candidate may agree, with the concurrence of the Provost/EVC, to extend the review period by up to two years.

Those candidates who request (or agree) that a normal merit review be deferred should provide a memo to that effect to be included in the personnel file. If, however, it is advisable in the judgment of the University Librarian, a review will be conducted at the normal time.

Normal periods of review will be based on a fiscal-year appointment. Reviews for the previous review period will begin during July, with a recommendation to the Provost/EVC by May 1st with any salary increase to take effect the following July 1st. A year of service will follow prescribed policy for review purposes (a six-month or greater period of appointment is considered to be a year of service).

Candidates who are judged to be deserving of advancement before a normal review cycle may be recommended for an accelerated merit increase or promotion.

The University Librarian will submit a recommendation for a merit increase, promotion, or denial of advancement.

C. DOCUMENTATION AND GENERAL PROCEDURES

In January, the University Librarian prompts each Assistant University Librarian and Associate University Librarian who has completed a two-year or three-year period of service, respectively, to prepare a review file, to include:

1. A letter of self-assessment of the quality of the services the appointee has rendered during the review period. It should include a statement of the candidate’s professional achievements and administrative accomplishments during the review period. For example, the narrative may
• highlight accomplishments in leadership, change-management, and policy-setting;
• enumerate contributions to and detail impact for the Library as a whole and at the campus or the system levels as well as to the profession;
• advance goals for the coming review period.

2. A job description or statement of the candidate’s primary duties and responsibilities;
3. An updated curriculum vitae; and
   Any supporting or supplemental documentation that the candidate deems relevant (i.e., publications, evidence of presentations or other such materials).

Campus policy does not require letters of evaluation as part of the review process for positions in the AUL series. The candidate may, however, request, in writing, that the University Librarian solicit letters from specific individuals for additional information to be included in the file. At his or her option the University Librarian may solicit letters or other evaluation information from other constituents internal and/or external to the Library for use in the review process. In both cases, requests for letters or other evaluation information should include the University’s Statement of Confidentiality. The identities of referees will be kept confidential from the candidate.

The candidate may also provide names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, might not objectively evaluate him or her in a letter. Any such list will become part of the case file going forward.

This file should be provided to the University Librarian by March 1.

Following the initial review discussion with the candidate (including initiation of the Procedural Safeguard Statement) and subsequent receipt of all relevant materials from the candidate, it is the responsibility of the University Librarian to review the file, to supplement it as necessary and appropriate with any additional letters and documents, including any requested by the candidate, and to prepare the entire file for submission to the Academic Personnel Office with a letter of recommendation. The opening of the letter should include:

1. Name, date, rank and salary of the candidate’s initial appointment at UCM;
2. Existing rank and salary of the candidate;
3. Number of years at the existing salary; and
4. Recommended action.

The University Librarian’s letter of recommendation should also include the following:

1. A comprehensive assessment of the candidate’s performance and accomplishments together with specific evidence to support the evaluation. This evaluation should follow the same criteria and areas of Librarianship outlined in APM 210-4.e.3 and APM 365-10, but with primary emphasis on administrative performance within defined responsibilities.
2. An evaluation of the candidate’s plans and goals for his or her division, professional and/or personal goals, and a comparison of the previous review file’s statement with actual accomplishments since that date.
3. In the case of a recommendation for promotion, an assessment of the candidate’s professional growth or increased responsibilities, and sustained successful performance at the rank of Assistant University Librarian.

Recommended actions may be one of the following:

• No Merit
• Meritorious (with a typical salary increase of 7% based upon available funding); or
• Extra-Meritorious (with specific salary increase based upon available funding).
The University Librarian will forward his or her recommendation, along with the complete review file, to the Academic Personnel Office by May 1st. APO will review the file for compliance with policy and procedures, and forward to the Provost/EVC, who will provide a final decision. Any action will take effect July 1st.

D. APPEALS

In cases in which a candidate wishes to allege procedural violations (as outlined below), the candidate will first review the issues with the University Librarian in an effort to reach a resolution. If after this discussion the candidate still wishes to submit an allegation, a formal written allegation statement will be sent to the Provost/EVC via the Academic Personnel Office.

Disagreements or questions regarding academic judgment are not procedural violations and are not subject to appeal.

A procedural violation is deemed to have occurred when:

1. Procedures followed in the review process were not in consonance with the applicable rules and requirements of the University or the Merced Campus, as outlined here and in the APM; and/or
2. The challenged decision was reached on the basis of impermissible criteria including (but not limited to): race, sex, or political conviction.

