



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-133-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles

### PPM 230-133-0 Policy

APM 133-0

#### Important Introductory Note

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

APM 133-0 Introductory Note I

APM 133-0 Introductory Note II

APM 133-0 Introductory Note III

#### PPM 230-133-0 Introductory Note IV

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

At UC San Diego, promotion consideration typically occurs in the sixth year of appointment at the Assistant rank. The period of time prior to consideration for promotion is referred to as the probationary period. During the probationary period, Assistant-rank appointees are expected to produce work sufficient to justify promotion.<sup>1</sup>

### PPM 230-133-6 Responsibility

APM 133-6

### PPM 230-133-12 Exceptions

APM 133-12

### PPM 230-133-16 Restrictions

APM 133-16

### PPM 230-133-17 Computation of Years of Service

APM 133-17

APM 133-17. a

APM 133-17. b

APM 133-17. c

APM 133-17. d

APM 133-17. e

APM 133-17. f

#### PPM 230-133-17. g

APM 133-17. g. (1)

APM 133-17. g. (2)

#### PPM 230-133-17. g. (3)<sup>2</sup>

**(3) Periods of leave, whether with or without salary, shall be included as service toward the eight-year period unless, upon the basis of a petition filed at the time leave is requested, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel, determines that the activity undertaken during the course of the leave is**

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. D

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. V. D. 2. b

**substantially unrelated to the individual's academic career and that the period of the leave shall not count toward the eight-year service period.** For new appointments, this determination is made on the basis of a petition filed at the time of the proposed appointment. In such cases, the Executive Vice Chancellor may permit the leave period to be excluded from service for the purposes of calculating the eight years.

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

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

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

APM 133-17. g. (2)

#### **PPM 230-133-20 Notice of Non-Reappointment**

APM 133-20

#### **PPM 230-285-24 Authority<sup>3</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-281-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-160-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES

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

#### PPM 230-160-0 Policy

APM 160-0

#### PPM 230-160-20 Access to Academic Personnel Records

APM 160-20. a

APM 160-20. b

#### PPM-230-160-20. c - Access by the Individual.

APM 160-20. c. (1)

APM 160-20. c. (2)

APM 160-20. c. (3)

APM 160-20. c. (4)

APM 160-20. c. (5)

#### PPM-230-160-20. c (6)<sup>1</sup>

**The provisions of APM - 160-20-c(2), (3), (4) apply only to the following academic personnel titles and title series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine), Professor of Practice, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Supervisor of Teacher Education, Teacher of Special Programs, Professional Research (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, Specialist, Postgraduate Research, Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator, Coordinator of Public Programs, Continuing Educator, Cooperative Extension Specialist (Advisor), Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian.**

For appointees covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), this policy applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.

APM 160-20. d

APM 160-20. e

#### PPM 230-160-30 Opportunity to Request Corrections or Deletions in Academic Personnel Records and to Make Additions to Such Records

APM 160-30

#### PPM 230-160, Appendix A

APM 160, Appendix A

#### PPM 230-160, Appendix B

APM 160, Appendix B

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-29. II



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-200-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### General

#### PPM 230-200-0 Policy

It is the policy of the University to evaluate objectively and thoroughly each candidate for appointment, promotion, or merit increase. Promotions and merit increases are not automatic, but are based on merit.

Every academic appointee shall be reviewed at least every five years<sup>1</sup>. The Chancellor, with the advice of the Academic Senate, shall determine the level and type of review and shall develop appropriate implementing procedures.

The Chancellor may exempt from this five-year review faculty Deans (see APM - 240), full-time Faculty Administrators (see APM - 246), and those members of the Senior Management Group (“SMG”) with an underlying academic appointment.

#### PPM 230-200-8 Types

APM 200-8

#### PPM 230-200-17 Effective Service Dates

APM 200-17

#### PPM 230-200-19 Normal Periods of Service at Rank and Step

APM 200-19

#### PPM 230-200-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-200-30 Academic Personnel Actions – Personnel Review Files

APM 200-30

#### PPM 230-200-96 Reports

APM 200-96

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. A

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-205-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Recall for Academic Appointees

#### **PPM 230-205-0 Policy**

APM 205-0

#### **PPM 230-205-2 Purpose**

APM 205-2

#### **PPM 230-205-14 Eligibility**

APM 205-14

#### **PPM 230-205-16 Restrictions**

APM 205-16

#### **PPM 230-205-18 Salary**

APM 205-18

#### **PPM 230-205-20 Terms and Conditions of Employment**

APM 205-20

#### **PPM 230-205-24 Authority<sup>1</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-205-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-210-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Review and Appraisal Committees

### PPM 230-210-0 Policy

APM 210-0

### PPM 230-210-1 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor and Corresponding Series

APM 210-1

APM 210-1. a

APM 210-1. b

APM 210-1. c

### PPM 230-210-1 d - Criteria for Appointment Promotion and Appraisal

APM 210-1. d

#### PPM 230-210-1 d (1) – Teaching<sup>1</sup>

By its broadest definition, teaching is the transmission of knowledge. This embraces a wide range of activities, including classroom and laboratory training, mentoring students outside the classroom, directing or participating in graduate student dissertation work, directing reading groups, and overseeing clinical apprenticeships in Health Sciences. It also includes studio teaching, seminar and symposium presentations, tutorials, supervision and training of teaching assistants, and independent study endeavors, as well as the writing of textbooks and software.

**Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role.** Evidence of teaching may vary according to the level of the appointment and the extent of the candidate's previous teaching experience. In exceptional cases where no such evidence is available, the candidate's potential as a teacher may be indicated by closely analogous activities. The departmental recommendation letter should also clearly state how the candidate will be expected to contribute to the department's teaching program. Departments should develop appropriate procedures for evaluating the teaching performance of faculty at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels.

**In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate's command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate's learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups.**

**The committee should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total**

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VI. B and PPM 230-28. V. A. 2

performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which its appraisal of teaching competence has been based.

In those exceptional cases when no such evidence is available, the candidate's potentialities as a teacher may be indicated in closely analogous activities. In preparing its recommendation, the review committee should keep in mind that a redacted copy of its report may be an important means of informing the candidate of the evaluation of his or her teaching and of the basis for that evaluation.

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

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

#### **PPM 230-210-1 d (2) - Research and Creative Work**

Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate's published research or recognized artistic production in original architectural or engineering designs, or the like. Publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible.

**When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, it is the responsibility of the department chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort.** This is crucial for work judged most significant to the case, or when much of the work submitted is multi-authored. When the appointee's contributions to collaborative work are unclear, the department may:

- Request a personal statement from the appointee describing his or her individual contributions to collaborative research, and/or
- Solicit feedback from the appointee's collaborators regarding the nature and extent of the appointee's contributions to specific works.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VI. A and PPM 230-28. V. A. 1

**It should be recognized that special cases of collaboration occur in the performing arts and that the contribution of a particular collaborator may not be readily discernible by those viewing the finished work. When the candidate is such a collaborator, it is the responsibility of the department chair to make a separate evaluation of the candidate's contribution and to provide outside opinions based on observation of the work while in progress. Account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field. Appraisals of publications or other works in the scholarly and critical literature provide important testimony. Due consideration should be given to variations among fields and specialties and to new genres and fields of inquiry.**

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

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

The standing and importance of the journals in which publications have appeared should be indicated; in particular, the letter should state whether or not the journals are refereed.

Indices of the stature of journals (e.g., journal ratings by professional societies, acceptance/rejection rates, etc.) should be provided for key pieces of work, particularly if they are published in journals that are not likely to be familiar to campus reviewers.<sup>3</sup>

The candidate's success in obtaining research support, including support for graduate students, should be addressed. The role of the candidate on grants should be indicated (e.g., Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, or Co-Investigator, with the number of other investigators indicated). Evidence of successful grant funding may provide calibration of research impact and capacity for research training, and may be an *indicator* of research productivity or impact; however, grants are not required as a measure of productivity or impact. In large teams, the expectation of grant success should be moderated based on role in the team.

For appointment at or advancement to the Associate level or higher, independent academic and intellectual leadership in the field must be demonstrated. Although candidates must demonstrate independence from early-career mentors or advisors in order to be appointed at the Associate level, evidence is not restricted to independent research papers, other independent creative accomplishments, or garnering sole-P.I. grants, particularly if the candidate's research or creative activity takes place in a large-scale, collaborative team. However, if a traditional demonstration of independence is absent, more substantial documentation is needed to explain and support the case that appointment at the Associate level is warranted. In such a case, letters from non-independent referees (e.g., research team members) may be provided in addition to the usual complement of independent letters.<sup>4</sup>

If the department chair is unable to evaluate the candidate's research and other creative accomplishments, assistance should be obtained from someone within the department or University or from experts outside the University.

A mere listing of publications is inadequate; the work must be analyzed with regard to its nature, quality, importance, and impact on its field.

Department chairs in Health Sciences should make clear whether clinical case reports are merely historical or whether they contain new ideas or results.

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 6 and PPM 230-28. V. A. 1

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 8 and PPM 230-28. V. A. 1



**PPM 230-210-1 d (3) - Professional Competence and Activity<sup>5</sup>**

A candidate for appointment to this series must possess a Ph.D. degree or equivalent.<sup>6</sup> **In certain positions in the professional schools and colleges, such as architecture, business administration, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for appointment or promotion.** In Health Sciences, candidates with clinical responsibilities must have a doctorate in a clinical discipline. If required for the position, the candidate must possess and maintain an appropriate valid license and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or the equivalent. Those appointed at the Associate rank or above should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.

**The candidate's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems, including those that specifically address the professional advancement of individuals in underrepresented groups in the candidate's field. It is responsibility of the department chair to provide evidence that the position in question is of the type described above and that the candidate is qualified to fill it.**

APM 210-1. d (4) University and Public Service

APM 210-1. e

APM 210-1 Appendix A

---

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 1, PPM 230-20. VII. A 2, PPM 230-220- VII. A. 4, and PPM 230-28. V. A. 4

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 1, PPM 230-20. VII. A 2, and PPM 230-220- VII. A. 4

**PPM 230-210-2 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) Series**

APM 210-2. a

APM 210-2. b (1) - Teaching

**PPM 230-210-2. b (2) – Professional Competence and Activity**

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

In the Health Sciences, faculty at the Associate rank or above who have clinical responsibilities should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.<sup>7</sup>

**PPM 230-210-2. b (2) (a) Standards for Appointment or Promotion**

**For entry level positions, the individual should have three or more years of training and/or experience post M.D., Ph.D. or equivalent terminal professional degree. In addition, an appointee should show evidence of a high level of competence in a clinical specialty. If required for the position, the candidate must possess and maintain an appropriate valid license and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or the equivalent.<sup>8</sup>**

**For promotion to or appointment at the Associate Professor rank, an appointee should be recognized at least in the local metropolitan health care community as an authority within a clinical specialty. Appointees at the Associate rank or above should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition. Appointees may receive patient referrals at the community and institutional levels.<sup>9</sup> A physician normally will have a regional reputation as a referral physician; another health professional normally will have a regional reputation as evidenced in such work as that of a consultant.**

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

APM 210-2. b (2) (b) Evaluation of Clinical Achievement

APM 210-2. b (3) Creative Work

APM 210-2. b (4) University and Public Service

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-28. V B. 2

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 3. g

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 3. C. ii

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

APM 210-3. a

**PPM 230-210-3. b**

The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties considering the record of the candidate's performance in (1) teaching, (2) professional achievement and activity, (3) University and public service, and (4). Educational leadership beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities

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

APM 210-3. (1) (Teaching)

APM 210-3. (2) (Professional Achievement and Activity)

APM 210-3. (3) (University and Public Service)

**PPM 230-210-3 (4) Educational Leadership and Contributions to Instruction-Related Activities**

A demonstrated record of educational leadership beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities (i.e., conducting TA training, supervision of student affairs, development of instructional materials/multimedia) is one of the criteria for advancement or promotion.

**PPM 230-210-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-210-4 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning  
Appointees in the Librarian Series**  
APM 210-4

**PPM 230-210-5 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning  
Appointees in the Supervisor of Teacher Education Series**  
APM 210-5

**PPM 230-210-6 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning  
Appointees in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series**  
APM 210-6



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-220-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Professor Series

#### PPM 230-220-4 Definition and Policy

APM 220-4. a

#### PPM 230-220-4. b<sup>1</sup>

Persons appointed to titles in the Professor series form the “regular ranks” faculty of the University. This series is distinct from the following series:

**Acting Professor series**

**Adjunct Professor series**

Professor of Practice series

**Health Sciences Clinical Professor series**

**Professor In Residence series**

**Visiting Professor series**

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

#### PPM 230-220-8 Types

APM 220-8. a

APM 220-8. b

APM 220-8. c

APM 220-8. d.

APM 220-8. e

#### PPM 230-220-8. f<sup>2</sup>

A retention occurs when a department prepares an academic review file for a faculty member who is being recruited by another institution.

#### PPM 230-220-8. g<sup>3</sup>

A. deferral occurs when an appointee delays the regularly scheduled academic review for one year by request.

#### PPM 230-220-8. h<sup>4</sup>

A no change action occurs when, following an academic review, a faculty member does not advance because productivity is not sufficient to justify advancement, or if the appointee is unresponsive to departmental requests to submit updated file materials.

#### PPM 230-220-8. i<sup>5</sup>

Accelerated advancement is early advancement to a higher step and/or rank. For series lacking established ranks and/or steps, accelerated advancement is an early increase in salary, or an increase greater than is expected based on the time since the appointee’s last review.

#### PPM 230-220-8. j<sup>6</sup>

A Career Equity Review (CER) is an evaluation to determine whether a faculty member’s rank and step are correctly calibrated. It is not a means of appeal for or expression of disagreement with a single

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.1. a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. E

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 1

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 2

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 4

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. C

personnel decision. The CER process examines cases in which normal personnel actions, from the initial hiring onward, may have resulted in an inaccurate rank and/or step designation. When warranted, a CER review may result in the recalibration of the faculty member to a higher rank and step consistent with prevailing UC San Diego standards.

**PPM 230-220-10 Criteria**

APM 220-10

**PPM 230-220-14 Eligibility**

APM 220-14

**PPM 230-220-16 Restrictions**

APM 220-16

APM 220-16. a

APM 220-16. b

APM 220-16. c

APM 220-16. d

APM 220-16. e

**PPM 230-220-16 f<sup>7</sup>**

University of California graduate students may not be appointed to titles in the Professor series.

**PPM 230-220-16 g.<sup>8</sup>**

For UC San Diego faculty with a current, salaried Professor (Ladder-Rank) appointment, a 0% Professor appointment may be proposed to reflect a secondary department affiliation. If a 0% Professor appointment is proposed:

- the candidate will be afforded voting rights in the secondary department;
- eligible faculty in both departments must vote on the file; and
- the candidate is required to fulfill responsibilities for research, teaching, and service in both departments.

Such 0% Professor appointments will be limited to a term equal to one review cycle. Reappointments may only be proposed at the time of review.

No guarantee of future appointment or funding is accorded with a 0% Ladder-Rank appointment.

**PPM 230-220-17 Terms of Service**

APM 220-17. a

APM 220-17. b

APM 220-17. c

**PPM 230-220-17. d<sup>9</sup>**

**Effective Date and Beginning Date of Service**

**(1) The effective date of an appointment is the initial date of the new status for payroll or other recordkeeping purposes and indicates the first day on which salary or change in rate of salary commences.**

- Academic-year appointments must be effective at the beginning of quarterly pay periods (i.e., July 1 for fall quarter; November 1 for winter quarter; March 1 for spring quarter).
- Fiscal-year appointments may be effective on any date, preferably the first day of a month.
- If an appointment that represents a series change coincides with an advancement, the advancement must be effective on July 1, regardless of the effective date of the proposed new appointment.

Whenever possible, appointments subject to the eight-year limit should be made effective July 1.

APM 220-17. d. (2)

APM 220-17. d. (3)

**PPM 230-220-18 Salary**

APM 220-18

APM 220-18. a

APM 220-18. b

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.2. d

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.2. h

<sup>9</sup> 230-20. V. E



APM 220-18. b. (1)

APM 220-18. b. (2)

APM 220-18. b. (3)

**PPM 230-220-18. b. (4)**

**Professor:** The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V. This involves an overall career review and will be granted on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching. Service at Professor, Step VI or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

Those Professors who are on the special Law School scale that has nine steps for the range are subject to the same criteria as Professors as outlined above.

Advancement to an above-scale rank involves an overall career review and is reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact; (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increase at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

The normal salary increase for a person in the Above Scale category is either 50% or 100% of the difference between the top two steps of the salary scale (i.e., 50% or 100% of the salary increase between Steps VIII and IX for the Professor and Research Scientist series.) Files proposing 100% of the difference between the top two steps must demonstrate exemplary performance in all areas (research and creative activity, teaching, service, and professional competence and activity). Files proposing more than 100% of the difference between the top two steps will be considered acceleration files.

#### **PPM 230-220-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 230-20

#### **PPM 230-220-24 Authority to Approve Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions<sup>10</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures**

**PPM 230-220-80. a<sup>11</sup>**

Formal considerations of appointments and reappointments, merit increases, appraisals, non-reappointments, and promotions are normally initiated by the department chair, after appropriate consultation with members of the departmental faculty. For actions affecting the chair, the vice chair, the Dean or Provost, or an appropriate officer may take the initiative.

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>11</sup> 230-20. V. A. 3

If the department chair and the candidate proposed for appointment are close collaborators, the department chair should not participate in the preparation of the appointment file. The vice chair or another independent senior faculty member should oversee the process and prepare the departmental recommendation letter.

If the department 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 should recuse themselves from contributing to the appointment file.

When an appointee holds joint appointments in two or more departments, all departments should be involved in the appointee's academic review; however, only one academic review file should be submitted.

Each department should act independently in arriving at its recommendation for inclusion in the academic review file.<sup>12</sup>

APM 220-80. b

**PPM 230-220-80. c<sup>13</sup>**

**Early in the course of a personnel review, before departmental consideration of a case, the chair shall notify the candidate of the impending review and in one or more conferences with the candidate make certain that the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is given the appropriate opportunity to ask questions, to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review, and, where relevant, to suggest names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation.**

Academic appointees must provide evidence of achievement in each of the criteria specified for their series. Appointees are also responsible for meeting the department's deadlines for submission of academic review file materials.

If eligible, appointees may initiate a Career Equity Review (CER). An appointee is responsible for requesting a CER at the time of his or her regular, on-cycle academic review (see PPM 230-220-89, Professor Series/Procedures for Career Equity Review.)<sup>14</sup>

Department chairs should establish in writing a deadline (no later than the established campus deadline) for the submission by candidates of all materials for their Review Files. Departments may establish an earlier deadline, but, in these cases, candidates must have a reasonable period of time to gather and submit the material. Departmental deadlines may not be later than the established campus deadline. For equity reasons, an appointee may not add bibliographic or other documentation reflecting activities or accomplishments beyond the established campus deadline. If material is received after the departmental meeting and vote, the chair shall determine whether or not the added material is of such significance that it should be reviewed by all voting members and whether a new departmental meeting should be scheduled to reconsider the case. If the chair determines that the new material is not of such substance as to require a new departmental meeting and/or vote, the chair should take steps to include the material in the File and describe the degree of departmental review of the material. The candidate also should be informed of the degree of departmental review and asked to sign Certification C as an indication of his/her awareness that the material has been added to the File.<sup>15</sup>

**The chair has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards.**

**The candidate should be made aware of APM - 210-1 and 220, of the University's policies about academic personnel records (APM - 160), and of the candidate's rights to make any desired addition to the personnel review file. The chair should be helpful in responding to the candidate's**

---

<sup>12</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. F

<sup>13</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 1. c. (4)

<sup>14</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. C

<sup>15</sup> PPM 230-29. III. G. 6 and PPM 230-28-IV.A. 3 and 4

**questions and in considering whether additions to the file by the candidate are needed. In accordance with established policy applicable to the personnel action under consideration, the chair shall solicit letters of evaluation of the candidate from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons nominated by the candidate.**

#### External Referee Letters

The department chair should solicit evaluations from individuals who are independent of the candidate, who are expert in the candidate's field, and who are able to provide an objective appraisal of the candidate's work. External referees should be senior scholars who are at the same rank as that proposed for the appointee, or higher.