The Provost/EVC will appoint an ad hoc appeal committee when he or she receives a formal written allegation of procedural violation. The Provost/EVC will request a written response to the allegations from the University Librarian, and both documents, along with the original review file, will be forwarded to the committee. The Provost/EVC will inform the candidate of his or her right to a hearing before the ad hoc committee. The committee will make a recommendation to the Provost/EVC, but is not empowered to reevaluate the academic qualifications or professional competence of the candidate. The Provost/EVC will inform the University Librarian of the final action in the case.
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3101: GENERAL GUIDELINES

Policies and procedures regarding terms and conditions of appointments in the Lecturer series which are not included in the MAPP are contained in APM 283, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Non-Senate Instructional Unit (Unit 18) and the Contract Administration Manual. The MOU shall prevail if there is an apparent discrepancy between the APM and the MOU.

DEFINITIONS

Titles in the Unit 18 Lecturer series do not confer membership in the Academic Senate. Lecturers are also known as Non-Senate Faculty or “NSF.” This series does not include the titles Lecturer PSOE, Lecturer SOE, Senior Lecturer PSOE or Senior Lecturer SOE (see MAPP Chapter 2 Section 05).

- **Lecturer (Pre-Six):** This title is used to designate individuals who have full or partial responsibility for instruction of assigned courses (or equivalent work) for a specified period of time. Used during the Lecturer’s first twelve semesters (six years) of employment in the same Unit at UC Merced.

- **Lecturer (Continuing):** This title is used to designate individuals who are appointed to teach courses for an indefinite period of time following completion of twelve semesters of employment in any Unit 18 title in the same UC Merced Unit. Semesters of employment need not be consecutive and can be at any positive appointment percentage. Appointment to this title can be made only when instructional need has been formally determined and the appointee is found to meet the required excellence standard following completion of an Excellence Review.

- **Senior Lecturer** (may be Pre-Six or Continuing): This title is used to designate individuals who have an appropriately senior level of achievement and experience. Designation as a Senior Lecturer shall be given to appointees who qualify for a Lecturer title and who provide service of exceptional value to the University.

- **Lecturer in Summer Session:** This title is used to designate Lecturers appointed on a temporary basis to teach courses in the Summer Session. Summer Session appointments do not count as Unit 18 semesters of service.

  *Note: Lecturers without salary are not members of Unit 18; however, the same procedures used for initial appointment and reappointment of pre-six Lecturers should be followed for without-salary appointments and reappointments. Deans’ offices are encouraged to contact APO for assistance with use of this title.*

RESTRICTIONS

- Graduate level courses may be taught by appointees to Lecturer titles only with prior approval from the Chair of Graduate and Research Council, per Academic Senate policy.

- Registered UC students may not be appointed to Lecturer titles. Advanced degree candidates who are not currently registered may be appointed as Lecturers by exception. Such appointments require prior approval from the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate Division.

RESPONSIBILITY

DEAN

Deans have responsibility for administering personnel actions regarding pre-six Lecturer appointments and reappointments. School evaluations and recommendations regarding pre-six appointments and reappointments shall be made pursuant to appropriate procedures and in accordance with the MOU.

ACADEMIC SENATE

Per Legislative Ruling 7.06 by the University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction, “it is the right and responsibility of the Academic Senate members of an academic department to provide administration with advice on the
instructional performance of non-Senate faculty. In accord with Academic Senate Bylaw 35.C, and re-affirming Legislative Ruling 12.75, only members of the Academic Senate may vote on the departmental recommendation in a merit action involving non-Senate instructional faculty. A department may solicit a recommendation or vote from non-Senate instructional faculty to be used in its deliberations.”
3102: RECRUITMENT

A thorough and determined search should be made both inside and outside the University for candidates, including candidates who are minorities, women, handicapped persons, disabled veterans, and Vietnam-era veterans. The letter and the spirit of the affirmative action policy should be followed in all recruitment activities. Special attention must be given to legal requirements regarding the recruitment and hiring of foreign nationals to ensure that they hold visas and employment authorization that allow compensation for services. School staff and the Academic Personnel Office should be notified as early as possible of a potential visa case. Questions should be referred to the Office of International Affairs.

Available academic-year Lecturer positions must at a minimum be advertised using the AP Recruit system. Posting on the Northern California Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC) website is recommended, and other external ads are encouraged if funding is available. Once curricular need has been determined, following internal School, program, or Unit processes, a job advertisement may be drafted and posted in AP Recruit. The draft ad should be approved by the Dean, Assistant Dean, Search Chair or Program Director (or any combination of these) and by a representative of APO. Once finalized, the ad can be published to the UC Merced website. Any external ads will then also be posted by School staff.