**All such letters received shall be included in the file;** unsolicited letters received by the department but NOT added to the file by the appointee may be included in the file at the department chair's discretion.<sup>16</sup> **In soliciting or receiving unsolicited letters of evaluation, the chair should include, attach or send a statement regarding the confidentiality of such letters.** This statement must include the following (or its equivalent):

“Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about 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.”<sup>17</sup>

Sample solicitation letters are provided on the Academic Personnel Services Web site. External referee letters are required as follows:

#### Appointment:<sup>18</sup>

For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step I or II, external letters of evaluation from the candidate's mentors and others at the home institution are acceptable; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if available.

For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step III or higher, and for all appointments at the Associate or Full level, letters should be from external referees who are senior scholars (Associate level or higher) and who are independent of the candidate.

#### Advancement:<sup>19</sup>

- For advancement to Step VI, external referee letters are not required, but may be solicited at the department's discretion when they are needed to demonstrate evidence of nationally or internationally recognized and highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, or excellent teaching.
- For advancement in the LPSOE/LSOE series, external evaluation letters must be solicited from individuals who are professionally independent from the appointee; however, additional evaluation letters may be solicited from referees from within UC San Diego as a tool to assist the effective evaluation of an appointee's contributions to pedagogy on campus.
- For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, evaluation letters may be solicited from within UC San Diego; however, the majority of required letters should be obtained from individuals external to UC San Diego
- For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, external evaluation letters may be solicited from individuals who are not professionally independent from the appointee; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if possible.

Depending on the discipline of the appointee under review, additional evidence provided in lieu of external letters may include, but is not limited to: published reviews of the candidate's work; Readers' Reports from publishers; or presentations of the research in competitive and prestigious venues.

In cases in which the department chooses not to solicit letters from external referees, campus reviewers

---

<sup>16</sup> PPM 230-20. V. A

<sup>17</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 2. b

<sup>18</sup> PPM 230-20. V. A

<sup>19</sup>

may later recommend that the department do so. In all other cases, external referee letters should not be solicited unless there is no department faculty member with sufficient expertise to evaluate the appointee.

**The candidate may provide in writing to the chair names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the personnel review file.**

Based upon the above, candidates occasionally have asked that the department chair, Deans, Provosts, members of the Committee on Academic Personnel, and other individuals within and outside the department be excluded from participation in their academic personnel review. CAP does not consider it appropriate to honor requests to exclude particular members of CAP from participation in the review of any file. CAP members routinely exclude themselves from review of candidates at the departmental level, and to exclude them at the CAP level would essentially disenfranchise them. It would, in general, be inappropriate to exclude them from consideration of any cases involving candidates from their own or other departments because their expertise is needed by CAP. Any member of CAP can, however, on his/her own initiative, voluntarily withdraw from a review.

Candidates occasionally name reviewers, inside and outside the University, who, for reasons stated in writing, might not provide an objective evaluation of the candidate's work. The department chair, in consultation with the voting members of the department, should decide whether or not to solicit letters from those named. If a named reviewer is used, the chair should explain the reasons for consulting the named individual so that the file will show not only the candidate's reasons for the exclusion, but also the reason for the department's decision to seek the opinion of the named person.

On rare occasions, candidates ask that the department chair not prepare the review file. Such requests will be decided by the Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs following consultation with CAP. In instances where someone other than the department chair is asked to prepare the review file, the department chair will participate in the review as a voting member of the department.

Members of the candidate's department, Deans, Provosts, and members of the Committee on Academic Personnel cannot be barred from participation in the personnel process on the basis of a challenge to their objectivity. To do so would infringe on rights granted to faculty by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(c) and rights granted to the Academic Senate by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(d). Individuals may voluntarily withdraw from participation in the review process.

**PPM 230-220-80. c (footnote 1)<sup>20</sup>**

**1The provisions of APM - 220-80-c, 220-80-d, 220-80-e, 220-80-h, 220-80-i, 220-80-j, and 220-84-b, modified as appropriate, apply to the following series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), Professor of Practice, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Supervisor of Teacher Education, Teacher of Special Programs, Professional Research (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, Specialist, Postgraduate Research, Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator, Coordinator of Public Programs, Continuing Educator, Cooperative Extension Specialist (Advisor), Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian.**

For appointees covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), this policy applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.

**PPM 230-220-80. d<sup>21</sup>**

**Before the departmental recommendation is determined, the chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents in the personnel review file other than confidential academic review records (as defined in APM – 160-20-b (1)), and shall provide to the candidate upon request a redacted copy (as defined in APM - 160-20-c (4)) of the confidential academic review records in the file. Within seven days of receiving redacted copies, the candidate may submit for inclusion in the**

---

<sup>20</sup> PPM 230-29. II

<sup>21</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D 3

**personnel review file a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file.**

The candidate's response must be made available to the faculty prior to the meeting at which the departmental recommendation is determined. The candidate's signature on Certification A (Exhibit A) certifies that these procedures have been followed. Certification A should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs and must be included in each Personnel Review File.

The chair has the responsibility of making the complete Review File available for inspection by the voting members of the department before the departmental vote is taken. Copies of the files or portions thereof should not be distributed to members of the faculty.

"Complete Review File" refers to the review file prepared for the proposed personnel action and generally does not include previous review files or other material which are not relevant for the proposed personnel action. The department or the candidate can, of course, make material in a previous review file a part of the current file.

**PPM 230-220-80. e.<sup>22</sup>**

**The departmental recommendation is made in accordance with the procedural regulations of the Academic Senate and established governance practices of the department, and is based upon the evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department.**

Department chairs are responsible for ensuring compliance with the provisions of Bylaw 55 and should review them carefully prior to initiating departmental votes.<sup>23</sup>

Except in unusual circumstances, whenever University or departmental policy requires a vote on a proposed action, the action must be supported by at least 50% of the members eligible to vote and in residence on campus in the quarter when the vote is taken.

Except for appraisals, votes should be "for," "against," "abstain," or "absent," as defined below:

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| <b>FOR</b>     | The voter is in favor of the proposed action.  |
| <b>AGAINST</b> | The voter is not in favor of the proposed action.  |
| <b>ABSTAIN</b> | The voter is available, but has elected to refrain from voting.                            |
| <b>ABSENT</b>  | The voter is unavailable for voting due to an approved leave or other absence from campus. |

Departments should develop their own rules, when necessary, for consultation or voting on academic personnel actions not covered by Academic Senate Bylaw 55.<sup>24</sup>

**The chair initiates a personnel action for an appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, or terminal appointment by addressing a letter setting forth the departmental recommendation to the approval authority.**

**This departmental letter shall:**

**1. Discuss the proposed personnel action in the light of the criteria set forth in APM - 220-10 and shall be accompanied by supporting evidence.**

a. For appointments, the letter should provide a thorough evaluation of the candidate's qualifications in accordance with the specific criteria established for the proposed series. This includes a full and detailed evaluation of the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements, a description and evaluation of the candidate's teaching experience and effectiveness, and assessment of his or her professional reputation in the academic community.

Utilizing information from the candidate's previous institution, the departmental recommendation letter should include a meaningful assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at both the undergraduate and graduate levels of instruction.

---

<sup>22</sup> PPM 230-20. V A. 4

<sup>23</sup> PPM 230-20. V. F

<sup>24</sup> PPM 230-28. VIII. A

b. For all actions but appointments, the appointee's performance in each area should be evaluated in terms of the department's established performance norms and expectations, using established departmental evaluation methods.<sup>25</sup>

**2. Report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department (including any vote taken) and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a contrary opinion.**

**3. Discuss the proposed title, rank, step, salary, effective appointment date(s).**

4. [Justify] the recommended rank, step, and salary based on the criteria specified for the series, including justification for an market off-scale salary, if applicable.

5. Include verification that a complete file was presented for voting members' consideration

6. Provide information about the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department (including the results of any vote taken and the reasons (if known) for any negative votes.)

7. Include a statement regarding external referees' recommendations, **ensuring that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified in the departmental letter except by code.**

8. Include a statement from the chair regarding any conflicts of interest.<sup>26</sup>

For appointments, the letter should include:<sup>27</sup>

1. The proposed title, rank, step, salary, effective appointment date(s), and discussion of any funding contingencies.

2. A brief description of the open recruitment conducted by the department for the position and how the candidate was selected. (Other applicants should not be identified in this description.)

3. Documentation of the participation and membership of the departmental ad hoc committee

4. A description of the candidate's expected role in the department: research to be conducted and/or classes the candidate will teach; the candidate's anticipated contribution to the department's instructional mission at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; and a description of the department's teaching requirements and how the candidate's teaching load meets those requirements (for applicable titles).

For Visiting Titles:<sup>28</sup>

The departmental recommendation letter should describe clearly the special expertise that the visitor brings to the campus and should clearly state that the individual will be returning to the home institution upon completion of the visiting appointment.

**The department shall adopt procedures under which the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation shall be available, before being forwarded, for inspection by all those members of the department eligible to vote on the matter or by a designated committee or other group of such members.** The operating word is inspection, not approval; dissenting faculty may add dissenting letters into the File. Dissenting letters are considered non-confidential and will be available to the candidate.<sup>29</sup> **Pursuant to campus procedures, the chair may also, in a separate letter, make an independent evaluation and recommendation, which may differ from the departmental recommendation.** This letter should be shown to all voting members of the department, and will be accessible to the candidate, upon request, in redacted form.<sup>30</sup>

**Before or at the time of forwarding the departmental letter and the personnel review file, the candidate shall be informed orally or, upon request, in writing of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of departmental evaluations under each of the applicable University criteria (teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and University and public service). If the chair provides this information to the candidate in writing, a copy of the written statement is to be included in the personnel review file. Upon request, the chair shall provide to the candidate a copy of the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation. As stated above, the identities of persons who were the sources of confidential**

---

<sup>25</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. A. 5

<sup>26</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. A. 7

<sup>27</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. A. 4

<sup>28</sup> PPM 230-28. V. N.

<sup>29</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 4. e

<sup>30</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 5. d

documents are not to be disclosed in this letter. The candidate has the right to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation. The candidate should in such a case request a written statement from the chair as described above, and the candidate's comment shall be transmitted, at the option of the candidate, either to the chair, Dean, or Provost. This should be done within a time limit prescribed by the Chancellor. This written comment shall become part of the personnel review file as the review proceeds.

APM 220-80. f

APM 220-80. g

**PPM 230-220-80. h.**<sup>31</sup>

**If, during Academic Senate or administrative review of a departmental recommendation, the personnel review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, additional information shall be solicited** from the chair through the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor-- Academic Affairs or the applicable Dean/Director in cases where the Dean/Director is the approving authority. **Such new material shall be added to the personnel review file, and the department shall be invited to comment on the new material. The candidate shall be informed by the chair of the new material which has been added to the personnel review file (without disclosing the identities of sources of confidential academic review records), and may be provided access to the new material in accord with APM - 220-80-d. The candidate shall be provided the opportunity to make a written statement for inclusion in the personnel review file.** The candidate's statement should be received by the department within seven days of the candidate being informed of the new material. The candidate's signature on Certification C (Exhibit C) certifies that these procedures have been followed. **The review shall then be based upon the personnel review file as augmented.**

APM 220-80. i

**PPM 230-220-80. j**<sup>32</sup>

**If the Administrative Authority's preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department, or of reviewers, the Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs (or applicable dean, where appropriate) shall notify the candidate, chair or applicable reviewers, indicating the reasons and asking for any further information which might support a different decision.** The chair or applicable reviewers will have an opportunity to accept the preliminary decision or to respond to it, within fourteen days, before a final decision is made. **When additional information is furnished, appropriate reviewers will be given opportunity to comment on the augmented file before a final decision is made.** If the candidate chooses to comment, such comments should be received by the department chair within seven days from the date the candidate was informed of the preliminary decision. Any response to the preliminary decision and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C.

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>31</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 6

<sup>32</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 7

**PPM 230-220-82 Procedure for Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion to the Rank of Assistant Professor**

**The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:**

APM 220-82. a

APM 220. 82. b

APM 220-82. c

**PPM 230-220-82. d**

a. First Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>33</sup>

The first reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs during the second year of appointment. The department may propose:

1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

3. *Non-Reappointment*

If an appointee is not making acceptable progress, the eligible department faculty may vote to recommend non-reappointment at the end of the first two-year appointment period in accordance with APM 220-20. C., and APM PPM 230-220-84.

b. Second Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>34</sup>

The second reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the fourth year of appointment, and is usually combined with an appraisal in accordance with PPM-220-83. The department may propose:

1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

3. *Termination*

If an appointee's performance is unacceptable, the department may consider termination. A recommendation to terminate an assistant-rank appointee requires a vote of the eligible department faculty and may only be recommended after the department has conducted an appraisal in accordance with PPM 230-220-82.

c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>35</sup>

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review of a Senate Faculty Member, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

1. Promotion is Recommended

---

<sup>33</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D.4

<sup>34</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D.4

<sup>35</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D.7



If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Termination is Recommended

If the department believes an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, the department may vote to recommend termination with notice.

g. Reconsideration<sup>36</sup>

An appointee who has received notice of termination may be reconsidered for promotion.

Reconsideration is appropriate only when there is substantial evidence of significant improvement in the appointee's record of scholarly achievement since the termination decision was reached, particularly with respect to those elements of the record previously identified as areas of weakness.

A reconsideration file must be received in the Academic Personnel office no later than February 15 of the terminal year. Neither submission of a reconsideration file nor a failure to meet the file deadline will postpone a terminal appointment ending date.

If a final decision has not been made by the ending date of the terminal period of service, the appointment will end as scheduled. If reconsideration results in a decision to promote, the promotion action becomes effective retroactive to July 1, regardless of when the decision is reached.

---

<sup>36</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D. 10

### PPM 230-220-83 Procedure for the Formal Appraisal of an Assistant Professor

Formal appraisals of Assistant Professors shall be made in order to arrive at preliminary assessments of the prospects of candidates for eventual promotion to tenure rank as well as to identify appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence desired for continued membership in the faculty.

The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:

a. 1. Normally each Assistant Professor shall be appraised well in advance of possible promotion to tenure rank (at least two and one-half years before the anticipated effective date of the promotion). A case of initial appointment from outside the University, with anticipation of promotion within two or three years after appointment, obviously calls for an exception to the general rule. Each Assistant Professor shall be appraised no later than the first half of the appointee's sixth year of service in the University with the title Assistant Professor or with this title in combination with other titles as defined in APM - 133-0-a and 133-0-b. Earlier appraisals are permissible. Subject to these guidelines and restrictions, each Chancellor shall establish general schedules and rules for the timing of formal appraisals on the respective campus.

The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with the second reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.<sup>37</sup>

**No formal appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of an appraisal, the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.**

a.2<sup>38</sup>. The following factors should be evaluated when conducting an appraisal:

- Published research and other completed creative activity, and potential for continued research and creative activity.
- teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

a.3. Appraisal Vote<sup>39</sup>

...

The eligible department faculty should vote on an appraisal rating, as follows:

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| FAVORABLE                   | Indicates that promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining the current trajectory of excellence and on appropriate external validation. |
| FAVORABLE WITH RESERVATIONS | Indicates that promotion is likely, if identified weaknesses or imbalances in the record are corrected.                                    |

---

<sup>37</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D. 6. b

<sup>38</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D. 6. b

<sup>39</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D. 6. c

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| PROBLEMATIC | Indicates that promotion is possible if substantial deficiencies in the present record are remedied. |
| UNFAVORABLE | Indicates that substantial deficiencies are present; promotion is unlikely.                          |

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees in accordance with PPM 230-220-85.

If the majority of eligible department faculty vote for an appraisal rating of “unfavorable,” a second vote of the faculty should be taken to determine whether the department wishes to continue the appointment or recommend termination in accordance with PPM 230-220-84.

a.4. When the appraisal is combined with a reappointment/merit review, the department must make a recommendation regarding reappointment and merit advancement. The department may propose:

- *Reappointment with Merit Advancement:*  
indicates that sufficient work has been completed during the review period to justify merit advancement, and the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.
- *Reappointment without Merit Advancement:*  
indicates there has not been sufficient work completed in the review period to justify merit advancement, but the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.
- *Termination:*  
Termination should be considered in accordance with PPM 230-220-84 if the majority of voting faculty are convinced that substantial deficiencies in the record cannot be corrected in time for consideration for promotion and therefore further effort will not result in promotion.

APM 220-83. b

**PPM 230 220-83.c**

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

APM 220-83. d

APM 220-83. e

**PPM 230-220-84 Procedure for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor**  
The general rules of APM - 220-80 apply here. In addition:

- a. <sup>40</sup>A proposal not to reappoint an Assistant Professor may originate with the department chair as a result of departmental review during consideration of reappointment. Also, during a formal appraisal of an Assistant Professor/Supervisor/Research Scientist/Scholar, a department may recommend that a candidate be notified of a terminal appointment. **In either event, the case shall be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of APM Sections 220-82, 220-83, and 220-84.**
- b. <sup>41</sup>During a review of a formal appraisal, or consideration of reappointment or promotion of an Assistant Professor (or other appointee of equivalent rank), , there is a recommendation to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint by a Dean, Provost, campus ad hoc review committee, and/or the Committee on Academic Personnel; and-if the Academic Vice Chancellor's (or designee's) preliminary assessment is to make a terminal appointment, is not to reappoint or promote, or is contrary to the departmental shall be notified of this in writing (including a statement of reasons)-by the Academic Vice Chancellor (or applicable dean, where appropriate). **The candidate also shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to the records placed in the personnel review file subsequent to the departmental review in accordance with APM - 160-20-c. When the candidate is provided copies of such records, the department chair also shall be provided with copies of the extradepartmental records. The candidate and the chair, after appropriate consultation within the department, shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing within fourteen days and to provide additional information and documentation. The candidate may respond either through the department chair or directly to the Academic Vice Chancellor within seven days of being informed of the preliminary decision (or within seven days of receipt of the extra- departmental records as outlined above). The personnel review file, as augmented by the added material, shall then be considered in any stage of the review process as designated by the Academic Vice Chancellor before a final decision by the Chancellor is reached.** The departmental response and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C. **The Chancellor's final decision to make a terminal appointment, or not to reappoint or promote, shall not be made without the appropriate preliminary assessment notification process and opportunity to respond being provided to the candidate as specified herein.**

---

<sup>40</sup> PPM 230-29. III. E. 1

<sup>41</sup> PPM 230-29. III. E. 2

**PPM 230-220-86 Procedure for Deferral of the Academic Review**<sup>42</sup>

A. deferral occurs when an appointee delays the regularly scheduled academic review for one year by request. An appointee may request a deferral of his or her academic review when:

1. there is evidence that work in progress will come to fruition within the year and that having the additional year will make a difference in the result of the next review; or
2. circumstances beyond the appointee's control have impacted his or her productivity (i.e., illness, family member's illness, etc.).

In general, the following appointees are not eligible to defer academic reviews: Assistant-rank appointees (except when approved as a family accommodation; see [\[Link to PPM 230-15\]](#), non-salaried Adjunct Professors, and appointees with established ending dates (term appointments).

Deferral requests must be submitted to the appointee's department(s) no later than October 15.

An appointee may request a maximum of two consecutive deferrals.

---

<sup>42</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 1

**PPM 230-220-87 Procedure for No Change Action**<sup>43</sup>

The general Rules of PPM 230-220-80/APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:

An academic review file must be prepared and submitted for review for an appointee serving in the final year of the normal period at step<sup>44</sup>, even if the appointee is not recommended for advancement. A department should propose a no-change action if productivity is not sufficient to justify advancement, or if the appointee is unresponsive to departmental requests to submit updated file materials. For appointees subject to [APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment](#), the department may allow the appointment to expire instead of recommending a no-change action.

After a no-change action takes effect, the appointee's review cycle will be reset for the normal two-, three-, or four-year cycle. Should the department propose advancement prior to the end of the appointee's normal review cycle, this action will not be considered an acceleration.

**Consecutive No Change Actions**

In cases in which an appointee is proposed for a consecutive no change action, the department must discuss the reasons for the no change action in the departmental letter. Potential reasons include:

1. **Full Service at a Barrier Step**  
An appointee's failure to advance resulting from insufficient career accomplishments to pass through a barrier step, while continuing to provide full service to the University. For example, an appointee may continue to be productive in research and/or creative activities, teaching, and service at a level that would support normal merit advancement, but may not be sufficiently productive at a level that would support promotion, advancement to Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale.
2. **Extenuating Circumstances**  
An appointee's failure to advance resulting from extenuating circumstances, such as the appointee's own illness, the illness of a family member, or other significant event outside of his or her control that impacted productivity and/or performance.
3. **Insufficient Contributions**  
In the absence of extenuating circumstances, an appointee's failure to advance resulting from contributions which are insufficient in quality and/or quantity to support normal advancement.

When an appointee is proposed for a consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose the reduction or elimination of a market off-scale salary component at the time of future range adjustment actions. See [\[Link to PPM 230-620\]](#).

In cases in which an appointee receives a second consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions:

- The department chair, in consultation with the dean, must meet with the appointee to develop a plan to correct the deficiencies in the record contributing to the lack of advancement. This plan must be included in the next academic review file.
- The appointee is ineligible to defer a regularly scheduled review until deficiencies in the record are corrected and the appointee advances.

---

<sup>43</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 2

<sup>44</sup> For appointees subject to APM 137, this applies only if the appointee is to be reappointed.

**PPM 230-220-88 - Procedure for Accelerated Advancement**

The general Rules of PPM 230-220-80/APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:

a. Criteria for Accelerated Advancement.

An appointee whose performance is at an exceptional level over a period may be considered for accelerated advancement. Exceptional performance is defined as work that significantly exceeds the normal departmental expectations in one or more of the areas of review: research and other creative activities, teaching, professional competence and activities, and university and public service. The candidate for acceleration must also meet the departmental criteria for advancement in every area of review. Acceleration proposals should not be made if there is any evident weakness in the case.

Acceleration proposals must address the department standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the candidate's performance is exceptional. In parallel with normal merit advancement progress, the criteria for both good and exceptional performance become more rigorous with rank and step.

1. Series requiring research and/or creative activity:

For series in which research and/or creative activity is among the performance criteria, above-average research and/or creative activity is a prerequisite to accelerated advancement.

2. Evidence that a candidate's productivity is double that which is expected for normal advancement in the review period is typically sufficient to demonstrate a candidate's performance is exceptional for purposes of a one-step acceleration. In cases in which research productivity is greater than that required for normal advancement, but falls short of twice the expected rate, extraordinary achievements in additional performance criteria are necessary to justify accelerated advancement.

An acceleration case based on exceptional productivity in research must be documented with evidence of the appointee's contributions and their impact using norms appropriate to the research field. The department recommendation should articulate the grounds for acceleration beyond simple numerical tabulation of papers and citations; for example, demonstration of the special impact of research, the quality of publications, the awarding of prizes or election to national or international learned academies.

b. Other series:

An acceleration proposal based primarily on the quality and quantity of contributions other than research and/or creative activity must contain documentation and evidence of these extraordinary achievements and of their impact characterizing their exceptional nature of effort and outcomes. Documentation substantiating the significant and extraordinary nature of the achievements and their impact is needed; for example, the awarding of prizes, exceptional service of significant duration and/or importance (not otherwise rewarded or compensated), or professional recognition of contributions.

c. Timing of Accelerated Advancement

Except in remarkable circumstances (such as in the case of the appointee's receipt of an extraordinary award during the review period, or in the case of a parallel retention review) accelerated advancement should be proposed only at the time of the regularly scheduled review.

Normally, the activities considered for acceleration pertain to the complete review period only. Acceleration proposals occurring before the normal time for a merit review are discouraged unless extraordinary circumstances, such as the awarding of a major prize or an off-cycle review due to retention, warrant their consideration.

Accelerations may also be proposed as part of a case for recalibration of rank and step at the time of career review; e.g., tenure, promotion, or advancement to Step VI. Such a case requires documentation of activity and impact spanning the expanded review period and must contain evidence supporting the case for acceleration.

Normally, either the candidate or the department will propose accelerated advancement. When a

candidate requests to be considered for acceleration, this must be stated in the departmental recommendation letter. In addition, any campus reviewer may propose acceleration and all subsequent campus reviewers must provide comment on this proposal with regard to these acceleration criteria.

d. General Considerations

- i. The previous award of bonus off-scale salary is immaterial to the consideration of any acceleration proposal.
- ii. Acceleration proposals based on unpublished work or work yet to be evaluated by scholarly review are inappropriate.
- iii. Acceleration is an inappropriate mechanism to address purely salary-related issues.
- iv. Promotion from the Assistant level to the Associate level, regardless of when proposed, is not considered an acceleration. Assistant-level appointees should be proposed for promotion whenever they are deemed ready for such advancement. However, a promotion to a higher-than-normal step at the Associate level is considered an acceleration.
- v. If an Associate Professor is promoted to Professor after two years at Step III, it is considered a normal promotion even if the individual has not spent six years as Associate Professor.
- vi. For Professors at Step IX and Above Scale, a merit advancement is an acceleration if it becomes effective after the individual has spent less than four years at the current step. There must be rare and compelling reasons for accelerated advancement to or as Professor, Above Scale, and departments must address the rare and compelling reasons when proposing such advancement.

**PPM 230-220-89 Procedure for Career Equity Review**<sup>45</sup>

A CER is available to Senate faculty members (excluding those at the LPSOE, Assistant, or Above Scale levels). A CER may be requested only once while the faculty member is at the Associate Professor level, once while at the Full Professor level prior to advancement to Professor, Step VI, and once after advancement to Professor, Step VI, prior to advancement to Above Scale.

The decision to initiate a CER rests solely with the faculty member, and may be initiated by the faculty member only at the time of his or her regular on-cycle academic review. A request for a CER must contain the specific rank and step desired and justification for the recalibration. Possible justification may include, but is not limited to, the following assessments: 1) the cumulative record warrants an acceleration, even though no one review period did; 2) the rank/step was low at the time of initial appointment; 3) particular work and contributions should be reevaluated by the department and/or other reviewing bodies.

The CER is conducted in parallel with the regularly scheduled academic review. The department chair should compile an academic review file that addresses the appointee's entire academic record for the purposes of the CER, as well as the regular action for the current review period. 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 department must seek external referee letters addressing the barrier step advancement for inclusion in the file.

If recalibration is approved, the effective date will be the same as that which would have applied to the regular action.

CERs are intended to supplement regular academic reviews, and they neither replace nor affect existing procedures for regular reviews.

The Executive Vice Chancellor's decision on the CER is not subject to appeal and is not retroactive.

**PPM 230-220-96 Reports**

APM 230-96

---

<sup>45</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. C





# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

### Section: 230-230-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 (3/13/2017 DRAFT)

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 (TARGET)

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Visiting Appointments

### PPM 230-230-4 Definition and Policy

APM 230-4

#### PPM 230-230-10 Criteria<sup>1</sup>

The criteria for evaluation of a candidate for appointment with a Visiting title shall be the same as for the corresponding regular title. Because the appointment is temporary, reasonable flexibility may be employed in the application of these criteria. Care should be taken to inform the appointee of the provisions of Section 230-4-d.

The departmental recommendation letter should describe clearly the special expertise that the visitor brings to the campus and should clearly state that the individual will be returning to the home institution upon completion of the visiting appointment.

#### PPM 230-230-14 Eligibility

APM 205-14

#### PPM 230-230-16 Restrictions

APM 205-16

#### PPM 230-230-17 Terms of Service

Each appointment or reappointment with a Visiting title shall be for a specified term not to exceed one year. The total period of consecutive service with a Visiting title shall not exceed two years, unless a longer period is approved by the Chancellor. The combined initial period of service in the Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor title and the Assistant Professor title should not exceed two years.

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.

#### PPM 230-230-18 Salary

##### PPM 230-230-18. a

Salaries for visitors are not restricted to the published salary scale.<sup>2</sup> The salary of an appointee with a Visiting title shall be determined according to the special circumstances of the case, with due consideration given to the individual's regular salary or professional income. In some cases, it will be appropriate to separate considerations of rank from those of salary. Although no steps are assigned to Visiting appointees, the departmental recommendation letter must justify the salary level recommended.<sup>3</sup>

##### PPM 230-230-18. b

Since the negotiated salary for an appointment to a Visiting title may take into account certain

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. V N

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. V. E. 2

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. V N

relocation expenses, it should not necessarily be regarded as the appropriate salary for any subsequent regular appointment. (Relocation expenses are not the same as travel expenses; for travel expense reimbursement to a Visiting appointee, see the provisions of APM - 230-20-h.) The salary paid may not include travel expenses but may include an amount to cover relocation expenses if the department chair and the respective Dean agree that University funding is available to cover such relocation expenses. Any relocation costs included in the salary must be justified in the departmental recommendation letter.<sup>4</sup>

APM 230-18.c  
APM 230-18. d

**PPM 230-230-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 230-20

**PPM 230-230-24 Academic File Review and Final Authority<sup>5</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-230-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-230-96 Reports**

APM 230-96

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. V. E. 2

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-235-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Acting Appointments

#### PPM 230-235-4 Definitions

**a. The “Acting” prefix will be accorded only to a person on a temporary appointment. The prefix thus will signify the conditional, probationary, or emergency status of the appointment, as well as the privilege and responsibility of conducting research, and will often be applied to a person under consideration for appointment to a regular professorial title.**

i. A probationary appointment in an Acting title is appropriate when a department or the appointing authority has reservations about recommending an individual for a regular professorship and wishes to observe the appointee's teaching or research for a one- or two-year probationary period. If the expressed doubts are removed, the person will be “regularized”—that is, proposed for a regular professorship—at the end of the probationary period.

ii. An Acting title in the Ladder-Rank series can be used for an individual who does not have an appropriate visa, or when an academic condition that would justify a regular Ladder-Rank appointment is lacking—i.e., the terminal degree of the field, such as the Ph.D. A conditional appointment is made with the intention of converting the Acting title to a regular title when the candidate acquires the requisite academic or immigration credential.

iii. When the Acting prefix is used to indicate the lack of the Ph.D. for an Assistant Professor candidate whom the department intends to transfer to the regular ranks Assistant Professor title, the appointment file proposing the Acting title must indicate clearly the department’s recommendation regarding regularization. A change to a regular appointment may be made upon receipt of official certification that an appointee has completed all formal degree requirements.

APM 235-4. b.

APM 235-4. c.

#### PPM 230-235-18 Salary

APM 235-18

#### PPM 230-235-20 Conditions of Employment<sup>1</sup>

APM 235-20. a

APM 235-20. b

APM 235-20. c

#### PPM 230-235-20 d

Acting appointments do not accord tenure or security of employment.

#### PPM 230-235-20 e

Assistant-level acting appointments do not convey membership in the Academic Senate.

#### PPM 230-235-20 f

Acting appointments are subject to APM 137, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment.

#### PPM 230-235-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII E. 1

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-235-25 Transfer to Regular Status**

**An Acting appointee may be transferred to a regular appointment at regular-scale salary provided the appointment has had appropriate Academic Senate review and approval of the Chancellor.**

APM 235-25. a

**PPM 230-235-25 b. When a change to a regular appointment is approved** for an academic-year appointee, **the change in title shall be effective with the beginning of the quarter following the date of completion of all formal degree requirements and the change in salary shall be effective at the beginning of the pay period for that quarter.** For a fiscal-year appointee, the change in title will be effective at the beginning of the month following the date of completion of all formal degree requirements.

**PPM 230-235-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-255-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Non-Salary Instructional Positions

#### PPM 230-255-4 Definitions

Occasionally, eminent scholars and scientists, either already appointed at UC San Diego or not affiliated with the University, are appointed to non-salaried instructional titles (e.g., non-salaried Lecturer or Adjunct Professor) to assist in the teaching of undergraduate and graduate students. Non-salaried instructional appointees do not assume full responsibility for a course. The series assigned to such appointees should be determined by the degree of teaching involvement as described in [policy](#) (See, [PPM 230-230](#), Visiting Appointments; [PPM 230-235](#), Acting Appointments; and [PPM 230-280](#), Adjunct Professor Series.)

When a research appointee whose full-time salary is administered by the University participates in an instructional program, s/he must be appointed in a salaried instructional title for formal instruction and/or significant participation. Appointees also may be appointed to and perform services under a non-salaried instructional title. For example, a non-salaried instructional title may be accorded for an occasional lecture or seminar dealing with the research being sponsored by the funding agency and is required for a researcher to supervise a doctoral thesis, provided the thesis is appropriate to the investigator's line of research.

Department chairs must ensure that the use of non-salaried instructional appointees is not abused. The departmental recommendation letter should clearly outline the type and amount of teaching the candidate will do, as well as the effectiveness of his or her teaching in any previous period of appointment.

#### PPM 230-255-10 Types

- a. Non-salaried instructional titles for individuals funded from sources not administered by the University (e.g., Salk Institute appointees)
- b. Non-salaried instructional titles for individuals whose full time salaries are administered by the University

#### PPM 230-255-16 Restrictions

For non-salaried instructional titles for individuals whose full time salaries are administered by the University:

- a. If an appointee is paid under another title from a federal contract or grant and participates in the instructional program under a non-salaried instructional title, the department chair must assure compliance with the University's contractual agreement with the funding agency.
- b. Under no circumstances should appointees paid entirely from federal funds be permitted to be officers of instruction in regularly scheduled courses, unless they are paid from non-federal funds for the proportion of time spent on teaching. In such cases, the appointee should be appointed to a salaried instructional title and paid for the proportion of time spent on teaching. His or her salaried appointment will be reduced accordingly so that the total percentage does not exceed 100%. The occasional lecture or seminar, dealing with the research and creative activity being sponsored, is considered part of the normal research and creative process and should be encouraged.
- c. A federally funded appointee may supervise a doctoral thesis occasionally, provided the research topic is appropriate to the investigator's line of research. Such supervision is contingent upon the approval of

the department chair and the subsequent administrative approval of an appropriate instructional title for the investigator. In such cases, departments should consult the Office of Research Affairs to determine the necessity of a non-salaried lecturer appointment in order for an appointee to qualify to serve on a thesis committee.

d. It is appropriate for research personnel totally funded from federal sources to supervise the activities of Research Assistants or other students if the supervision is directly connected with the objectives of the contract.

**PPM 230-255-17 Terms of Service<sup>1</sup>**

- a. Non-salaried instructional titles  
For individuals funded from sources not administered by the University (e.g., Salk Institute appointees), an appointment may be made for a period of two or three years, depending on the appointee's rank (e.g., two years for the Assistant rank).

Appointment files should include the same documentation required for salaried appointees in the title or series.

- b. Non-salaried instructional titles for individuals whose full time salaries are administered by the University:

An appointment may be made for two to three years, corresponding to the appointment period in the appointee's salaried title. In such instances, only one academic review file should be submitted for both the appointment in the non-salaried instructional title and the recommendation for action in the salaried title. The departmental recommendation letter must evaluate the service in each area and clearly outline the type and amount of teaching the appointee will do.

**PPM 230-255-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-255-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. E. 7. d

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-270-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Professor of (e.g., *Psychology*) In Residence Series

#### PPM 230-270-4 Definition

**a** Titles in this series are assigned to academically qualified individuals who engage in teaching, research or other creative work, and University and public service to the same extent and at the same level of performance as those holding corresponding titles in the Professor series in the same department. For School of Medicine clinical appointments, this may also include patient-related care.<sup>1</sup>

Such assignments, however, shall be made only under conditions and restrictions (see APM - 270-16, 270-17, and 270-20) which serve to make a clear distinction between appointments in this series and appointments in the Professor series (defined in APM - 220). Professor in Residence titles are intended to be used for individuals supported by non-State funds.

#### PPM 230-270-8 Types of Appointments

APM 270-8

#### PPM 230-270-10 Criteria

APM 270-10

#### PPM 230-270-16 Restrictions

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

APM 270-16. a.

#### PPM 230-270-16. b. Limits on State Funding:

**Fifty percent or more of the base salary of the appointee shall come from funds other than General (State) funds;** at UC San Diego, 100% funding from other than state sources is typically required<sup>2</sup>, **except that the Chancellor is authorized, under justifying circumstances, to fund more than 50 percent of the base salary from General (State) funds for a period normally not in excess of two years.**

If the salary of a Professor In Residence is fully funded from federal sources administered by the University, non federal funds should be provided to fund a portion of the salary during periods when that individual is significantly involved in teaching.<sup>3</sup>

APM 270-16. b

APM 270-16. c

#### PPM 230-270-16. d

**An initial appointment for less than full-time service with a title in this series may be authorized under appropriate circumstances, provided that the Chancellor specifically approves the arrangement as being in the best interests of the University. Such part-time appointments will ordinarily be limited to cases in which the professional commitment is to the University. In the rare case of a part-time appointment of an individual with a professional commitment other than the**

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. A. 2. a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. A. 2. f

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. A. 2. f

one to the University, the Chancellor must be assured that the appointee will fulfill all the obligations entailed in the University appointment. When an appointment for less than full-time service is approved, the University is not obligated to increase the percentage of time of the appointment, even if the appointee and the department should desire such an increase in the future. An initial part-time appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or subsequent promotion to one of these ranks on a part-time basis shall be subject to the provisions which apply in the case of a full-time appointment; and the appointee shall execute a memorandum of understanding agreeing that the tenure status and other benefits of the appointment as described below are limited to the specified percentage of time. The memorandum of understanding also shall specify expectations as to workload, productivity, reviews, and any other applicable conditions of the appointment. A copy of the memorandum of understanding should be included in the personnel review file. The memorandum of understanding shall be set forth in a letter from the Chancellor advising the individual that the part-time appointment is subject to the specific understanding that there are no implied rights to a full-time tenure appointment; and, further, that the rate at which credit for University service accrues for various University fringe and retirement benefits as well as related academic privileges will likewise be affected. The individual shall be asked to sign and return a copy of such letter to indicate consent. A voluntary permanent part-time appointment or a voluntary temporary reduction by an appointee in the percentage of time of the appointment shall be subject to the same restrictions stipulated above for an initial part-time appointment.... Membership and voting privileges in the Academic Senate for part-time appointees to this series are the same as for full-time appointees.