Interested candidates should submit the following during the application process:

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Teaching Evaluations
3. Any other materials required by the School or program, which may include:
   - List of references
   - Self-Statement or Statement of Teaching Philosophy
   - Sample Syllabi
   - Other evidence of teaching proficiency

Schools shall establish procedures for assessment and selection of candidates based on demonstrated competence in the field and teaching ability, as evidenced by requisite degree and/or previous teaching experience and performance. Master’s and/or PhD degree is required unless an exception is granted by the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF). Experience and/or professional degree must be appropriate to the course(s) which the candidate is to teach.
3103: APPOINTMENT

TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

1. Initial appointments to Unit 18 titles are normally made for terms of one year or less, but may be for a period of up to two years. Reappointments in the first six years of service may be made for a term not to exceed three years given appropriate funding allocation. Continuing Appointments do not have a specified ending date, and shall terminate only by a full layoff (see Article 17 of the MOU) or by dismissal in accordance with relevant disciplinary procedures (see Article 30 of the MOU).

2. Appointments of a full academic year (Fall and Spring semesters) will be made on a 9/12 basis effective July 1 through June 30. This rule is in effect whenever the University has the intention to appoint for both semesters. This pay period is to be used regardless of the percent time of the appointment. Appointments for only one semester are made on a 9/10 basis. (MOU Article 6)

3. Service dates reflect the actual service period; that is, a Lecturer is expected to work from the first day of the semester to the last day of the semester. Note that the semester begins before formal instruction begins. Academic year dates are published annually by the Registrar’s Office. Because service and pay periods differ, appointees should be aware that unexpected leaves without salary or mid-term resignation might result in overpayment that must be reimbursed to the University.

4. During the academic year in which the sixth semester of service falls, every Lecturer shall be afforded the opportunity to take part in a mentoring meeting with his or her Unit Chair for the sole purpose of providing the Lecturer with performance feedback. The contents of the meeting are not to be recorded and will not be used in any subsequent evaluation process. The meeting will be planned and conducted in accordance with Article 31 of the MOU. Guidelines and documentation template are available here: Mentoring Meeting Toolkit.

5. At the time of appointment to a seventh semester of service within the same Unit, a pre-six Lecturer will be given a 6% salary increase if the individual has not received at least a 6% increase during the previous six semesters of service. (MOU Art. 7a.F.3)

6. All assignments must conform to the Workload Policy approved by the School.

7. The UCNet website provides information regarding benefits and their relationship to workload percentages.

REAPPOINTMENT (PRE-SIX)

This section refers to reappointment that commences prior to completion of six years of service in the same Unit. See section 3104 below for Continuing Appointment (“post-six”) procedures.

Reappointment files must contain sufficient materials to document the demonstrated competence of the candidate in keeping with University of California standards of excellence. Any reappointment shall be preceded by an assessment of the performance of the Lecturer, which shall be undertaken in accordance with the School’s applicable procedures (MOU Art. 7a.F.1). Such assessments may take on added significance should the individual subsequently be proposed for a Continuing Appointment. Assessment of Lecturers for reappointment shall be based on the following:

- Demonstrated competence in the field, as evidenced by:
  - Requisite degree, and/or
  - Previous teaching experience
- Demonstrated ability in teaching. Performance is measured by evaluation of qualities and evidence such as:
  - Command of the subject matter;
• Ability to organize and present course materials;
• Ability to stimulate imaginative thinking and encourage critical and analytical skills;
• Ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students;
• Appropriately current syllabi, reading lists, and other instructional material; and
• Student evaluations, including the use of student learning outcomes.

NON-REAPPOINTMENT

No notice of non-reappointment is required for appointments that terminate on the scheduled end date when total service is less than six years. Termination or reduction in time prior to the scheduled end date must be in compliance with MOU Art. 17.
3104: MERIT, ADVANCEMENT, APPRAISAL REVIEW

Reappointments which commence after twelve semesters of service in a Unit 18 title in the same Unit at UC Merced are known as “Continuing Appointments” and are granted only after an Excellence Review has been conducted and resulted in a positive assessment. All Lecturers who provide six years of service in the same Unit at UC Merced are eligible to undergo an Excellence Review, although a Continuing Appointment can only be made when instructional need is established as described below. If instructional need does not exist for the semester(s) following successful completion of an Excellence Review, the Lecturer will be said to have “Continuing status” and shall be notified that he or she is entitled to the right of first refusal for NSF work for which he or she is qualified for two years. After the two-year period of right of first refusal has expired, should there again be a need for the Lecturer’s service, he or she may be rehired through the normal appointment process outlined in MAPP 3103 above. This Lecturer would retain Continuing status upon being rehired.

Conferment of Continuing status following an Excellence Review after six years of service, and the subsequent merit reviews, are intended to reward those individuals who meet specified needs and standards of excellence. The retention of these candidates beyond the sixth year is a significant academic personnel action and the criteria and guidelines herein must be carefully followed in the review process.