APM 270-16. e

#### **PPM 230-270-17 Terms of Service**

APM 270-17

#### **PPM 230-270-18 Salary**

APM 270-18

#### **PPM 230-270-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 270-20

#### **PPM 230-270-24 Authority<sup>4</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-270-80 Review Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

#### **PPM 230-270-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Professor of (e.g., Psychology) in Residence**

APM 270-82

#### **PPM 230-270-83 Procedures for the Appraisal of an Assistant Professor of (e.g., Psychology) in Residence**

APM 270-83

#### **PPM 230-270-84 Procedures for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor of (e.g., Psychology) in Residence**

APM 270-84

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



**PPM 230-270-85 Procedures for Appointment or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor of (*e.g., Psychology*) in Residence or Professor of (*e.g., Psychology*) in Residence**

APM 270-85



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-275-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Professor of Clinical X (e.g. *Medicine*) Series

#### PPM 230-275-4 Definition

**Titles in this series are assigned to academically qualified individuals who are occupied full time in the service of the University, whose predominant responsibilities are in teaching and clinical service, and who also engage in creative activities. These *appointments* are reserved for salaried positions in the health sciences with the University and/or an affiliated hospital. For an exception to the requirement of full-time service, see APM - 275-16-a.**

**An appointee to a title in this series will normally carry a heavier load of teaching and/or clinical service than appointees in the regular Professor series or in the Professor in Residence series.**

For more information on the Professor of Clinical X series, please see [PPM 230-275, Appendix A, Guidelines for the Professor of Clinical X \(e.g., Medicine\) Series](#), and [PPM 230-275, Appendix B, Guidelines for the Professor of Clinical X \(e.g., Pharmacy\) Series](#).

#### PPM 230-275-8 Types of Appointments<sup>1</sup>

**a. Titles and (and ranks) in this series are:**

**(1) Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine)**

**(2) Associate Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine)**

**(3) Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine)**

APM 275-8. b

APM 275-8. c

APM 275-8. d

APM 275-8. e

#### PPM 230-275-10 Criteria

APM 275-10

#### PPM 230-275-16 Restrictions

APM 275-16. a

#### PPM 230-275-16. b Funding

Titles in this series are intended to be used for individuals supported by non-state funds.<sup>2</sup>

**(1) On a campus where all appointees in this series have one-year appointments or less, funding may come from General (State) funds or from other sources. The use of State funds in this case does not involve any commitment of tenure or security of employment. The State money is a temporary funding source for one year or less, and may be renewed.**

**The Chancellor shall notify appointees on State funds of the above conditions and restrictions.**

**(2) Limits on State funding for campuses not covered by (1) above. On campuses not covered by (1) above, 50 percent or more of the base salary of the appointee shall come from funds other than General (State) funds, except that the Chancellor is authorized, under justifying circumstances, to fund more than 50 percent of the base salary from General (State) funds for a limited period of time. When an appointment in any title in this series is supported by General (State) funds for**

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.3. b.

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.3. d

more than 50 percent time (0.5 FTE), the total period of such appointment, in combination with any other State funded appointments in those titles specified in APM - 133-0-b and -c, shall not exceed eight years. In other words, there is a cumulative eight-year limit on State funding on these particular campuses for an individual who holds any title or titles in this series, i.e., Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor of Clinical (e.g., *Medicine*).

APM 275-16. c

APM 275-16. d

APM 275-16. e

APM 275-16. f

APM 275-16. g

**PPM 230-275-17 Terms of Service**

APM 275-17

**PPM 230-275-18 Salary**

APM 275-18

**PPM 230-275-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 275-20

**PPM 230-275-24 Authority**<sup>3</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-275-80 Review Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-275-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*)**

APM 275-82

**PPM 230-275-83 Procedures for the Appraisal of an Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*)**

APM 275-83

**PPM 230-275-84 Procedures for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*) for Academic Reasons**

APM 275-84

**PPM 230-275-85 Procedures for Appointment or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*) or Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*)**

APM 275-85

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28 X

## **GUIDELINES FOR THE PROFESSOR OF CLINICAL X (e.g., MEDICINE) SERIES**

These guidelines are intended to provide additional, detailed information on the Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*) series (hereafter referred to as Clinical X) at UC San Diego, to assist in the evaluation of the appropriateness of appointment to and advancement within the Clinical X series.

### **A. Definition of the Professor of Clinical X series**

The Professor of Clinical X series should be reserved for those faculty who have demonstrated expertise, dedication and achievement in clinical and educational activities within and outside the health sciences schools. Appointment in this series should represent recognition by the institution of an individual's commitment to the clinical and educational activities that are of utmost importance to the mission of the schools. Thus, appointment in this series should reflect high institutional esteem for the selected individual, and advancement should be based on well-documented contributions toward this mission. Criteria for appointment and promotion in this series should be rigorously applied.

Candidates for the Professor of Clinical X series should demonstrate excellence in both teaching and clinical practice, as well as documented scholarship that has an impact beyond UC San Diego. This requirement is intended to distinguish Clinical X faculty from faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, who are required only to demonstrate excellence in teaching and clinical activity with scholarly or creative activities related to their clinical practice at UC San Diego. In achieving beyond the criteria set forth for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, candidates in the Professor of Clinical X series should be able to demonstrate 1) accomplishments of increasing geographic scope as they advance through the series, from local to regional to national to international levels, and 2) areas of recognized clinical expertise, whether in general or specialty practice.

The Professor of Clinical X series should be available at all levels of professorship to candidates who have demonstrated focus, ability, and commitment towards a career of clinical education and practice. This should be considered as specific as the criteria for the Ladder-Rank series. The Professor of Clinical X should not be used as a series into which to transfer faculty from other series because of insufficient research productivity. It is preferable that a candidate demonstrate desire for a continuous career in clinical education and practice from the time of his or her first appointment, although well-substantiated changes in career goals do occur and should be taken into consideration.

### **B. Criteria and Methods of Evaluation for Appointment and Advancement**

Candidates for the Professor of Clinical X series will be required to demonstrate excellence in teaching and clinical activity and creativity in these areas. It is essential that the candidate demonstrate early in his or her career a desire to participate and advance in this series through continuous achievement. The guidelines should therefore be clear and unequivocal such that candidates are fully aware of the level of achievement expected of them prior to appointment or advancement at each level. When a candidate approaches the time of consideration for appointment or advancement in the series, the individual has the primary responsibility for documenting success in reaching the required level of achievement. The department has the responsibility to ensure that appropriate teaching assessment is performed.

#### **1. Teaching and Educational Activity**

The level at which excellence in educational activity is recognized for appointment or advancement in the Professor of Clinical X series should be:

- a. Assistant Professor: recognition at the local school and medical center level.
- b. Associate Professor: recognition at the institutional and regional level.
- c. Full Professor: recognition at the institutional and national level.

*Methods of Evaluation:*

The following methods are not all-inclusive and should be used only where appropriate.

- Documentation of the types of teaching carried out, the time involved, the primary teaching role (e.g., clinic or ward attending, lecturer, or mentor), the average number and type of students per year, and the average number of contacts per year. Descriptions of the teaching environment and workload are important.
- Documentation of special courses taught, including the type and setting. These could include, e.g., the physiology section of OPP, a dog laboratory on the use of pulmonary artery catheters or transesophageal echocardiography, the American Heart Association ACLS Course, or a postgraduate course for community physicians on laparoscopic cholecystectomy or management of diabetes. The course could be for health sciences or allied health students, house officers, or postgraduate trainees. Also documented should be the continuity of the course (year-to-year, for example). Attendance, growth of attendance, and participant evaluations of the course should be included.
- Letters or standardized teaching evaluations from students who have been taught at the individual, group, and conference levels. Students may be required to submit evaluations of their teachers for completion of a course of studies. There must be more than one kind of teaching assessment.
- Recommendations and critical reviews from fellow educators at the parent institution or from other institutions, outside physicians and other health care personnel, including unsolicited commendations. These should be based on personal observation of the candidate's teaching (including peer review). Letters from patients may be included, but would receive less weight if not critically written.
- Documentation of teaching leadership in the department, medical centers or medical school; in some cases may be indicated by title (e.g., Director of Training Program), in all cases by extent of responsibility and recognition.
- Description of teaching awards received and the basis for the recognition.
- Documentation of the number of invitations to participate in conferences and continuing education courses. The type of conference and sponsoring institution should be recorded. Teaching ratings and comments from the participants should be included. If available, ratings of other lecturers (with identity undisclosed) should be included with this information for comparison.
- Roles in educational organizations (e.g., offices, committees, or boards of directors). The duties performed and the innovations accomplished should be outlined. Leadership contributions to the organization of educational activities in the health sciences schools may also be considered and evaluated here, beyond ordinary participation as university service.
- Documentation of a role in running a scientific or clinical meeting locally, nationally, or internationally. This should include factual and evaluative documentation as above. It is also recommended that candidates review their objective evaluations from the sources indicated when consulting with the department chair.

2. Professional Competence and Clinical Activity

These criteria concern the extent and quality of the candidate's clinical performance.

- a. Assistant Professor:

The candidate must demonstrate an understanding of the subject of his or her clinical activity, as well as an appropriate quality and volume of activity as judged using the methods described below. This evaluation may be based on activity at the UC San Diego Medical Centers, the Veterans Administration San Diego Healthcare System (VASDHS), or other affiliated institutions. Clinical services beyond our own institutions, such as at regional or national levels, can serve as further evidence of the candidate's standing. In addition to routine individual patient care, clinical activity may take the form of developing or sustaining specific clinical care programs or programs involving applications of new techniques or new uses of existing therapeutic modalities. These could include, but are not limited to, developing a model program for a diagnostic or therapeutic procedure or a successful clinical program that could be implemented in a new setting. It is important that the candidate demonstrate promise and a desire to progress in the acquisition and application of clinical expertise.

b. Associate Professor:

The candidate must be clinically active in the local institution and, in applicable disciplines, at the community or regional levels. The latter are more likely to involve program development, supervision, or consultation, rather than individual patient care, although a regional referral record would certainly qualify. Activities at the national level are desirable but not required. A demonstration of creativity is important in documenting superior clinical achievement.

c. Full Professor:

The candidate's clinical influence must be recognized beyond the parent institution and, in applicable disciplines, at the regional and national levels. Activities at the international level are desirable, but not required. A clear demonstration of creativity is important in evaluating clinical achievement, to afford proper recognition and reward.

*Methods of Evaluation:*

The following methods are not all-inclusive. Each method should be used only where appropriate. In each case, the goal is to document excellence, and the data should be evaluated accordingly.

- Testimony from peers and faculty of higher rank. It is important to obtain such testimony from practitioners of the same and related disciplines. This is solicited by the department chair, who would send to prospective evaluators forms that address the quality of critical aspects of practice in that clinical discipline, as explained below. These forms may be similar to ones used to evaluate residents. Also important for perspective are evaluations from outside the department. For example, radiologists could evaluate internists, and vice versa; surgeons could evaluate anesthesiologists, and vice versa.
- Documentation of the pattern of referral, e.g., the extent and number of referrals, as well as the area from which they are drawn--hospital, community, regional, national, or international. A summary of referrals, with names of referring physicians, the number of patients referred by each physician, and a description of the areas of San Diego city and county, California, the nation, and other countries from which they are drawn would be especially useful. A clinician who treats patients from all over the world is probably excellent.
- In specialties that entail the performance of procedures, such as surgery or radiology, documentation of the quality of the candidate's practice (e.g., the number of difficult cases performed or the complication rates) would provide a measure of excellence. In anesthesia, for example, huge databases are being accumulated that can provide a detailed profile of the excellence of a clinician's practice.

- In specialties that render consultations, documentation of the helpfulness or the frequency of error in the rendering of expert opinion would also provide a measure of clinical excellence. These evaluations would usually be obtained outside the candidate's specialty. In particular, primary care physicians may evaluate the quality of consultations by specialists, while specialists can evaluate the quality of referrals by primary care physicians. In the case of primary care physicians, documentation of the thoroughness of patient workup and the appropriateness of the requests for consultation by specialists and consultants would serve as a measure of clinical excellence. Chart reviews are also commonly useful in this assessment.
- Establishing or running a clinical service, either inpatient or outpatient. This could include, e.g., trauma, intensive care, ECG, cardiac catheterization, diabetes, child abuse, or drug abuse. The pattern of referral should be documented, as described below.

The success of a service in attracting referrals from outside the University system is an important factor in measuring excellence. Documentation of excellence when the candidate establishes or runs a clinical service should be relatively straightforward. A successful clinical service that attracts a large patient population denotes excellence; after all, one of the reasons for this series is to reward clinicians who can help the medical school, and hence the University.

Evaluating, quantifying, and establishing clinical excellence can be difficult, but several mechanisms exist whereby this is possible. Some data will be more appropriate for procedural specialties than for consulting specialties. To use the example of anesthesia again, in analyzing procedural data, there are certain "flags" that trigger an entry into the anesthesiologist's database. If the anesthesiologist is significantly below the norm--currently only a local norm--counseling is advised. If the candidate is strikingly above that norm, this could serve as one criterion to help establish excellence.

Outcome data, especially a particularly low rate of complications, could also indicate excellence. Evidence that physicians are continually sending their difficult cases to the candidate is an outstanding endorsement of his or her clinical excellence.

As mentioned above, another possibility for establishing excellence is evaluation forms. The following gives examples of evaluation forms that can be used. Note that there are short forms and long forms. The use of the short form is encouraged, since it is more likely to be filled out by the large number of people required to make any evaluation credible. If the short form is used, the department should carefully define each category for the evaluator. Each department should develop its own set of evaluation forms, since the problems and characteristics for each department are different. Similarly, each department should develop different forms for each set of evaluators: students, house officers, members of the department, members of other departments, practitioners outside UC, any clinician who consults with the candidate, nurses, patients, etc.

Nurses can make excellent evaluators. They pick up subtle factors in clinical performance that most others cannot. For example, they are often the first to spot a decrement in performance in an impaired practitioner.

The following should be regarded as an example only:

#### Example of an evaluation form

Rate each of the following according to your experience with the candidate.

Use the appropriate descriptor (extremely effective, very effective, moderately effective, moderately ineffective, totally ineffective, NA).

- Communication skills
- Accessibility/availability
- Clinical skills

- Clinical judgment
- Creativity
- Leadership initiative
- Personal qualities

Would you want yourself or a member of your family to be treated by this physician?

3. Creative Work

Many faculty in the health sciences devote a large proportion of their time to the inseparable activities of teaching and clinical service and therefore have less time for formal creative work than most other scholars in the University. Some clinical faculty devote this limited time to academic research activities; others utilize their clinical experience as the basis of their creative work. Nevertheless, an appointee to the Professor of Clinical X series is expected to participate in scholarly pursuits in applied clinical sciences. This includes activities which may be independent or collaborative, and may focus on formal clinical or laboratory research, scholarly publications, or creative educational work.

a. Assistant Professor:

A candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should include at a minimum active participation in such pursuits.

b. Associate Professor:

A candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should have resulted in a significant contribution to knowledge or clinical or educational practice. Independence or leadership in some of these creative activities must also be demonstrated.

c. Full Professor:

A candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should manifest continued involvement and leadership in activities such as those described above.

*Methods of Evaluation:*

The candidate's creative work must have been disseminated, e.g., in a body of publications, in teaching materials used in other institutions, or in improvements or innovations in professional practice. For appointment or promotion to higher levels, there should be evidence that these have been adopted or had an influence elsewhere.

- Evidence of achievement may include clinical case reports. Clinical observations are an important contribution to the advancement of practice and knowledge in the health sciences and should be judged by their accuracy, scholarship, and utility.
- The development and evaluation of techniques and procedures by clinical investigators constitute significant and valuable pursuits in the clinical sciences. These activities are necessary for improvement in the practice of health care. Creative achievement may be demonstrated by the development of innovative programs in health care or in transmitting knowledge associated with new fields or other professional activity.
- Textbooks and reference publications, or contributions by candidates to the literature for the advancement of professional education or practice, should be judged as creative when they contain original scholarly work, manifest an innovative approach, or include new information such as research results.



- The development of new or better ways of teaching the basic knowledge and skills required by students in the health sciences may be considered evidence of creative work. This may be demonstrated in written materials, novel approaches to teaching, or, for example, the development of computer methods that can be used for teaching, clinical care, or research.
- Acquisition of extramural resources for clinical or educational programs, including research or practice, is usually an indication of successful creative effort.

The significance of the quantitative productivity level achieved by a candidate should be assessed realistically, with knowledge of the time and institutional resources available to the individual for creative work, and the nature of the individual's professional discipline.

4. University and Public Service

Service is an important component of the activity of faculty in the Professor of Clinical X series. In many cases, this service will have a direct bearing on the education and clinical care missions of the University, and will therefore be best listed and evaluated under the categories of teaching and professional or clinical activity, which take precedence as criteria for advancement. For example, invited service on QA boards would be useful in evaluating a candidate's clinical expertise.

With increasing rank, greater participation and leadership in service are expected, although formal criteria are not specified. The extent and significance of service at the department, school, campus, University, community, and national or profession-wide level should be evaluated.

## **GUIDELINES FOR THE PROFESSOR OF CLINICAL X (i.e., PHARMACY) SERIES**

These guidelines are intended to provide additional, detailed information on the Professor of Clinical X (i.e., *Pharmacy*) series (hereafter referred to as Clinical X) at UC San Diego, to assist in the evaluation of the appropriateness of appointment to and advancement within the Clinical X series in the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SSPPS).

### **Definition of the Professor of Clinical X series**

The Professor of Clinical X series should be reserved for those faculty who demonstrate, or have the strong potential to demonstrate expertise, dedication and achievement in clinical and educational activities within and outside the Health Sciences. Appointment in this series should represent recognition by the institution of an individual's commitment to the clinical and educational activities that are of utmost importance to the mission of the Health Sciences. Thus, appointment in this series should reflect high institutional esteem for the selected individual, and advancement should be based on well-documented contributions toward this mission. Criteria for appointment and promotion in this series should be rigorously applied.

Candidates for the Professor of Clinical X series should demonstrate excellence in both teaching and clinical practice, as well as documented scholarship that has an impact beyond UC San Diego. This requirement is intended to distinguish Clinical X faculty from faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, who are required to demonstrate excellence in teaching and clinical activity with scholarly or creative activities related to their clinical practice. In achieving beyond the criteria set forth for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, candidates in the Professor of Clinical X series should be able to demonstrate 1) accomplishments of increasing geographic scope as they advance through the series, from local to regional to national to international levels, and 2) areas of recognized clinical expertise.

The Professor of Clinical X series should be available at all levels of professorship to candidates who have demonstrated focus, ability, and commitment towards a career of clinical education and practice. The criteria should be considered as specific as the criteria for the Ladder-Rank series. The Professor of Clinical X should not be used as a series into which to transfer faculty from other series because of insufficient research productivity. It is preferable that a candidate demonstrates desire for a continuous career in clinical education and practice from the time of his or her first appointment, although well-substantiated changes in career goals do occur and should be taken into consideration.

### **Criteria and Methods of Evaluation for Appointment and Advancement**

Candidates for the Professor of Clinical X series will be required to demonstrate excellence in teaching, professional competence, clinical activity and creativity. It is essential that the candidate demonstrate early in his or her career a desire to participate and advance in this series through continuous achievement. The guidelines should therefore be clear and unequivocal such that candidates are fully aware of the level of achievement expected of them prior to appointment or advancement at each level. When a candidate approaches the time of consideration for appointment or advancement in the series, the individual has the primary responsibility for documenting success in reaching the required level of achievement. The school has the responsibility to ensure that appropriate teaching assessments are performed.

#### **A) Teaching and Educational Activity**

The level at which excellence in educational activity is recognized for appointment or advancement in the Professor of Clinical X series should be:

- 1) Assistant Professor: recognition at the institutional and local level.
- 2) Associate Professor: recognition at the institutional and regional level.
- 3) Full Professor: recognition at the institutional and national level.

#### **Methods of Evaluation:**

The following methods are not all-inclusive and should be used only where appropriate.

- Documentation of the types of teaching carried out, the time involved, the primary teaching role (e.g., preceptor, lecturer or mentor), the average number and type of students per year, and the average number of contacts per year. Descriptions of the teaching environment and workload are important.
- Documentation of special courses taught, including the type and setting. Also documented should be the continuity of the course (year-to-year, for example). Attendance, growth of attendance, and participant evaluations of the course should be included.
- Letters or standardized teaching evaluations from students who have been taught at the individual, group and conference levels.
- Recommendations and critical reviews from fellow educators at the parent institution or from other institutions, outside pharmacists and other health care professionals, including unsolicited commendations. These should be based on personal observation of the candidate's teaching (including peer review). Letters from patients may be included, but would receive less weight if not critically written.
- Documentation of teaching leadership in the department, medical centers or pharmacy school; in some cases may be indicated by title (e.g., Director of Training Program), in all cases by extent of responsibility and recognition.
- Description of teaching awards received and the basis for the recognition.
- Documentation of the number of invitations to participate in conferences and continuing education courses. The type of conference and sponsoring institution should be recorded. Teaching ratings and comments from the participants should be included. If available, ratings of other lecturers (with identity undisclosed) should be included with this information for comparison.
- Roles in educational organizations (e.g., offices, committees, or boards of directors). The duties performed and the innovations accomplished should be outlined. Leadership contributions to the organization of educational activities in the health sciences schools may also be considered and evaluated here, beyond ordinary participation as university service.
- Documentation of a role in running a scientific or clinical meeting locally, nationally, or internationally. This should include factual and evaluative documentation as above. It is recommended that candidates review their objective evaluations from the sources indicated when consulting with the department chair or equivalent.

## **B) Clinical Activity and Professional Competence**

Pharmacy practice in the health care system is in constant evolution. Faculty in this series should have clinical activity that is innovative and creative and expands the scope of pharmacy practice. The impact may be on the care of individual patients or on the care of patient populations depending on the type and scope of the practice environment.

### **1) Assistant Professor:**

The candidate must demonstrate an understanding of the subject of his or her clinical activity, as well as an appropriate quality and volume of activity as judged using the methods described below. This evaluation may be based on activity at UC San Diego or its affiliated institutions. In addition to the provision of individual patient care, clinical activity may take the form of developing and/or administering specific clinical care programs or programs involving applications and quality improvement of new methodologies in the delivery and use of medications and clinical pharmacy services. These may include, but are not limited to, developing, implementing or administering a successful clinical program (e.g. medication-therapy management program, pharmacist-physician collaborative practice, therapeutic drug

monitoring service, etc.). It is important that the candidate demonstrates promise and a desire to progress in the acquisition and application of clinical expertise.

2) Associate Professor:

The candidate must be clinically active in the local institution and, in applicable disciplines, at the community or regional levels. The latter are more likely to involve program development, supervision, or consultation, rather than individual patient care. Activities at the national level are desirable but not required. A demonstration of creativity is important in documenting superior clinical achievement.

3) Full Professor:

The candidate's clinical influence must be recognized beyond the parent institution, at the regional and national levels. Activities at the international level are desirable, but not required. A clear demonstration of creativity is important in evaluating clinical achievement.

**Examples of Clinical Activity:**

Clinical activity is distinct from research and creative work in that it impacts individual patients and/or patient populations in the care of the candidate. The following examples are not all-inclusive:

- Consulting pharmacist in medical center in- and/or outpatient specialty services such as infectious disease rounds, emergency medicine service, anti-coagulation clinics, etc. wherein complex cases of patients with multiple conditions are reviewed for situations such as, contraindicated medication combinations, most effective medications to use among a number of alternatives, etc.
- Contributions to Drug Utilization Review or Formulary Consultations to determine the most effective medication based on what is available in a hospital formulary.
- Medication reconciliation services wherein patient medications are reviewed to identify such things as contraindicated combinations of medications, assessment of more effective medications than those currently prescribed, etc.
- Development and implementation of medication prescribing systems in medical centers (e.g., computerized tracking of medicines using bar codes) to reduce medication errors.
- Development, implementation, and participation in new clinical practice sites.
- Development and implementation of new models of pharmacy care delivery.

**Examples of Professional Competence:**

The following examples are not all-inclusive:

Invited service on editorial boards, as a peer reviewer for scientific publications, or as a peer reviewer for scientific grant applications are indications of an established or developing professional competence.

Invitations to speak at local, state, national or international scientific meetings or to serve on or lead panel discussions are an indicator of professional competence.

**Methods of Evaluation:**

The following methods are not all-inclusive. Each method should be used only where appropriate. In each case, the goal is to document excellence, and the data should be evaluated accordingly.

- Testimony attesting to clinical competence from peers and faculty of higher rank (or equivalent rank for full Professors). It is important to obtain such testimony from practitioners of the same or related disciplines. For the evaluation of clinical activity, testimony may be from individuals from within and outside the institution. For appointments above the entry level (Steps I & II at the Assistant rank) such testimony should preferably be from reviewers independent of the candidate (e.g., outside the School of Pharmacy).

Documentation of excellence when a candidate develops or implements a clinical service should be gathered. This should include comments from other healthcare professionals attesting to the impact of the faculty member's practice on patient care and/or the practice environment. When appropriate, evaluators should be asked to comment on the candidate's communication skills, accessibility and availability, clinical skills, clinical judgment, creativity, leadership, personal qualities and/or the effect of the candidate's practice on patient care.

For faculty whose practice does not directly impact individual patients, information should be provided that demonstrates the faculty member's work to improving patient care overall.

- Evaluation forms completed by students, members of the department, practitioners outside UC San Diego, any clinician who consults with the candidate, nurses, patients, etc.
- Documentation of the patient population and pharmacotherapeutic interventions using quantitative and qualitative measures.
- In specialties that render consultations, documentation of the helpfulness or the frequency of error in the rendering of expert opinion would also provide a measure of clinical excellence. These evaluations would usually be obtained outside the candidate's specialty or discipline.

Demonstration of excellence in establishing or running a clinical pharmacy service, either inpatient or outpatient. This could include, e.g., mental health, cardiology, critical care, diabetes, general medicine, chronic kidney disease, liver disease, or pain and palliative care.

Clinical, economic, and humanistic outcomes data could be an indicator of excellence. Evidence of consultations or referrals from other healthcare professionals is outstanding endorsement of a candidate's clinical excellence. Another example of strong evidence of clinical expertise is that the candidate is frequently asked to provide input to committees or organizations that are making decisions influencing the use of medications in patient populations.

As the impact of the candidate's practice may influence patient care in a variety of ways, the total impact on patient care should be evaluated and not just the impact on individual patients.

### **C) Creative Work**

Many faculty in the health sciences devote a large proportion of their time to the inseparable activities of teaching and clinical service and therefore have less time for formal creative work than most other scholars in the University. Some clinical faculty devote this limited time to academic research activities; others utilize their clinical experience as the basis of their creative work. Nevertheless, an appointee to the Professor of Clinical X series is expected to participate in scholarly pursuits in applied clinical sciences. This includes activities which may be independent or collaborative, and may focus on formal clinical or laboratory research, scholarly publications, or creative educational work.

Creative work is distinct from clinical activity in that it indirectly impacts 1) patient populations that are not in the care of the candidate, 2) the practice of other health professionals, 3) the education of students or trainees beyond those for whom the candidate is responsible for teaching, or is in other ways unrelated to the candidate's direct clinical, educational, administrative activities.

#### 1) Assistant Professor:

A candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should include at a minimum active participation in such pursuits.

- 2) Associate Professor:  
A candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should have resulted in a significant contribution to knowledge or clinical or educational practice. Although collaboration with other faculty in the health sciences is expected, independence or leadership in some of these creative activities must also be demonstrated.
- 3) Full Professor:  
A candidate's achievement and contribution to scholarship in the applied or clinical sciences should manifest continued involvement and leadership in activities such as those described above.

**Methods of Evaluation:**

The candidate's creative work must have been disseminated, e.g., in a body of publications, in teaching materials used in other institutions, or in improvements or innovations in professional practice. For appointment or promotion to higher levels, there should be evidence that these have been adopted or had an influence elsewhere.

For the assessment of research and creative work, testimony should be obtained from independent reviewers from outside the institution.

The following methods are not all-inclusive. Each method should be used only where appropriate.

- 1) Evidence of achievement may include clinical case reports. Clinical observations are an important contribution to the advancement of practice and knowledge in the health sciences and should be judged by their accuracy, scholarship, and utility.
- 2) The development and evaluation of techniques and procedures by clinical investigators constitute significant and valuable pursuits in the clinical sciences. These activities are necessary for improvement in the practice of health care. Creative achievement may be demonstrated by the development of innovative programs in health care or in transmitting knowledge associated with new fields or other professional activity.
- 3) Textbooks and reference publications, or contributions by candidates to the literature for the advancement of professional education or practice, should be judged as creative when they contain original scholarly work, manifest an innovative approach, or include new information such as research results.
- 4) The development of new or better ways of teaching the basic knowledge and skills required by students in the health sciences may be considered evidence of creative work. This may be demonstrated in written materials, novel approaches to teaching, or, for example, the development of computer methods that can be used for teaching, clinical care, or research.
- 5) Acquisition of extramural resources for clinical or educational programs, including research or practice, is usually an indication of successful creative effort.

The significance of the quantitative productivity level achieved by a candidate should be assessed realistically, with knowledge of the time and institutional resources available to the individual for creative work, and the nature of the individual's professional discipline.

**D) University and Public Service**

Service is an important component of the activity of faculty in the Professor of Clinical X series. In many cases, this service will have a direct bearing on the education and clinical care missions of the University, and will therefore be best listed and evaluated under the categories of teaching and professional or clinical activity, which take precedence as

criteria for advancement. For example, invited service on pharmacy and therapeutics committees or similar activities would be useful in evaluating a candidate's clinical expertise. Examples of University and Public Service include, but are not limited to, the Space Committee, the Research Committee, the Admissions Committee, service in professional organizations, community outreach, etc.

With increasing rank, greater participation and leadership in service are expected, although formal criteria are not specified. The extent and significance of service at the school, campus, University, community, and national or profession-wide level should be evaluated.



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-278-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series

#### PPM 230-278-4 Definition

##### PPM 230-278-4. a

**Faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series are salaried appointees in the health sciences who teach, participate in patient care, and also <sup>1</sup>participate in University and/or public service and scholarly and/or creative activities.**

**Faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series teach the application of basic sciences and the mastery of clinical procedures in all areas concerned with the care of patients, including dentistry, medicine, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, psychology, veterinary medicine, the allied health professions, and other patient care professions.**

**The Health Sciences Clinical Professor series is separate from the volunteer Clinical Professor series, which is governed by APM - 279.**

For more information on this series, please see PPM 230-278, Appendix A, *Guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series.*<sup>2</sup>

APM 278-4. b

APM 278-4. c

APM 278-4. d

#### PPM 230-278-8 Types of Appointment

APM 278-8

#### PPM 230-278-10 Criteria

**A candidate in this series shall be evaluated using the criteria specified below. The criteria shall be appropriately weighted to take into account this series' primary emphasis on direct patient care services and clinical teaching. See APM - 210-6 and PPM 230-278, Appendix A, *Guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series.***

**The criteria are:**

- a. Professional competence and activity**
- b. Teaching**
- c. University and public service**
- d. Scholarly and creative work**

The departmental recommendation letter must provide a description of the proposed allocation of the candidate's time among the areas of activity. Candidates with part-time appointments are expected to demonstrate the same quality of performance as full-time appointees, but the amount of activity may be less.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 5.a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 5 a

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 5 c



These criteria and standards are set forth in APM - 210-6, Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series and PPM 230-278, Appendix A, *Guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series*.

**PPM 230-278-16 Restrictions**

APM 278-16

**PPM 230-278-17 Terms of Service**

APM 278-17

**PPM 230-278-18 Salary**

APM 278-18

**PPM 230-278-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 278-20. a

APM 278-20. b

**PPM 230-278-20. c**

Faculty in this series must have a doctorate in a clinical discipline.<sup>4</sup> **Unless not required for the position, appointees in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series must possess and maintain an appropriate valid license and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or equivalent. Loss of license or active Medical Staff privileges will result in, at department discretion, reassignment of duties or termination of appointment for cause under APM - 150.**

APM 278-20. d

APM 278-20. e

APM 278-20. f

APM 278-20. g

APM 278-20. h

APM 278-20. i

APM 278-20. j

**PPM 230-278-24 Authority<sup>5</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-278-80 Review Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-278-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Health Sciences Clinical Professor**

**The general rules of APM 278-80 apply here. In addition:**

a. Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>6</sup>

When a non-Senate appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 5.g

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 4

1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*  
If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.
2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*  
If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>7</sup>

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review of a Senate Faculty Member, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

1. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Non-reappointment<sup>8</sup>

If the department believes that an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

4. Notice of Non-Reappointment<sup>9</sup>

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

**PPM 230-278-83 Procedures for the Formal Appraisal of an Assistant Health Sciences Clinical Professor Who May Be a Candidate for Promotion**

An assistant-rank appointee in the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, or Professional Research (Research Scientist) series must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of his or her

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6.c

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 7

achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for academic appointees.

Departments may conduct appraisals for appointees in other non-Senate series if the department believes such an assessment would be valuable to the department and/or appointee.

**The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:**

a.1 The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with a reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.<sup>10</sup>

**No formal appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of an appraisal, the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.**

a.2<sup>11</sup>. The following factors should be evaluated, if appropriate for the series when conducting an appraisal:

- Published research and other completed creative activity, and potential for continued research and creative activity.
- teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

**a.3 Appraisal Vote**

An appraisal vote is not required for non-Senate appointees; however, departments and/or divisions may choose to establish voting procedures for non-Senate appraisals.

A department may form a departmental ad hoc committee in order to assess the appointee's achievements and activities.

The departmental recommendation letter should discuss the nature and extent of department consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result of a vote, if taken.

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees.

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E.

<sup>11</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 5. b

PPM 230-278, Appendix A

### **GUIDELINES FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES CLINICAL PROFESSOR SERIES**

These guidelines are intended to provide additional, detailed information on the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series at UC San Diego to assist in the evaluation of the appropriateness of appointment to and advancement within this series.

The guidelines also are intended to provide information on the distinctions between this series and the Professor of Clinical X series.

It should be noted that the diversity of talents and accomplishments required in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series are such that the criteria for appointment and advancement must be applied with some degree of flexibility. These guidelines create a better understanding of the series at UC San Diego and the flexible application of the series criteria.

#### **Criteria and Methods of Evaluation for Appointment and Advancement**

The four criteria for appointment and advancement in the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series at UC San Diego are:

1. Performance in teaching
2. Scholarly and creative accomplishments
3. Professional (clinical) competence and activity (patient care)
4. University and public service

However, the combined demands of teaching, research, patient care and community service are such that it is unrealistic to expect that all faculty members in a clinical department can excel in each of these endeavors.

Faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series are appointed for the primary purpose of filling roles in patient care services and in the clinical teaching programs. These functions should be identified and documented by the department in preparing the candidate's file for review.

The criteria and the frequency of review in judging candidates for appointment or advancement in this series are the same as those specified for the Professor (Ladder-Rank) series, except that each of the criteria must be appropriately weighted to take into account the primary emphasis on direct patient care services and clinical teaching activities.

Documentation should be compiled as for other academic series, including documentation of teaching and clinical performance as described in the Professor of Clinical X series criteria.

The Health Sciences Clinical Professor series should not be regarded as an escape or contingency appointment for faculty in other series who fail to receive promotion.

Professional competence and activity generally focus on the quality of patient care. A doctoral degree in a clinical discipline, as well as a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities, is a criterion for appointment. The candidate should also demonstrate evidence of achievement, leadership, or progress in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems.

Although it need not be as extensive as that required for the other professorial series (e.g., Clinical X), some evidence of scholarly or creative activity appropriate to the clinical discipline, as determined by the individual department, is expected in this series at UC San Diego. Scholarly activities such as participation in collaborative research, publications in the medical

literature (e.g., case reports, book chapters, reviews, letters to the editor), published articles for the lay population (e.g., newsletters, newspapers, magazines) presentations at scholarly meetings or continuing education courses are desirable and should be encouraged. Development of innovative clinical procedures, teaching methods, new courses, clinical guidelines, and instructional materials for teaching patients should also be recognized as creative accomplishment.

**Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor:**

For an initial appointment to the Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor rank, the departmental recommendation letter should describe the candidate's present position and the likelihood that the candidate will be a competent teacher and develop an excellent professional practice.

For appointment as Health Sciences Assistant Clinical Professor, Step I or II, the candidate should:

1. have high-quality postgraduate clinical training providing eligibility for one of the medical specialty boards (a minimum of three years Post M.D.) or equivalent achievement and recognition.
2. demonstrate teaching ability or have clear potential as a clinical teacher; and
3. demonstrate clinical ability of high quality commensurate with his or her experience in a branch of medicine.

For appointment at a Step III or above, the candidate must also:

4. be board eligible in the specialty appropriate to the clinical care and teaching activities, or have appropriate equivalent recognition;
5. demonstrate ability as a clinical teacher; and
6. demonstrate continuing achievement in clinical care and teaching.

**Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor:**

In addition to proven competence in teaching, a candidate for appointment to the rank of Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor should demonstrate evidence of excellence in professional practice. Such evidence may include, but is not limited to, evaluations that demonstrate:

- provision of high-quality patient care;
- a high level of competence in a clinical specialty;
- expanded breadth of clinical responsibilities;
- significant participation in the activities of clinical and/or professional groups;
- effective development, expansion, or administration of a clinical service;
- recognition or certification by a professional group; or
- evidence of scholarly or creative activities appropriate to this series.

Further, the candidate must:

1. be certified by one of the medical specialty boards, or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition;
2. be recognized as a consistently effective clinical teacher by undergraduate, graduate, or postgraduate students and by faculty;
3. have excellent clinical skills and abilities and apply them in the management of clinical problems, as evidenced by the opinion of the faculty, house staff and appropriate professional groups;
4. serve effectively as a clinical consultant to house staff, faculty, and members of the community; and
5. actively and effectively participate in the affairs of professional organizations, UC San Diego Medical Center or VASDHS committees, School of Medicine or Pharmacy committees, University and administrative committees, and community programs.