INITIAL CONTINUING STATUS

EXCELLENCE REVIEW

A Lecturer who has been appointed to twelve semesters of service must undergo an Excellence Review to determine whether she or he meets the excellence standard required for Continuing status. (MOU Article 7b)

The Excellence Review will be conducted during the academic year in which the Lecturer’s twelfth semester in the same Unit at UC Merced falls.

Prior to the initiation of the Excellence Review (i.e., before the Procedural Safeguard Statement is initiated), normally in March of the previous year, the Lecturer under consideration shall be notified in writing of the review, and the timing, criteria, and procedures that will be followed. This Letter of Eligibility will indicate that the candidate’s materials are due to the Dean’s office by July 15, and the completed Case File is due to APO by the following March 15. (Schedule for AP Actions).

Once the Excellence Review is initiated (i.e., the Procedural Safeguard Statement has been initiated), the Case File shall continue through the entire review process (i.e., all files, including files in which the School recommends against a Continuing Appointment, shall be forwarded to all reviewing entities). The candidate, however, may request in writing to the VPF at any time that the review be halted. If such a request is made, the file will not continue through the review process, and reappointment will not be considered further.

CONTINUING STATUS CRITERIA

Consideration for Continuing status shall be made on the basis of demonstrated excellence in the field and in all three of the following categories:

- Teaching/instructional performance;
- Academic responsibility;
- Other assigned duties which may include University co-curricular and community service. (MOU 7b.E)

Instructional performance is measured by evaluation of evidence demonstrating such qualities as:

- Command of the subject matter and continued growth in mastering new topics;
- Ability to organize and present course materials;

See MOU Article 7a.B.1 for potential transfer of service credit from another UC campus.

---

2 See MOU Article 7a.B.1 for potential transfer of service credit from another UC campus.
• Ability to awaken in students an awareness of the importance of the subject matter;
• Ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to do creative work;
• Achievements of students in their fields; and
• Evidence of learning as determined by learning outcome assessment. (MOU 7b.E)

REVIEW COMMITTEE
Excellence Reviews will be conducted by a Review Committee within the School appointed by the Dean in consultation with Senate faculty and composed of Senate faculty with sufficient knowledge in the field of expertise of the individual being reviewed. In addition, the School will make reasonable efforts to ensure that a qualified non-Senate faculty member (e.g., Lecturer) be a member of each review committee. All such service will be voluntary.

PREPARATION OF THE CASE FILE
All candidates for Excellence Review will complete the Procedural Safeguard Statement to ensure that their rights under Articles 7b and 7c of the MOU have been explained and upheld.

Candidate’s Materials
Once a Lecturer has been informed of her or his eligibility for an Excellence Review, she or he is expected to assemble a file of documentation including:

1. Updated curriculum vitae, including teaching information and current address;
2. Instructional materials that may include syllabi, tests and reading lists;
3. Student evaluations, including written comments;
4. Evidence of student learning outcomes assessment; and
5. Optional materials that may include letters of assessment not solicited by the School (such as assessment by peers or other faculty members or from former students), a statement of pedagogical philosophy and goals, and/or other relevant materials such as a self-statement or self-evaluation. The program or School may have specific requirements regarding these or other materials.

Other Documentation of Performance
The School will gather other evidence for evaluation, which may include:

1. Assessment from classroom visitations by colleagues and evaluators;
2. Annual pre-six assessments; and

The candidate shall have the opportunity to review the file and to respond in writing within five business days. Any such statement will become part of the Case File.

Case Analysis
It is the Review Committee’s responsibility to submit analytical comments concerning the candidate’s teaching effectiveness in the form of a Case Analysis. These comments must be accompanied by evidence from the materials included in the file. Any references to confidential letter writers must be by alpha code. The Case Analysis should include the following:

1. Evaluation of performance in all assigned duties and evaluation of qualifications in relation to criteria for a Continuing Appointment;
2. Recommendation for or against Continuing Appointment; and
3. Merit recommendation: if the candidate is found to have met the excellence standard for a Continuing Appointment, the salary must be raised to the minimum annual salary for Continuing Appointment per Table 17-B of the Academic Salary Scales.

4. Either within the Case Analysis or in a separate document, the standards of excellence appropriate to the particular discipline or subject area being used in evaluating the candidate should be outlined.

The candidate shall have the opportunity to review the Case Analysis and to respond in writing within five business days. Any such statement will become part of the Case File.

Faculty Vote

If so specified in the Unit’s voting procedures, the Case File may be considered by voting members of the Unit. Any discussion and vote by the Unit should be recorded in a Transmittal Memo written by the Chair and included in the Case File which is then forwarded to the Dean.

Dean’s Recommendation Letter

In the Letter, the Dean provides his or her recommendation regarding the proposed action and supplies additional analysis as needed. The Dean should also either endorse the salary recommendation put forth or provide justification for a different recommendation.

Routing

Once completed, the Case File is routed to the Academic Personnel Office for review by the Vice Provost for the Faculty, who shall make the final decision regarding granting Continuing status.

DETERMINATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL NEED

Instructional need shall exist when the Dean determines the following:

1. There is a curricular need for courses to be taught by Lecturers in the area in which the Lecturer under consideration has taught, and
2. the Lecturer under consideration is qualified to teach the course(s), and
3. a Continuing Appointee is not already expected to teach the course(s).

Instructional need will not exist when:

1. A specified Senate faculty member is designated to teach the course(s) previously assigned to the Lecturer in the next academic year;
2. a graduate student whose training is in the same discipline, or where the assignment is made pursuant to an academic plan for pedagogical training, is designated to teach the course(s) previously assigned to the Lecturer during the initial appointment year;
3. an unanticipated distinguished Visiting Professor or Adjunct Professor is designated to teach the course(s) previously assigned to the Lecturer during the initial appointment year; and/or
4. the assignment of the Lecturer to teach the course(s) conflicts with the established School academic program requirements for intellectual diversity.

ESTABLISHING THE CONTINUING APPOINTMENT PERCENTAGE

Normally, the Lecturer’s initial Continuing Appointment base percentage will be at least equal to his or her appointment percentage in the previous academic year (e.g., the sixth year). It may be lower, however, if the Dean determines that the course(s) taught by the Lecturer in the previous year will not be offered, or will not be taught by Lecturers because Instructional Need has changed for one or more of the reasons cited above.
MERIT REVIEWS

Every March, the appropriate Dean’s Office will issue letters of eligibility for Merit Reviews for Continuing Appointees. It is the School’s responsibility to initiate review of Continuing Appointees every three years. Each School, using standards of excellence appropriate to the particular discipline or subject areas, should develop systematic methods and criteria for discriminating among levels of performance. Documentation of these standards should be included with the case. The process for conducting a Merit Review for a Continuing Appointee shall follow the same procedure outlined above for an Excellence Review. The primary criterion for review will be demonstrated excellence in teaching, along with the other criteria outlined in MAPP 3104 above. Well-documented evidence should be provided on which the appraisal of teaching competence has been based. A positive review shall result in a merit increase of at least 6% on the Academic Salary Scale (MOU Article 22.C.2.b) If during the course of a review, or at any other time, the School determines that based on the evaluation criteria there has been a significant decline in the quality of performance by the Continuing Appointee, the procedures outlined in Article 30 of the MOU must be followed.

A Continuing Appointee may request a one-year deferral of the merit review. Such a request should be submitted in writing to the Dean for approval by the May 15th following distribution of letters of eligibility. Future eligibility for review will be based on the new review date.

Schools should inform the candidates of internal deadlines and the opportunity to submit materials to be included in the Case File. If the candidate does not provide materials by the School’s due date, the School will conduct the review based on the materials available in the School as of the due date.
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5011: DEFINITION

A Senate faculty member who is appointed to assume administrative responsibility in addition to his or her faculty responsibilities is considered a Faculty Administrator at less than 100% time. Normal scholarly activity is expected to continue at a proportionate level that would allow for normal progression in the faculty member’s academic series. It is acknowledged that time must be given up to administrative duties that would otherwise have been available to devote to teaching and scholarship. Administrative responsibilities, when balanced with appropriate teaching and research levels, are understood to be a type of academic activity.

Titles under this policy include, but are not limited to:

- AP/Unit Chair
- Graduate Group Chair
- Undergraduate Group Chair
- Associate Dean
- Director, Associate Director
5012: TERMS OF SERVICE

Faculty Administrator appointments at less than 100% time may be made for a period of up to five years, subject to review and reappointment. Appointment as Acting or Interim will normally not be for more than a one-year period, subject to reappointment.

Appointees to these titles are at-will and serve at the discretion of the Chancellor. Termination of an administrative appointment does not affect the underlying faculty appointment.
A. RECRUITMENT

In accordance with AA/EO laws and regulations, internal appointments for Faculty Administrators must be filled following a search process open to all appropriate UC Merced faculty. Notification of a search may take the form of an email, and/or any other means by which all appropriate UC Merced faculty are informed of a position opening.

The job posting must include:

1. Description of job duties and expectations;
2. Qualifications;
3. Term of appointment;
4. Title of the person to whom the position will report

A copy of the posting should be sent to the Provost/EVC via the Academic Personnel Office for review before distribution.