### **Health Sciences Clinical Professor**

A candidate for appointment to the rank of Health Sciences Clinical Professor should satisfy the above qualifications for Health Sciences Associate Clinical Professor. In addition, the candidate must:

1. demonstrate superior clinical teaching;
2. demonstrate superior clinical skills and abilities; and
3. provide documentation that his or her clinical service and/or teaching are of great importance to the academic or health care missions of the University.

Transfer of faculty from one series to another, especially from the regular professorial series to the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, should occur only in exceptional cases. Requests for such transfers must carefully document the specific achievements and future responsibilities in clinical care and teaching that qualify the candidate for such a transfer.

Faculty who demonstrate sustained, substantial scholarship that has an impact beyond UC San Diego should be considered for transfer to the Professor of Clinical X series. Examples of sustained, substantial scholarship include, but are not limited to, development of new diagnostic or therapeutic approaches and procedures that have been adopted regionally or nationally, publication of clinical case studies, creative design of teaching materials or textbooks used regionally or nationally, active participation in collaborative and joint research programs, or demonstrated effectiveness in establishing and supervising major teaching or clinical service programs, development of innovative health care programs that have had regional or national impact, or development of innovative computer software.



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-279-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Volunteer Clinical Professor Series

#### PPM 230-279-0 Policy

Appointees in the Clinical Professor series are community volunteer clinicians who teach the application of clinical and basic sciences in areas of patient care. These appointments constitute a valuable way to utilize the interest and expertise of practitioners from the community on a part-time unsalaried voluntary basis in the areas of teaching, patient care, and clinical research.

For an individual who is employed by the University as a staff physician or clinician or who holds a clinical appointment paid by an affiliated site, a concurrent without salary appointment should be made in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series (see APM - 278) not in the volunteer Clinical Professor series.

An appointment in the Clinical Professor, Voluntary series does not create an employment relationship with the University of California, San Diego.<sup>1</sup>

#### PPM 230-279-8 Types of Appointment

APM 279-8

#### PPM 230-279-10 Criteria

**An appointee must have** a doctorate in a clinical discipline. If required for the position, the candidate must possess and maintain an **appropriate** valid **license** and board certification<sup>2</sup> **to practice in his or her field** and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or the equivalent,<sup>3</sup> **and must contribute significantly to the clinical teaching program. The Chancellor shall establish campus guidelines that specify the minimum number of required hours per year; the number of minimum hours may vary in different schools or departments.**

**Clinical competence and excellence in teaching will be the primary basis for appointment, reappointment, and promotion in this series. Clinical competence should be determined by primary verification of licenses, written peer recommendations from recent supervisors, National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB) report (may be self-query by applicant), evidence of current medical malpractice insurance, chronology of employment with no unexplained gaps since completion of residency, and list of malpractice claims and suits in which the applicant has been involved with narrative description of the underlying allegations, facts and resolution of the complete case. If the individual has participated in professional organizations, University and community service, and/or research, a description of these activities should be included in the appointee's personnel file as part of the review material.**

#### PPM 230-279-17 Terms of Service

APM 279-17

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.6.f

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.6.c

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.6. d

**PPM 230-279-20 Conditions of Employment**

An appointment in this series with a specified ending date expires by its own terms on that date. Written notice should be provided when the appointment is not renewed. It is within the University's sole discretion not to reappoint an individual. APM - 137, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment, does not apply.

An appointment may be terminated before the ending date for cause, such as failure to serve the required minimum number of hours, or when in the judgment of the Dean, upon the recommendation of the chair, there is no longer a need for the appointee's services or the conduct or performance of the appointee does not warrant continued appointment with the University. The Dean shall give the individual 30 (thirty) days written notice with a statement of the reason for the termination. APM - 145, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Layoff and Involuntary Reduction in Time, and APM - 150, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal, do not apply to appointees in this series.

An appointee may present a written complaint about his or her appointment or early termination of the appointment to the Chancellor for administrative review. A complaint must be filed within 30 (thirty) calendar days from the date on which the appointee knew, or could reasonably be expected to have known, of the event or action that gave rise to the complaint.<sup>4</sup> The Chancellor shall consult with the appropriate University official, such as the department Chair or Dean, and shall make a written response to the appointee. The written response shall normally be made within 90 days of the receipt of the complaint. APM - 140, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances, does not apply to appointees in this series.

**PPM 230-279-24 Authority<sup>5</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 279-75 University Defense and Indemnification**

APM 279-75

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.6.f

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X





[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-280-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Adjunct Professor Series

#### PPM 230-280-4 Definition

##### PPM 230-280-4. a

Titles in the Adjunct Professor series are assigned to academically qualified research or other creative personnel who contribute meaningfully to teaching either in formal courses or in guidance of graduate students.<sup>1</sup>

**Titles in this series may be assigned (1) to individuals who are predominantly engaged in research or other creative work and who participate in teaching, or (2) to individuals who contribute primarily to teaching and have a limited responsibility for research or other creative work; these individuals may be professional practitioners of appropriate distinction. Appointees with titles in this series also engage in University and public service consistent with their assignments.**

APM 280-4. b

APM 280-4. c

#### PPM 230-280-8 Types of Appointments

APM 280-8

#### PPM 230-280-10 Criteria

**A candidate for appointment or advancement in this series shall be judged by the four criteria specified below. Evaluation of the candidate with respect to these criteria shall take appropriately into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities and shall adjust accordingly the emphasis to be placed on each of the criteria. For example, a candidate may have a heavy workload in research and a relatively light workload in teaching.** The relative distribution of responsibilities among the four criteria may differ but must be clearly defined for each individual at the time of appointment. The departmental recommendation letter must document how the candidate will fulfill all criteria for appointment in this series.<sup>2</sup>

**The four criteria are:**

**a. Teaching**

**b. Research and creative work**

**c. Professional competence and activity**

**d. University and public service**

For appointments in which research is the primary activity, the candidate need not teach a formal course, however meaningful contributions to the graduate or undergraduate instructional program are required and the candidate's expected contributions in this area must be clearly articulated at the time of appointment. Clinical teaching may also satisfy the teaching requirement.

Flexibility is expected to be exercised in judging the character of research and creative work.

The productivity rate expected for advancement and promotion is proportionate to the percentage of appointment, and the relative distribution of responsibilities among the four review criteria as defined for the individual at the time of appointment.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.c

For Adjunct Professors whose appointments are primarily based on their professional distinction, the continuing value of their professional distinction to the University's teaching mission may be considered in the evaluation of an appointee's research and creative work.

In the Health Sciences, faculty at the Associate rank or above who have clinical responsibilities should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.<sup>3</sup>

#### **PPM 230-280-16 Restrictions**

##### **PPM 230-280-16. a**

**For appointments in which teaching is the main activity, it should be demonstrated clearly before appointment to the Adjunct Professor series that a "teaching only title" such as Lecturer is not appropriate (e.g., a faculty member who also has clinical responsibilities). If, during an appointment in the Adjunct Professor series, research and/or creative work cease to be a part of the appointee's duties, the individual should be considered for transfer to an instruction-only title.**

Similarly, if meaningful contributions to instructional responsibilities cease to be part of the appointee's duties,<sup>4</sup> **the individual should be considered for transfer to a research-only title. Clinical teaching may satisfy the teaching requirement.**

**If, during an appointment in the Adjunct Professor series, research ceases to be part of the appointee's duties, the individual should be considered for transfer to another academic title.**

APM 280-16. b

APM 280-16. c

APM 280-16. d

#### **PPM 230-280-17 Terms of Service**

APM 280-17. a

APM 280-17. a. (1)

##### **PPM 230-280-17. a. (2) Assistant Adjunct Professor**

**Each appointment and reappointment is limited to a maximum term of two years. The appointment may be made for a shorter term.**

##### **PPM 230-280-17. b**

**An appointment or reappointment to the title of Associate Adjunct Professor or Adjunct Professor should be proposed with a specified ending date.<sup>5</sup>**

**For an Associate Adjunct Professor (Steps I, II, III), each appointment is limited to a maximum term of two years. For an Associate Adjunct Professor (Steps IV and V) and for an Adjunct Professor, each appointment period is limited to a maximum term of three years. These appointments may be made for a shorter term.**

...

**Appointment or reappointment with no specified ending date (indefinite) may only be made when there is a reasonable expectation of long-term funding.** If the appointment is indefinite, academic review of the appointee must be conducted on a biennial or triennial basis corresponding to normal periods of service for the rank and step. Non-salaried appointments and reappointments in the Adjunct series must be made with a specified ending date.<sup>6</sup>

...

##### **PPM 230-280-17. c**

**Rules concerning effective dates of appointments are stipulated in APM - 200-17, except that an appointment period normally will coincide with the University's fiscal year of July 1 through June 30. The effective date of a promotion or merit increase is normally July 1. However, exceptions may be approved by the Chancellor, subject to the provisions of APM - 280-24-a (6) and (7).**

#### **PPM 230-280-18 Salary**

APM 280-18

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. V. C

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.d

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.e

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.e

## PPM 230-280-20 Conditions of Employment

APM 280-20

### PPM 230-280-24 Authority<sup>7</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

### PPM 230-280.80 Review Procedures

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

### PPM 230-280-81 Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment of an Adjunct Instructor

APM 280-81

### PPM 230-280-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Adjunct Professor

**The general rules of APM 280-80 apply here. In addition:**

APM 280-82. a

APM 280. 82. b

APM 280-82. c

#### **PPM 230-280-82. d**

#### a. Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>8</sup>

When a non-Senate appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

##### 1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

##### 2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

#### c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>9</sup>

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

##### 1. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 4

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6

or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Non-reappointment<sup>10</sup>

If the department believes that an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

4. Notice of Non-Reappointment<sup>11</sup>

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

**PPM 230-280-83 Procedures for the Formal Appraisal of an Assistant Adjunct Professor Who May Be a Candidate for Promotion**

An assistant-rank appointee in the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, or Professional Research (Research Scientist) series must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of his or her achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for academic appointees.

Departments may conduct appraisals for appointees in other non-Senate series if the department believes such an assessment would be valuable to the department and/or appointee.

**The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:**

a. 1. The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with a reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file..<sup>12</sup>

**No formal appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of an appraisal, the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.**

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6.c

<sup>11</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 7

<sup>12</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E.

a.2<sup>13</sup>. The following factors should be evaluated, if appropriate for the series when conducting an appraisal:

- Published research and other completed creative activity, and potential for continued research and creative activity.
- teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

### a.3. Appraisal Vote

An appraisal vote is not required for non-Senate appointees; however, departments and/or divisions may choose to establish voting procedures for non-Senate appraisals.

A department may form a departmental ad hoc committee in order to assess the appointee's achievements and activities.

The departmental recommendation letter should discuss the nature and extent of department consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result of a vote, if taken.

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees.

### **PPM 230-280-84 Procedures for Non-Reappointment for Academic Reasons of an Assistant Adjunct Professor Who Is a Candidate for Promotion**

APM 280-84

### **PPM 230-280-85 Procedures for Appointment or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Adjunct Professor or Adjunct Professor**

APM 280-85

---

<sup>13</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 5. b



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-281-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Professor of Practice Series

#### PPM 230-281-4 Definition<sup>1</sup>

a. Appointees in the Professor of Practice series are distinguished professionals, either practicing or retired, with specific expertise in their fields. Professors of Practice, though leaders in their fields, do not have traditional academic backgrounds.

Professors of Practice provide students and faculty additional opportunities to interact with and to benefit from the presence of experienced professionals who have distinguished practical accomplishments in their fields.

Professors of Practice primarily contribute to teaching and/or research programs by providing faculty, undergraduate students, and graduate students with a deeper understanding of the practical applications of a particular field of study, and help promote the integration of academic scholarship with practical experience. Professors of Practice teach courses, advise, and collaborate in areas directly related to their specific expertise and unique professional experience. Professors of Practice may also contribute to the less traditional research and scholarly mission of the University and/or provide service to the University based upon their practical professional experience.

Appointees in the Professor of Practice series may contribute predominantly to the University's instructional program, with lesser contributions to the University's research and/or creative programs; or, they may contribute primarily to the University's research and/or creative programs, and have limited responsibility in teaching. In all cases, however, successful reappointment and/or advancement in the Professor of Practice series is contingent upon documented contributions in all four criteria as listed above (professional competence and activity, teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service).

b.<sup>2</sup> The Visiting Professor of Practice title is used to designate one who is appointed temporarily to perform the duties of the Professor of Practice series, and who holds, is on leave from, or is retired from the professional position that is the basis for qualification in the series.

#### PPM 230-281-8 Types

a.<sup>3</sup> The titles (and ranks) in the Professor of Practice series at UC San Diego are:

- Professor of Practice
- Visiting Professor of Practice<sup>4</sup>

#### PPM 230-281-10 Criteria

a.<sup>5</sup> Criteria for appointment, advancement and reappointment in this series are:

- Professional competence and activity
- Excellent teaching contributions

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 9. a

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. b

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. b

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. c. and PPM 230-28. V. F

- Contributions to the research and/or creative mission of the University, with emphasis on professional practice and leadership contributions
- Service contributions

Evaluation of the candidate with respect to these criteria should take into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities, which must be clearly explained in the departmental or ORU recommendation letter.

The criteria for appointment as a Visiting Professor of Practice are the same as those for the regular Professor of Practice title.

**1. Professional competence and activity**

Professional competence and activity and exemplary professional practice and leadership in the field should be evaluated by comparison to peers in the field and with regard to the viewpoints, skills, and experience the appointee brings to the teaching mission (including research training). Credentials from practice should be established and documented, with emphasis on eminence, innovation, rigor, and depth.

**2. Teaching of truly exceptional quality and so specialized in character that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by ladder-rank faculty members or by strictly temporary appointees.**

Appointees in the Professor of Practice series teach primarily at the graduate level. Instruction at the undergraduate level is permissible when an appointee's individual expertise and professional skills warrant such a teaching assignment; however, it is not expected that Professors of Practice teach core courses at the undergraduate level.

The teaching requirements may be satisfied by meaningful engagement in and significant contributions to the graduate or undergraduate instructional program, including efforts in the research and professional training of students, and/or the development and instruction of specialized courses.

At the time of appointment, the anticipated teaching contributions must be discussed in detail. Particularly, the program requirements addressed by the candidate should be explained, including why they are important to the quality of the UC San Diego program, how the candidate is unusually highly qualified to contribute this teaching, and how the area is unsuited to teaching by the tenured faculty, Lecturers with Security of Employment, or Lecturers (Unit 18).

**3. Contributions to the research and/or creative mission of the University, with emphasis on professional practice and leadership contributions.**

Candidates proposed for appointment in the series should have an eminent reputation for superior accomplishments and creative contributions within his or her field, and these should serve as the basis for a detailed discussion of the candidate's potential for contributions to the University's teaching and research/creative mission. The individual will normally have a leadership role in the field and/or in a relevant professional organization. The degree of his or her success achievement in practical endeavors must be described.

**4. Service contributions**

The appointee's potential service contributions to the department, the school, the campus, the University, and the public must be discussed in detail at the time of appointment. Service activities should be related to the candidate's professional expertise and achievement.

**b. Standards for Reappointment and/or Advancement**

At the time of review, the department must demonstrate that the appointee has maintained a significant presence in the department during all periods of active service. Active and meaningful participation and excellence with respect to the duties assigned upon appointment are essential for reappointment and eligibility for a merit increase. The department must fully document the appointee's contributions and demonstrate the quality of work performed and its impact on the department. A change of duties to a different mixture from those within the above categories may be requested as part of consideration for reappointment.

At the time of review, the department must demonstrate the appointee's continued trajectory of professional competence and activity, exemplary professional practice, and leadership in the field. The departmental recommendation letter must also provide a description of service activities and an analysis of the quality of this service, paying particular attention to that service which is directly related to

the appointee's professional expertise and achievement.

Professional activity, teaching, and creative contributions may differ from standard ladder-rank professorial activities, and can also be judged on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, originality, and the total value of the appointee's engagement with the department. Evaluation of the candidate with respect to these criteria should take into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities.

In all cases, however, successful reappointment and/or advancement in the Professor of Practice series is contingent upon documented contributions in all four criteria as listed above (professional competence and activity, teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service).

### **PPM 230-281-16 Restrictions**

#### a.<sup>6</sup> Professor of Practice

1. Appointments in the Professor of Practice series must be supported by non-state funds.
2. The number of Professors of Practice within a department cannot exceed one eighth of the number of ladder-rank faculty. Likewise, the number of Professors of Practice within a division or ORU cannot exceed one-eighth of the number of ladder-rank faculty.
3. Salaried Professors of Practice are subject to the restrictions set forth in APM 025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members.

#### b.<sup>7</sup> Visiting Professor of Practice

1. Visiting titles at UC San Diego are not intended for candidates who are under consideration for or whom the department plans to propose for a permanent appointment
2. If an academic appointee with a Visiting Professor of Practice title is later considered for transfer to the regular Professor of Practice title, the proposal for such transfer should be treated as a new appointment subject to full customary review.

### **PPM 230-281-17 Terms of Service**

#### a.<sup>8</sup> Professor of Practice

1. Appointment or reappointment in the Professor of Practice series must have a specified ending date.
2. An appointment or reappointment as Professor of Practice may be for a period not to exceed three years, normally ending on the third June 30 following the date of appointment or reappointment. Appointment or reappointment may be for a shorter duration.
3. Faculty in the Professor of Practice series may serve full time or part time, and with or without salary. Salaried Professors of Practice may be appointed up to 100% time, but are normally appointed at 50% time or less. If appointed at 100% time, it is expected that the appointee's full professional commitment will be to the University.
4. A Professor of Practice appointed at greater than 50% time may serve a maximum of six consecutive years in the series.

#### b.<sup>9</sup> Visiting Professor of Practice

Visiting Professor of Practice appointments may be made for a period of up to one year. The total period of service as Visiting Professor of Practice may not exceed two consecutive years

### **PPM 230-281-18 Salary**

a. The salary paid to a Professor of Practice or Visiting Professor of Practice will be at a negotiated annual rate based upon, but not necessarily equivalent to, the appointee's professional income, and consistent with the service rendered. The departmental recommendation letter must clearly justify the salary level recommended.

The minimum pay level for the Professor of Practice series is no less than that of Professor, Step I. The full range of allowable salaries for appointees in the Professor of Practice series is listed in Table 50 of the Academic Salary Scales located on the Academic Personnel Services Web Site.

---

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. d

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 9. c

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. e

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 9. d



b. Salary Increases

1.<sup>10</sup> Professor of Practice

Upon successful performance as Professor of Practice, the appointee will be eligible for a standard salary increase of 5% of the current salary.

2.<sup>11</sup> Visiting Professor of Practice

Salaries paid to appointees in the Visiting Professor of Practice title are fixed and not subject to adjustment by any general increase that may be approved by the Regents of the University of California.

**PPM 230-281-20 Conditions of Employment<sup>12</sup>**

a. This series does not accord tenure or security of employment.

b. This series does not convey membership in the Academic Senate.

c. Appointees in this series are subject to APM 137, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment.

d. Appointees in this series are not eligible for sabbatical leave; however, appointees not in Visiting titles are eligible for leave with pay in accordance with APM 758 Other Leaves with Pay.

**PPM 230-281-24 Authority<sup>13</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-281-80 Recommendation and Review: General Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. F

<sup>11</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. f

<sup>12</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. g

<sup>13</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-283-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

#### Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Series

#### **PPM 230-283-0 Policy**

APM 283-0

#### **PPM 230-283-2 Purpose**

APM 283-2

#### **PPM 230-283-14 Eligibility**

The terms and conditions of appointment in the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer series are covered by a [Memorandum of Understanding \(MOU\)](#) entered into by the Regents of the University of California and the University Council, American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT).

#### **PPM 230-283-16 Restrictions**

APM 283-16

#### **PPM 230-283-18 Salary**

APM 283-18

#### **PPM 230-283-20 Terms and Conditions of Employment**

APM 283-20

#### **PPM 230-283-24 Academic File Review and Final Authority<sup>1</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-281-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

### Section: 230-285-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Lecturer with Security of Employment (Teaching Professor) Series

#### PPM 230-285-0 Policy

APM 285-0

#### PPM 230-285-4 Definition

APM 285-4. a

APM 285-4. b

#### PPM 230-285. c

Appointees in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series may use the working title “Teaching Professor,” as indicated in [PPM 230-285-8. a](#), below.<sup>1</sup>

#### PPM 230-285-8 Titles<sup>2</sup>

##### PPM 230-285-8 a.

Titles in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series are:

- (1) Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (LPSOE) (Assistant Teaching Professor)
- (2) Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (LPSOE) (Assistant Teaching Professor)
- (3) Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) (Associate Teaching Professor)
- (4) Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (Senior LSOE) (Teaching Professor)

Lecturer PSOE and Senior Lecturer PSOE positions are “security of employment–track” positions in the same way that the Assistant Professor position is a “tenure-track” position.

APM 285-8. b

APM 285-8. c

#### PPM 230-285-10 Criteria

##### PPM 230-285-10 a.<sup>3</sup>

**A candidate for appointment, merit increase, or promotion in this series shall be judged by the following criteria:**

- **Teaching**, of truly exceptional quality and so specialized in character that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by Professor (Ladder-Rank)
- **Professional achievement and activity**; an appointee in the LSOE series is expected to maintain currency in the profession and pedagogy
- **University and public service.**
- Educational leadership beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities (i.e., conducting TA training, supervision of student affairs, development of instructional materials/multimedia)

The departmental recommendation letter should state what the candidate's teaching load will be and how it compares with the normal load for professors in the department.

**Criteria for examining achievement in these areas are set forth in [PPM 230-210-3, Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of](#)**

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. A and PPM 230-28. V. G

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. b

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. C and PPM 230-28. V. G

**Employment (SOE) Series.**

**PPM 230-285-10. b<sup>4</sup>**

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

An appointee holding the title Lecturer PSOE or Senior Lecturer PSOE is eligible for reappointment, merit increase, and promotion. Decisions about reappointment, merit increase, and promotion of the appointee are based on careful reviews of the appointee's progress, promise, and achievement, and may be affected by fiscal and programmatic considerations.

For merit advancements, there should be evidence of the professional achievement required for an equivalent salary in the Professor series.<sup>5</sup>

APM 285-10. c

APM 285-10. d

APM 285-10. e

**PPM 230-285-16 Restrictions**

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

**a. Normally an appointment to this series is for full-time service to the University;** however, an appointment must be at least 51% time.<sup>6</sup>

APM 285-16. b

APM 285-16. c

APM 285-16. d

APM 285-16. e

**PPM 230-285-17 Terms of Service – Appointment Review**

The candidate's experience and record of accomplishment will determine the appropriate rank for appointment.

APM 285-17. a

APM 285-17. b

**PPM 230-285-18 Salary<sup>7</sup>**

**The Office of the President publishes a salary range for this series. The rate of advancement may be more variable, and in many cases slower, than for professorial positions.**

Salaries for Lecturer PSOEs will normally begin in a range approximately equivalent to that for Assistant Professors, with academic review occurring every two years. The salary for a Senior Lecturer PSOE must be equal to or above that of a Professor, Step I.

Salaries for Lecturer SOEs normally begin in a range approximately equivalent to that for Associate Professors, with academic review occurring every two years. If a Lecturer SOE is being paid at a level equivalent to the salary of a Professor, the academic review will occur every three or four years.

Advancement of an LSOE to a salary level equivalent to that of Professor, Step VI, may be granted on evidence of great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in the areas of professional achievement and educational leadership, teaching, and University and public service.

**The period of service in the rank of Lecturer SOE may be of indefinite duration. Promotion to Senior Lecturer SOE is not normally expected, but may occur when warranted. Review for promotion to the Senior Lecturer SOE title will normally occur only after a minimum of six years in title of Lecturer SOE.**

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. c

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-28. V. G

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. d

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. F and PPM 230-28. V. G

Senior Lecturer SOE titles should be paid at a level no less than Professor, Step I. Normally, an appointee shall be reviewed every three years for a merit increase, until the salary is equivalent to that of Professor Step V. Service at that level and higher may be of indefinite duration, and review for advancement will not usually occur after less than four years.

**Senior Lecturers SOE of the highest distinction, whose work has been nationally or internationally acclaimed**, and who demonstrate a level of distinction equivalent to that required of Distinguished Professors in the areas of professional achievement and educational leadership, teaching, and University and public service **are eligible for salaries above the top of the range**. In these cases, the departmental recommendation letter must provide an analysis of the candidate's achievements throughout his or her career and evidence of work of great distinction. Mere length of service and continued good performance at the top of the salary range are not a justification for further salary advancement. The academic review file must reflect a critical career review.

Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement to a base salary above the top of the salary range should not occur after less than four years at the top of the salary range. Further, acceleration to this high level should be a rare event requiring evidence of extraordinary performance beyond the already exceptional standard required for advancement to the top of the range.

Files proposing a full merit advancement to a base salary above the top of the salary range, or a full merit advancement further above the top of the salary range, must demonstrate exemplary performance in all areas (teaching, service, educational development and professional competence and activity).

The honorary title "Distinguished Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment" may be conferred upon Senior LSOEs with a salary above the top of the range who demonstrate a level of distinction equivalent to that required of Distinguished Professors.

#### **PPM 230-285-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 285-20. a

APM 285-20. b

APM 285-20. c

#### **PPM 230-285-20. d.**

**Since appointment to a title in this series does not imply the responsibility of engaging in research, an appointee will be assigned a heavier instructional load than that of an appointee in the regular professorial series.**- The departmental recommendation letter should state what the candidate's teaching load will be and how it compares with the normal load for professors in the department.<sup>8</sup>

APM 285-20. e

APM 285-20. f

#### **PPM 230-285-20. g<sup>9</sup>**

A candidate for appointment to this series must possess a Ph.D. degree or equivalent.

#### **PPM 230-285-24 Authority to Approve Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions<sup>10</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-285-80 Review Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

#### **PPM 230-285-95 Letters of Invitation and Notification**

APM 285-95

---

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. c

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. g

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-289-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Guest Lecturers *(Including Lecturers, Miscellaneous Part-Time)*

#### PPM 230-289-4 Definitions

Individuals who will participate in the instructional program for a short period of time (i.e., two weeks or less in a quarter) and do not have full or partial responsibility for a course may be eligible for payment as Guest Lecturers. These are individuals who do not hold titles with the University but who are brought to the University for their expertise in given subjects.<sup>1</sup>

The Lecturer, Miscellaneous Part-Time title is appropriate for individuals who are being proposed to teach a course or courses for more than two weeks in a quarter, but less than a full quarter, who do not hold a title with the University, who are brought to the University for their expertise in a given subject, and who are paid a “By Agreement” (BYA) salary.<sup>2</sup>

#### PPM 230-289-6 Responsibility

APM 289-6

#### PPM 230-289-8 Types of Appointment

APM 289-8

#### PPM 230-289-24 Authority<sup>3</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-289-80 Procedures

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. E.5

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. A. 10

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-290-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Regents' Professors and Regents' Lecturers

#### **PPM 230-290-0 Policy**

APM 290-0

#### **PPM 230-290-1 Terms**

APM 290-1

#### **PPM 230-290-4 Definitions**

APM 290-4

#### **PPM 230-290-6 Responsibility**

APM 290-6

#### **PPM 230-290-8 Types of Appointment**

APM 290-8

#### **PPM 230-290-10 Criteria**

APM 290-10

#### **PPM 230-290-16 Limitations**

APM 290-16.

#### **PPM 230-290-17 Terms of Service**

APM 290-17

#### **PPM 230-290-18 - Compensation**

APM 290-18

#### **PPM 230-290-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 290-20

#### **PPM 230-290-24 Authority<sup>1</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

Section: 230-310-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 (3/13/2017 DRAFT)

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 (TARGET)

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

#### Professional Research (Research Scientist) Series

#### PPM 230-310-4 Definition

a. The Professional Research series is 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. Appointees in the Professional Research series (referred to as the Research Scientist series at UC San Diego) function as independent investigators, have complete responsibility for their research programs, and are leaders or have the potential for leadership in their fields. The ability to sustain an independent research program is a necessary but not sufficient criterion for appointment as a Research Scientist. **Appointees with Professional Research titles do not have teaching responsibilities.**

b. Appointees can with campus approval be Principal Investigators and have the major responsibility and leadership for their research programs.

Appointments in this series may also be made to individuals who are not Principal Investigators, if they meet the research qualifications and demonstrate the accomplishment and the independence of research equivalent to that required for the Professorial ranks. For example, these individuals may be funded from a large center or collaborative program grant on which many independent investigators are working, or they may hold a Visiting title. Assistant Research Scientists also may be funded as Co-Principal Investigators on grants. They should demonstrate strong potential to become independent and distinguished researchers and should work independently on grants.

**The ability to secure independent funding does not automatically qualify individuals for appointment to the Professional Research series.**

APM 310-4. c

APM 310-4. d

#### PPM 230-310-8 Types of Appointments

APM 310-8

#### PPM 230-310-10 Criteria

APM 310-10. a – Research

APM 310-10. b – Professional Competence and Activity

PPM 230-310-10. c<sup>1</sup> – University and/or Public Service

**An Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist) is not required to participate in service activities. An Associate Research (e.g., Physicist) and a Research (e.g., Physicist) are expected to engage in University and/or public service, within the constraints of the applicable funding source(s). This service requirement may be interpreted flexibly; service activities should be focused on the professional development of the appointee, such as service on research review boards. If there are limitations on potential service contributions due to constraints imposed by a funding source, this should be discussed.**

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 1



**An appointee in this series must demonstrate continuous and effective engagement in independent and creative research activity of high quality and significance, equivalent to that expected of the Professor series. Proposed merit increases and promotions in the Professional Research series shall be reviewed with the same rigor accorded to proposed merits and promotions in the Professor series. See APM - 210-1.**

#### **PPM 230-310-16 Restrictions**

##### **PPM 230-310-16. a<sup>2</sup>**

A Research Scientist funded entirely from extramural funds is not permitted to be an officer of instruction in a regularly scheduled course. In order to engage in formal instruction and/or significant participation in the instructional program, the individual must be appointed in a salaried instructional title paid from state funds for the proportion of time spent on teaching. The combined percentage of appointment cannot exceed 100%.

Appointees also may be appointed to and perform services in a non-salaried instructional title. For example, a non-salaried instructional title may be accorded for an occasional lecture or seminar dealing with the research being sponsored by the funding agency. A non-salaried instructional title also is required for a Research Scientist to supervise a doctoral thesis, and the thesis should be related to the investigator's line of research.

Appointees totally funded from extramural sources may also supervise the activities of Research Assistants or other students if the supervision is directly connected with the objectives of the grant award. APM 310-16. b

##### **PPM 230-310-16. c<sup>3</sup>**

A registered student or candidate for a degree at UC San Diego or another campus of the University of California is not eligible for appointment in the Research Scientist series.

#### **PPM 230-310-17 Terms of Service<sup>4</sup>**

APM 310-17. a

##### **PPM 230-310-17. b**

**An appointment or reappointment to the title of Associate Research (e.g., Physicist) or Research (e.g., Physicist) should be proposed with a specified ending date. For written notification, see APM - 137-17.**

**Appointment or reappointment with no specified ending date (indefinite) may only be made when there is a reasonable expectation of long-term funding.**

Non-salaried appointments and reappointments in the Research Scientist series must be proposed with specified ending dates.

**The appointee shall be notified in writing that the appointment does not carry either tenure or security of employment.**

**For provisions concerning termination see APM - 310-20-c.**

##### **PPM 230-310-17. c<sup>5</sup>**

**There is an eight-year limit for an appointee who holds the Assistant Research Scientist title, either in that title alone or when combined with an Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist, or Visiting Assistant Research Scientist title, with or without salary on any campus of the University of California. The Chancellor may grant an exception to the eight-year limitation of service.<sup>6</sup>**

APM 310-17. d

APM 310-17. e

##### **PPM 230-310-17. f**

Research Scientists are to be provided use of space and facilities during their appointment periods. Space should be made available in accordance with departmental or ORU guidelines used to assign research space. The assignment of permanent space is not required.

#### **PPM 230-310-18 Salary**

---

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B.1

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B.1. d

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B.1. e

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. V. D.1. c

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20. V. D, Table 4

#### **PPM 230-310-18 a**

##### **Authorized salary scales are issued by the Office of the President.**

New appointees are normally paid at the minimum salary rate for the rank to which they are appointed. Salary increases are based on merit. The normal period of service prescribed for each salary level does not preclude more rapid advancement in cases of exceptional merit, nor does it preclude less rapid advancement.

Research Scientists of the highest distinction, whose work has been nationally or internationally acclaimed, may be appointed with salaries above the top of the salary scale. The honorary title “Distinguished Research Scientist” may be conferred upon Research Scientists with a salary above the top of salary scale who demonstrate a level of distinction equivalent to that required of Distinguished Professors.

APM 310-18. b

#### **PPM 230-310-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 310-20

#### **PPM 230-310-24 Authority<sup>7</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-310-80 Recommendation and Review**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

#### **PPM 230-310-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Research Scientist**

**The general rules of APM 310-80 apply here. In addition:**

##### **a. Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>8</sup>**

When a non-Senate appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

##### **1. Reappointment with Merit Advancement**

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

##### **2. Reappointment without Merit Advancement**

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

##### **c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>9</sup>**

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 4

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6

assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review of a Senate Faculty Member, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

1. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Non-reappointment<sup>10</sup>

If the department believes that an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

4. Notice of Non-Reappointment<sup>11</sup>

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

**PPM 230-310-83 Procedure of Appraisal of an Assistant Research Scientist Who May Be a Candidate for Promotion**

An assistant-rank appointee in the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, or Professional Research (Research Scientist) series must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of his or her achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for academic appointees.

Departments may conduct appraisals for appointees in other non-Senate series if the department believes such an assessment would be valuable to the department and/or appointee.

**The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:**

a.1 The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with a reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6.c

<sup>11</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 7

<sup>12</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E.

**No formal appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of an appraisal, the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.**

a.2<sup>13</sup>. The following factors should be evaluated, if appropriate for the series when conducting an appraisal:

- Published research and other completed creative activity, and potential for continued research and creative activity.
- teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

a.3 Appraisal Vote

An appraisal vote is not required for non-Senate appointees; however, departments and/or divisions may choose to establish voting procedures for non-Senate appraisals.

A department may form a departmental ad hoc committee in order to assess the appointee's achievements and activities.

The departmental recommendation letter should discuss the nature and extent of department consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result of a vote, if taken.

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees.

---

<sup>13</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 5. b



[Search](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-311-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Project Scientist Series

#### PPM 230-311-4 Definition

APM 311-4. a

APM 311-4. b

APM 311-4. c

APM 311-4. d

APM 311-4. e

#### PPM 230-311-4. f<sup>1</sup>

**An appointee in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series may not serve as a Principal Investigator but may serve as Co-Principal Investigators with members of the Professor or Research Scientist series.**

For Project Scientists who demonstrate strong potential for independent research, the Vice Chancellor for Research Affairs will consider requests from department chairs for exceptions to the Principal Investigator eligibility policy.

**Serving as a Principal Investigator is not required or expected for an appointment, merit increase, or promotion.**

**The designation as Principal Investigator does not in itself justify an appointment to the Professional Research series.**

APM 311-4. g

APM 311-4. h

#### PPM 230-311-8 Types of Appointments

APM 311-8

#### PPM 230-311-10 Criteria

APM 311-10

#### PPM 230-311-16 Restrictions

APM 311-16

#### PPM 230-311-17 Terms of Service<sup>2</sup>

**a. An appointment or reappointment in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series shall have a specified ending date. The appointee shall be advised in writing that the appointment is for a specific period and that the appointment ends at the specified date. See APM - 137.**

**When there is a reasonable expectation of long-term funding, the Chancellor, by exception, may make an appointment in the Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) and Project (e.g., Scientist) title with no specific ending date. The appointee shall be advised in writing that the appointment does not carry tenure or security of employment.**

Non-salaried appointments and reappointments in the Project Scientist series must be proposed with a specified ending date.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 2

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 2. e

Appointments and reappointments may have shorter terms than the maximums described below.

(1) An appointment or reappointment in the Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist) rank shall be for a period of two years or less. Ordinarily, appointees serve in the first four steps with the corresponding salary levels. Steps V and VI may be used in exceptional situations, with proper justification, consistent with campus practice. Service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step V, may be in lieu of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I, for which the published salary is slightly higher. Likewise, service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step VI, may be in lieu of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step II.

When service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step V, is followed by service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I, the normal period of combined service with both titles at the steps indicated is two years. The same normal two-year period of combined service applies when service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step VI, is followed by service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step II.

For campuses that adopt an eight-year limitation of service, there is an eight-year limit for an appointee who holds the Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist) title, either in that title alone or when combined with Associate Project Scientist, Project Scientist, Assistant Research Scientist, Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist, or Visiting Assistant Research Scientist title, with or without salary on any campus of the University of California.<sup>3</sup>

APM 311-17. a. (2)

APM 311-17. a. (3)

APM 311-17. b

**PPM 230-311-17. c**

Project Scientists normally will be provided use of research laboratory space by the faculty member(s) or Research Scientists with whom they are working. In unusual cases, department chairs may assign departmental space to Project Scientists.

**PPM 230-311-18 Salary<sup>4</sup>**

**Authorized salary scales are issued by the Office of the President.**

New appointees are normally paid at the minimum salary rate for the rank to which they are appointed. Salary increases are based on merit. The normal period of service prescribed for each salary level does not preclude more rapid advancement in cases of exceptional merit, nor does it preclude less rapid advancement.

**For off-scale salaries, see APM 620**

**PPM 230-311-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 311-20

**PPM 230-311-24 Authority<sup>5</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-311-80 Recommendation and Review**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-311-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Project Scientist**

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. V. D, Table 4

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 2. f

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

**The general rules of APM 311-80 apply here. In addition:**

a. Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>6</sup>

When a non-Senate appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>7</sup>

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review of a Senate Faculty Member, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

1. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Non-reappointment<sup>8</sup>

If the department believes that an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

---

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 4

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6.c

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

4. Notice of Non-Reappointment<sup>9</sup>  
Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

---

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 7





[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-330-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Specialist Series

#### PPM 230-330-4 Definition<sup>1</sup>

The Specialist series is used for academic appointees who are engaged in any specialized research, professional activity, and University and/or public service and who do not have any formal teaching responsibilities. Specialists are expected to use their professional expertise to make scientific and scholarly contributions to the research enterprise of the University and to achieve recognition in the professional and scientific community. Specialists may participate in University and/or public service depending upon funding source and the duties required by the job description for the position.