B. AUTHORITY

The Provost/EVC has appointing authority for all appointments to Faculty Administrator positions at less than 100% time. Appointment and reappointment requests are to be addressed to the Provost/EVC from the official to whom that administrator will most directly report (the “Recommending Authority,” e.g., Dean, Vice Provost, etc.) for approval.

C. PROCESS

An appointment recommendation, addressed to the Provost/EVC and routed via the Academic Personnel Office, should include the following elements:

1. Appointment recommendation memo:
   a. Name of the individual recommended
   b. Name of the program, group, or unit the individual will administer
   c. Recommended appointment title
   d. Recommended effective date and end date of appointment
   e. Compensation details including FAU. List financial commitments including summer salary, research support, research-related expenses, or other support
   f. Summary of qualifications
   g. Explication of expectations and goals for the position (this will form the basis for review)

2. Updated curriculum vitae for candidate

If approved, the Provost/EVC will issue an appointment letter via the Academic Personnel Office, including the criteria for review, based on the duties and responsibilities outlined in the recommendation.
5014: REVIEW/REAPPOINTMENT

A. GENERAL GUIDELINES

Annual reviews of Faculty Administrators by their Recommending Authorities are required. The review should consist of a meeting between the two individuals and completion of a form [form under construction]. A copy of the form should be sent to APO for the personnel file.

A full-term review is required during the last year of an Administrator’s term. The term review should be initiated by the Recommending Authority and should be based upon the expectations and goals outlined in the appointment letter. The review should give higher levels of review (i.e., Provost/EVC) a rational basis for the decision whether or not to reappoint an individual, and at the same time, it should provide the individual under review with guidance on improving his or her performance.

This review is distinct from an academic review of the individual, but service as a Faculty Administrator can and should be considered in any academic review. Per APM 245-11, “Academic leadership is, in itself, a significant academic activity. Therefore, distinguished leadership and effective discharge of duties...shall be considered as appropriate criteria in evaluating the performance of a [Faculty Administrator] for a merit increase, accelerated increase, or promotion.” The extent and quality of the administrative service, then, must be taken into consideration for merit advancements and promotions. It should also be acknowledged that a Faculty Administrator who discharges administrative duties with thoroughness and distinction will have reduced time available for teaching and research.

B. PROCESS

Early in the Fall semester of the final year of the Faculty Administrator’s term, the Recommending Authority shall notify the Administrator of his or her eligibility for reappointment review. If the Administrator consents to be considered for another term, the following actions should be taken:

1. Self-Statement
   The Faculty Administrator should provide a self-assessment of accomplishments in relation to the expectations of the position and any other relevant information regarding the term of service by December 15.

2. Faculty Consultation
   Members of the unit, program, or group being administered should be consulted in the review of the Administrator. The Recommending Authority may solicit letters or other forms of input from the appropriate constituents. If letters are solicited, they must be treated as confidential material in accordance with University policy, and they will be included in the review file. A summary of this input will be provided by the Recommending Authority in his or her statement.

3. Recommending Authority Memo
   The official serving as Recommending Authority for the appointment (e.g., Dean, Vice Provost, etc.) will write a letter evaluating the Faculty Administrator’s performance during the term of service. This evaluation will be conducted in the context of the expectations and goals set forth in the appointment letter.
4. **Review Meeting**

The Recommending Authority and the Faculty Administrator will meet to discuss the review, and the Administrator will be provided with copies of all documents, redacted as necessary. The Administrator will have ten business days to provide a written response to the file, if desired.

5. **APO Documentation**

The entire case file will be forwarded to the Vice Provost for the Faculty via the Academic Personnel Office by May 15. The VPF will review and forward the file to the Provost/EVC. The VPF and Provost/EVC will consult as needed and the Provost/EVC will render a final decision, via email, to the Recommending Authority. The Recommending Authority should then meet with the candidate to discuss the decision and, if the decision is for reappointment, to discuss goals and plans for the upcoming term. A written summary of this meeting should be forwarded to APO.

6. **Reappointment Letter**

If appropriate, the Provost/EVC will issue a reappointment letter via APO to the Faculty Administrator including all relevant appointment information including the criteria for the next review.
6001: POLICY FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF ENDOWED CHAIRS

A. DEFINITION AND AUTHORITY

Policy
This policy is in accordance with University of California policy (APM 191) and shall guide the establishment of all Endowed Chairs. Endowed Chairs are awarded to honor extraordinary academic achievement and to recruit and retain the most distinguished scholars.

Definition
An endowed chair is a perquisite that is supported by income from an endowment fund established by a gift or gifts from private sources and is made available to a distinguished faculty member in support of his or her teaching, research, and service activities. An endowed chair may be assigned to a School, Unit or Organized Research Unit (ORU).

Approvals
The establishment and naming of an Endowed Chair is subject to approval by the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) upon recommendation of the Chancellor. No commitment for establishing and naming a Chair shall be made to a prospective donor prior to Presidential approval.

B. REQUIRED MINIMUM LEVELS FOR ENDOWED CHAIRS

Minimum Endowment Principal
The minimum standard for endowed chairs at UC Merced will be set at $500,000.

Faculty and Salary Provision
Prior to any commitment on the part of the University, the campus must have available and must commit, if necessary, the general fund faculty provision and salary for the holder of the Chair. [Note: University policy allows for use of endowment payout to support base salary unless expressly prohibited by the gift agreement. APM 191.D.2,5]

C. ESTABLISHMENT, NAMING, AND FUNDING OF THE ENDOWED CHAIR

An Endowed Chair will be established only upon acceptance by the Chancellor of either:

1. Cash or a binding pledge that immediately or within a reasonable period of time will create a corpus in an amount sufficient to provide income adequate for meeting the purposes of the chair, or
2. A legally binding commitment to provide appropriate income at the end of each fiscal year from an equivalent corpus held inviolate by a trustee.

In the latter case, see UC policy, APM 191, B.7. Following approval by the President, the Chair will be deemed “conditionally established” until full funding is achieved. [Note: UC policy provides for contingent approval of Chairs to be funded through a bequest for deferred gift. See APM 191.B.6,7]

Associate Vice Chancellor for Development or designee shall coordinate all contacts and discussions with prospective donors.

The subject area of the Endowed Chair must be consistent with the mission of the University of California and the academic plan of the campus. The gift instrument shall permit appropriate alternative distribution of the income by the campus if the subject area of the Endowed Chair ceases to be consistent with the University’s mission or the academic plan of the campus. Such alternative distribution shall be as closely related to the donor’s original intent as is feasible.

A Chair may be named in honor of the donor or an honoree proposed by the donor, subject to approval by the President.
ENDOWED CHAIRS

Income from an Endowed Chair is to be made available to the faculty member appointed to the Chair in support of teaching and research. In addition, unless expressly prohibited by the gift instrument, fund payout may be used for all, or for a portion, of base salary, off-scale component of salary, sabbatical supplement, summer salary, additional compensation under a campus-approved compensation plan in accordance with applicable policies, or other additional compensation permitted by University policy (APM 191.D.2,5).

D. ADMINISTRATION OF ENDOWED CHAIRS

Income from an Endowed Chair is to be made available to the faculty member appointed to the Chair in support of teaching, research and service. In addition, unless expressly prohibited by the gift instrument, fund payout may be used for all, or for a portion, of base salary, off-scale component of salary, sabbatical supplement, summer salary, or other additional compensation permitted by University policy. Use of funds will be reviewed annually by the Provost/EVC, Associate Vice Chancellor for Development, and Alumni Relations.

The budget in any given year will not exceed the income available from the existing endowment.

The terms of the endowment shall be reviewed at least once every five years to ensure that the campus is continuing to fulfill its legal obligations to use Endowed Chair income in a manner consistent with the donor’s expressed intent. (APM 191.D.4)

During any period in which the Chair is not permanently occupied while the search proceeds for a suitable candidate, the Chancellor or the Provost/EVC may authorize use of the funds, after consultation with the relevant Unit(s), to use the endowment’s income for other purposes in support of research and teaching in the designated area of study.

If an established, fully-funded Chair has remained vacant for a period of three consecutive years or more, or if the Chair’s accumulated income exceeds five years of payout, the office of the Provost/EVC, in consultation with the Controller’s Office, shall review the fund’s terms and administrative history to ascertain the reason for the accumulation and take appropriate corrective action consistent with the terms of the gift agreement or consistent with the terms of the administrative allocation.

Provision shall be made in the gift document for the addition of unexpended endowment income to principal when circumstances warrant such action.

E. APPOINTMENT TO ENDOWED CHAIRS

Unless otherwise provided in the terms of the gift, an individual will be appointed for a period of five years, with the option of reappointment. Appointments to endowed chairs shall be made in accordance with regularly established procedures for faculty appointments (MAPP 2013). All appointments must be reviewed at least once every five years. The Chair appointee will be informed of this policy during recruitment. An Endowed Chair may be filled successively by a series of individuals appointed for prescribed periods, unless otherwise provided in the terms of the gift. An individual may simultaneously occupy more than one Endowed Chair at any given time.

The Provost/EVC has final approval authority for appointment to an Endowed Chair. If the proposed salary is above-scale, Regental authority is required to approve the salary.

F. APPOINTMENT PROCESS

An Endowed Chair may be used as a recruitment tool during the faculty appointment negotiation process, in which circumstance the case materials for the Endowed Chair appointment recommendation may come to APO in tandem with the faculty appointment case file. Appointment to an Endowed Chair should be considered a separate action from a faculty appointment, and requires a separate faculty vote. The Case Analysis and Dean’s Recommendation memo, however, may be identical documents for both actions. The Endowed Chair recommendation will be supported by the additional faculty appointment documents (Statement of Research, letters of reference, etc.). The unique materials required for the Endowed Chair recommendation will include:

- Transmittal Memo with Faculty vote
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- Development Office document containing description and stipulations of the endowment

Endowed Chair appointments may also be made available to existing UC Merced faculty.

The case file for such a recommendation would include the two documents listed above as well as:

- Case Analysis
- Dean’s Recommendation Memo
- Current Curriculum Vitae
- Self-Statement describing the alignment of candidate’s research interests with the Endowed Chair

The file will be submitted by APO to CAP for recommendation, and then to the Provost/EVC for consideration and final decision. If the decision is a positive one, the appointment letter for the Chair will be issued separately from the faculty appointment letter.

G. REAPPOINTMENT/RENEWAL PROCESS

The Dean of the relevant School, following consultation with the Development Office to verify continued funding, the appropriate Unit Chair, and the Endowed Chairholder, will make a decision whether to recommend reappointment of the incumbent to the Endowed Chair or to seek a new Chairholder. If the recommendation is for reappointment, a case file with the following documents will be prepared and submitted, no later than April 1, to APO which will forward it to CAP for recommendation and then to the Provost/EVC for consideration and final decision:

- Self-Statement, including analytical description of accomplishments during the previous period
- Case Analysis
- Transmittal Memo with Faculty Vote
- Dean’s Recommendation
- Current Curriculum Vitae
- Biobibliography for the previous four-year period
- Development Office document containing description and stipulations of the endowment
- Materials such as publications and creative works may be submitted. These should be dated from the four-year period in which the Chair has been held, and may include “new” materials (i.e., those not yet administratively reviewed as part of a regular faculty review). Such “new” materials will be allowed to “count” in any upcoming faculty reviews as appropriate to the academic review process.

Should the need to renew an Endowed Chair appointment happen to coincide with the Chairholder’s faculty advancement review, these shall be treated as entirely separate actions with two separate faculty votes, and therefore two Transmittal Memos. Other documents from the list above may be identical for both actions, and need only be submitted once.

If the recommendation is for non-reappointment of the incumbent, the Dean will provide written notice, with copies to the Provost/EVC and APO, to the faculty member notifying him or her of the reasons for not seeking reappointment (limitations of funding, service limits imposed by the endowment agreement, performance issues, etc.).

If a new Chairholder is to be sought, the processes under “Appointment Process” above shall be followed.
6002: DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR

Consistent with the University’s goal of recognizing outstanding Senate faculty in the Professorial series, and in view of parallel practices on other UC campuses, UC Merced has established the title of “Distinguished Professor” for faculty members in the Professorial series who have achieved the highest level of scholarship. These are scholars whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed and whose teaching performance is excellent. The title “Distinguished Professor” is the highest campus-level faculty title.

Because the requirements for this Professorship are the same as those needed to advance to Above Scale (APM 220-18.b.4), this title will be conferred by the Chancellor on all faculty members in the Professorial series at the time that they advance to Above Scale.

Faculty members who hold this title at the time they retire from UC Merced will be eligible to use the title “Distinguished Professor, emeritus/a.”

As this title is an honorific, it does not have a payroll title code and therefore cannot be used on legal documents such as contract and grant applications that require an “official” title. The title, “Distinguished Professor of X” may be included, however, in the honors/awards sections of Bio-bibliographies, curriculum vitae, and biosketches as well as in correspondence.
6003: CHANCELLOR’S PROFESSOR

The title “Chancellor’s Professor” is intended for individuals who have earned the title of Professor and who have demonstrated exceptional academic merit and whose continued promise for scholarly achievement is unusually high. Chancellor’s Professors are faculty members who have achieved acclaim for their accomplishments and who are likely to continue producing notable achievements in scholarship. The total number of Chancellor’s Professors on the UC Merced campus, excluding emeritus faculty, must not exceed 3% of the filled faculty lines.

Appointments to the title Chancellor’s Professor must be reviewed by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and thus shall be made in accordance with regularly established procedures for faculty appointments (MAPP 2013). Such appointments may be initiated in conjunction with an appointment or advancement case, or during any normal review cycle. Chancellor’s Professor appointments are to be made for five-year renewable terms, subject to review and recommendation of the Dean to the Provost/EVC.