The Specialist may work without direct supervision, but usually not independently. He or she provides a service to a supervisor, a group, or the institution. Specialists may not serve as Principal Investigators, but may serve as Co-Principal Investigators by exception and with a member of the Professor or Research Scientist series.

The Specialist series, the Specialist in the Agricultural Experiment Station, and the Specialist in the Scripps Institution of Oceanography are the same title series, differing in their source of funding. Specialists in the Agricultural Experiment Station must follow the guidelines for appointments in the Agricultural Experiment Station

#### PPM 230-330-8 Types

APM 330-8

#### PPM 230-330-10 Criteria

APM 330-10

#### PPM 230-330-11 Qualifications

APM 330-16

#### PPM 230-330-16 Restrictions

APM 330-16

#### PPM 230-330-18 Salary<sup>2</sup>

**a. Individuals appointed to the Specialist series are compensated on the fiscal-year salary scales issued by the Office of the President for the Specialist series.** New appointees are normally paid at the minimum salary rate for the rank to which they are appointed.

APM 330-18. b

APM 330-18. c

APM 330-18. d

#### PPM 230-330-20 Term of Employment

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 3

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 3.f

APM 330-20

**PPM 230-330-21 Conditions of Employment**

APM 330-21

**PPM 230-330-24 Academic File Review and Final Authority<sup>3</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-330-80 Recommendation and Review**

APM 330-80. a

APM 330-80. b

**PPM 230-330-80. c.<sup>4</sup>**

**Advancement to Above-Scale Advancement to Above-Scale status involves an overall career review and is reserved for only the most highly distinguished Specialists whose (1) work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact, (2) professional achievement is outstanding, and (3) service is highly meritorious. Advancement requires demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step V was based.**

At UC San Diego, advancement to Specialist, Above Scale, is reserved for Specialists with records of outstanding, distinguished performance, judged in an arena substantially broader than the particular research groups with which they are associated. Testimonials from outstanding extramural research groups in the same or related fields will be necessary in order to document the level of performance required for advancement to Specialist, Above Scale. In some instances, advancement to the Above Scale level may be justified on the basis of the Specialist's publications, or on his or her own scientific, technical, or otherwise creative contributions (as compared to contributions to a group effort).

**Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur in less than four years at Step V; mere length of service and continued performance at Step V is not justification for further advancement. A further merit increase for an individual already serving at Above-Scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of distinguished achievement; continued performance is not an adequate justification. Only in the most superior cases with strong and compelling evidence will a further increase be approved at an interval shorter than four years.**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-28. V. K



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-340-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Continuing Educator Series

#### **PPM 230-340-4 Definition**

APM 340-0

#### **PPM 230-340-8 Levels**

APM 340-8

#### **PPM 230-340-10 Criteria for Appointment**

APM 340-10

#### **PPM 230-340-17 Terms of Service**

APM 340-17

#### **PPM 230-340-18 Salary**

APM 340-18

#### **PPM 230-340-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 340-20

#### **PPM 230-340-24 Authority<sup>1</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-340-80 Procedures<sup>2</sup>**

Information about the Continuing Educator and Coordinator of Public Programs series may be obtained from University Extension.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. C. 3.



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-355-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Non-Salary Research Positions

#### PPM 230-355-4 Definitions

APM 355-2

#### PPM 230-355-10 Criteria

APM 355-10

#### PPM 230-355-17 Terms of Service<sup>1</sup>

Appointments may be made for a maximum of three years and may be renewed following academic review. Appointment or reappointment period may be for a shorter term.

Post-retirement appointment must be for one year or less, but may be renewed following academic review.

#### PPM 230-355-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-355-80 - Procedures

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. E. 7. d

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

#### Section: 230-360-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 (3/13/2017 DRAFT)

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 (TARGET)

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

#### Librarian Series

#### PPM 230-360-4 Definition

APM 360-4

#### PPM 230-360-6 Responsibility

APM 360-6

#### PPM 230-360-8 Types

APM 360-8

#### PPM 230-360-9 Recruitment

APM 360-9

#### PPM 230-360-10 Criteria

#### PPM 230-360-14 Eligibility<sup>1</sup>

For those appointees in the Librarian series covered by the [Memorandum of Understanding](#) (MOU) entered into by the Regents of the University of California and University Council, American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT), the terms and conditions of appointment may be found in the MOU.<sup>2</sup>

#### PPM 230-360-16 Restrictions

APM 360-16

#### PPM 230-360-17 Terms of Service

APM 360-17

#### PPM 230-360-18 Salary

APM 360-18

#### PPM 230-360-20 Conditions of Employment

APM 360-20

#### PPM 230-360-24 Authority to Approve Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions<sup>3</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. V. L. 3

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII. C. 3

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

**PPM 230-360-35 Records**

APM 360-35

**PPM 230-360-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-360, Appendix A**

APM 360, Appendix A



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

### Section: 230-370-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 (3/13/2017 DRAFT)

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 (TARGET)

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Academic Administrator Series

### PPM 230-370-4 Definition

APM 370-4

### PPM 230-370-10 Criteria

APM 370-10

### PPM 230-370-11 Criteria for Evaluating Performance<sup>1</sup>

Materials submitted in support of an appointment, merit increase, or a change in level must provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications and performance in the areas specified below. A job description must be provided, along with an explanation of the candidate's role in the program and within a larger unit, if appropriate.

i. Administration and Management of Programs

Normally, the Academic Administrator will have primary responsibility for the administration of one or more programs and may have responsibility for directing the activities of support staff. Ordinarily, evidence of superior promise and/or performance in areas such as those listed below will be expected:

- Effective administration of the unit managed by the Academic Administrator
- Program planning and development
- Development of proposals for extramural funding of campus programs
- Assessment of program and constituency needs
- Implementation of innovative program changes
- Evaluation of program activities and functions
- Creativity and originality in program development and usage of resources
- Supervision and leadership of staff
- Serving as a liaison with other agencies and institutions in the public and private sectors

ii. Professional Competence

Academic Administrators must provide intellectual leadership in the roles of administrator and supervisor.

Appointees should show evidence of:

- Continued professional growth to update and upgrade competency
- Ability to relate effectively with academic faculty, departments, and counterparts in other campus units
- Ability to forecast changing program and constituency needs
- Scholarship (not required but may be submitted as evidence of professional competence)

iii. University and Public Service

Academic Administrators participate in the administration of their home units and the University through appropriate roles in governance and policy formulation. In addition, they may represent the University in both the public and private sectors.

The effective performance of their duties may require productive participation in intra unit, University, and community service, as well as appropriate representation of the University in the private corporate environment.

### PPM 230-370-12 Exceptions

APM 370-12

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. C. 1

**PPM 230-370-18 Salary**

APM 370-18

**PPM 230-370-19 Normal Periods of Service at Salary Steps<sup>2</sup>**

**a. Positions with an Academic Administrator title may be established for relatively short periods of time.** Appointments may be finite or indefinite; however, indefinite appointments can be made only when the appointment file documents availability of long-term funding.

APM 370-19. b

APM 370-19. c

**PPM 230-370-19. d<sup>3</sup>**

Recommendations for merits and advancements normally will be reviewed every second year until an appointee reaches the level of Academic Administrator IV, Step 5, after which review for merit advancement will take place every three years. Once the appointee reaches the level of Academic Administrator VI, Step 7.0, review for merit advancement will take place every four years. Service as Academic administrator VII, Step 8.0, may be of indefinite duration, and appointees at this step will be reviewed every four years for reappointment.

Formal review by the appropriate campus committee is required every six years. **A performance review, in the absence of a merit or promotion review, shall take place at least every four years.**

**PPM 230-370-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 370-20

**PPM 230-370-22 Funds**

APM 370-22

**PPM 230-370-24 Authority<sup>4</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-370-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20, VII. C. 1. g

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. V. L

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X





# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

### Section: 230-375-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Academic Coordinator Series

### PPM 230-375-4 Definition

APM 375-0

### PPM 230-375-8 Levels

APM 375-8

### PPM 230-375-10 Criteria for Appointment

APM 375-10

### PPM 230-375-11 Criteria for Evaluating Performance

APM 375-11

### PPM 230-375-12 Exceptions

APM 375-12

### PPM 230-375-18 Salary

APM 375-18

### PPM 230-375-19 Normal Periods of Service at Salary Steps<sup>1</sup>

**a. Appointments to an Academic Coordinator title may be for one year or less, for longer periods, and/or for an indefinite period;** however, indefinite appointments can be made only when the appointment file documents availability of long-term funding.

Regular appointments may not exceed a total of two consecutive appointments/reappointments without formal campus review.

Temporary appointments of Academic Coordinators may be made for up to a one-year period and may not exceed a total of two consecutive years without formal campus review.

APM 375-19. b

APM 375-19. c

APM 375-19. d

### PPM 230-375-20 Conditions of Employment

APM 375-20

### PPM 230-375-22 Funds

APM 375-22

### PPM 230-375-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20, VII. C. 2. g

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-375-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-375-80, Appendix A**

**APM 375-80, Appendix A**



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-500-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## RECRUITMENT

### General

#### PPM 230-500-0 Policy

APM 500-0

#### PPM 230-500-2 Purpose

APM 500-2

#### PPM 230-500-14 Eligibility

APM 500-14

#### PPM 230-500-16 Restrictions

APM 500-16. a

#### PPM 230-500-16 b<sup>1</sup>

**Special conditions must be observed before initiating negotiations with the prospective employee:**

**(1) Who is employed by another California institution (see APM - 501).**

Combined teaching appointments at the University of California and the California State University (CSU) may not exceed 120% of full time, except for University Extension service. That is, CSU faculty who are employed 100% time may be appointed at UC San Diego up to 20% time with written authorization by the appropriate dean at the CSU campus.

**(2) Who is employed on another University of California campus (See APM 510).**

APM 500-16. c

#### PPM 230-500-18 Salary

APM 500-18

#### PPM 230-500-20 Terms and Conditions of Employment

APM 500-20

#### PPM 230-500-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-500-80 Procedures

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. IV. B.1

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

### Section: 230-610-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 (3/13/2017 DRAFT)

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 (TARGET)

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## SALARY ADMINISTRATION Salary Increases

### PPM 230-610-0 Policy

APM 610-0

### PPM 230-610-8 General Salary Increases

APM 610-8

### PPM 230-610-9 Merit and Promotion Increases<sup>1</sup>

APM 610-9

APM 610-9. a

APM 610-9. b

APM 610-9. c

APM 610-9. c (1)

APM 610-9. c (2)

#### **PPM 230-610-9. c (3)**

A fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period July 1 through January 1 will receive credit for one year of service at rank and step. A fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period January 2 through June 30 will not receive credit for that year's service at rank and step.

### PPM 230-610-14 Eligibility

APM 610-14

### PPM 230-610-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

### PPM 230-610-96 Reports

APM 610-96

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. A. 2

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-620-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### SALARY ADMINISTRATION

#### Off-Scale Salaries for Appointments and Advancement

#### PPM 230-620-0 Policy

APM 620-0

#### PPM 230-620-4 Definition

APM 620-4

#### PPM 230-620-14 Eligibility

APM 620-14

#### PPM 230-620-16 Restrictions

APM 620-16

#### PPM 230-620-18 Effect of a General Scale Adjustment on Off-Scale Salaries

APM 620-18

#### PPM 230-620-20 Terms and Conditions of Employment

APM 620-20

#### PPM 230-620-24 Authority<sup>1</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-620-80 Campus Procedures

**The Chancellor or the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, in consultation with the appropriate committee(s) of the divisional Academic Senate, shall develop local procedures for implementation of the off-scale policy. Procedures shall include the criteria for appointment or advancement to a position with an off-scale salary, as well as for an appointee's continuation with an off-scale salary or return to an on-scale salary. When an individual is placed on an off-scale salary, the appointee must be notified of this action and any limitation.**

##### a. Bonus Off-Scale <sup>2</sup>

A bonus off-scale is a temporary increase in salary which is generally awarded in recognition of outstanding achievements exceeding what is required for normal merit advancement, but insufficient to support accelerated advancement. In limited circumstances, a bonus off-scale may be awarded in conjunction with a no change action, when an appointee's achievements in the review period demonstrate both full service to the University and progress in all series criteria, but fall short of what is required for advancement.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 5

Bonus off-scale proposals must address the department's standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the appointee's achievements warrant the award of a bonus off-scale salary component.

Bonus off-scales are equivalent to half of the amount of the salary increase associated with normal advancement to the next higher step (or equivalent in series without formal steps).

**b. Market Off-Scale<sup>3</sup>**

A market off-scale may be proposed when marketplace conditions necessitate such measures to keep UC San Diego salaries competitive.

1. Departments may propose a market off-scale salary component when a candidate has received a competing offer from a peer academic institution for appointment in a similar position, and/or is currently similarly employed by a peer institution. Departments should specifically address how the competing institution compares to UC San Diego and take this information into consideration when determining the proposed value of a market off-scale salary component. Whenever possible, departments should discuss the ranking of the department of the competing institution relative to their own ranking.
2. Market considerations within a specific discipline may also justify an off-scale salary. Supporting information may include salary data from academic institutions of comparable stature and/or discipline-based salary studies by national organizations.
3. In disciplines in which market demands consistently require the award of market off-scale salary components, departments may propose an entry-level market off-scale agreement to establish department-specific market off-scale salaries for new assistant-level appointees. The proposal should specify whether the entry-level market off-scale applies to the entire department or only to specific fields or disciplines within the department. Departments should include information regarding entry-level salaries in the field, such as:

- o Data provided by a professional society (or by an academic institution) of salaries at comparable academic departments
- o Salary data published in trade journals
- o Salary data from departments in other University of California campuses
- o Information received from chairs of departments of comparable ranking departments in other Universities
- o Competing offers reported by candidates for recent entry appointments in the department

Proposals are reviewed by the divisional dean and CAP prior to a final decision by the EVC.

Market off-scale salary components are typically maintained indefinitely and do not require rejustification following the initial award; however, when there is evidence that an academic appointee with a market off-scale salary component has failed to sustain his or her career trajectory or stature in the field, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose reduction or elimination of the market off-scale salary component.

When an appointee whose salary includes a market off-scale salary component advances to Above Scale, the market off-scale salary component is folded into the new above-scale salary.<sup>4</sup>

*[APS Review/Appointment Instructions]*

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. B. 5

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-28. B. 5



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-133-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles

### PPM 230-133-0 Policy

APM 133-0

#### Important Introductory Note

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

APM 133-0 Introductory Note I

APM 133-0 Introductory Note II

APM 133-0 Introductory Note III

#### PPM 230-133-0 Introductory Note IV

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

At UC San Diego, promotion consideration typically occurs in the sixth year of appointment at the Assistant rank. The period of time prior to consideration for promotion is referred to as the probationary period. During the probationary period, Assistant-rank appointees are expected to produce work sufficient to justify promotion.<sup>1</sup>

### PPM 230-133-6 Responsibility

APM 133-6

### PPM 230-133-12 Exceptions

APM 133-12

### PPM 230-133-16 Restrictions

APM 133-16

### PPM 230-133-17 Computation of Years of Service

APM 133-17

APM 133-17. a

APM 133-17. b

APM 133-17. c

APM 133-17. d

APM 133-17. e

APM 133-17. f

#### PPM 230-133-17. g

APM 133-17. g. (1)

APM 133-17. g. (2)

#### PPM 230-133-17. g. (3)<sup>2</sup>

**(3) Periods of leave, whether with or without salary, shall be included as service toward the eight-year period unless, upon the basis of a petition filed at the time leave is requested, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel, determines that the activity undertaken during the course of the leave is**

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. D

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. V. D. 2. b

**substantially unrelated to the individual's academic career and that the period of the leave shall not count toward the eight-year service period.** For new appointments, this determination is made on the basis of a petition filed at the time of the proposed appointment. In such cases, the Executive Vice Chancellor may permit the leave period to be excluded from service for the purposes of calculating the eight years.

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

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

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

APM 133-17. g. (2)

#### **PPM 230-133-20 Notice of Non-Reappointment**

APM 133-20

#### **PPM 230-285-24 Authority<sup>3</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-281-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X





# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-160-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES

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

#### PPM 230-160-0 Policy

APM 160-0

#### PPM 230-160-20 Access to Academic Personnel Records

APM 160-20. a

APM 160-20. b

#### PPM-230-160-20. c - Access by the Individual.

APM 160-20. c. (1)

APM 160-20. c. (2)

APM 160-20. c. (3)

APM 160-20. c. (4)

APM 160-20. c. (5)

#### PPM-230-160-20. c (6)<sup>1</sup>

The provisions of APM - 160-20-c(2), (3), (4) apply only to the following academic personnel titles and title series: **Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine), Professor of Practice, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Supervisor of Teacher Education, Teacher of Special Programs, Professional Research (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, Specialist, Postgraduate Research, Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator, Coordinator of Public Programs, Continuing Educator, Cooperative Extension Specialist (Advisor), Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian.**

For appointees covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), this policy applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.

APM 160-20. d

APM 160-20. e

#### PPM 230-160-30 Opportunity to Request Corrections or Deletions in Academic Personnel Records and to Make Additions to Such Records

APM 160-30

#### PPM 230-160, Appendix A

APM 160, Appendix A

#### PPM 230-160, Appendix B

APM 160, Appendix B

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-29. II



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-200-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### General

#### PPM 230-200-0 Policy

It is the policy of the University to evaluate objectively and thoroughly each candidate for appointment, promotion, or merit increase. Promotions and merit increases are not automatic, but are based on merit.

Every academic appointee shall be reviewed at least every five years<sup>1</sup>. The Chancellor, with the advice of the Academic Senate, shall determine the level and type of review and shall develop appropriate implementing procedures.

The Chancellor may exempt from this five-year review faculty Deans (see APM - 240), full-time Faculty Administrators (see APM - 246), and those members of the Senior Management Group (“SMG”) with an underlying academic appointment.

#### PPM 230-200-8 Types

APM 200-8

#### PPM 230-200-17 Effective Service Dates

APM 200-17

#### PPM 230-200-19 Normal Periods of Service at Rank and Step

APM 200-19

#### PPM 230-200-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-200-30 Academic Personnel Actions – Personnel Review Files

APM 200-30

#### PPM 230-200-96 Reports

APM 200-96

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. A

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

#### Section: 230-205-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

#### Recall for Academic Appointees

#### PPM 230-205-0 Policy

APM 205-0

#### PPM 230-205-2 Purpose

APM 205-2

#### PPM 230-205-14 Eligibility

APM 205-14

#### PPM 230-205-16 Restrictions

APM 205-16

#### PPM 230-205-18 Salary

APM 205-18

#### PPM 230-205-20 Terms and Conditions of Employment

APM 205-20

#### PPM 230-205-24 Authority<sup>1</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-205-80 Procedures

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-210-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Review and Appraisal Committees

### PPM 230-210-0 Policy

APM 210-0

### PPM 230-210-1 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor and Corresponding Series

APM 210-1

APM 210-1. a

APM 210-1. b

APM 210-1. c

### PPM 230-210-1 d - Criteria for Appointment Promotion and Appraisal

APM 210-1. d

#### PPM 230-210-1 d (1) – Teaching<sup>1</sup>

By its broadest definition, teaching is the transmission of knowledge. This embraces a wide range of activities, including classroom and laboratory training, mentoring students outside the classroom, directing or participating in graduate student dissertation work, directing reading groups, and overseeing clinical apprenticeships in Health Sciences. It also includes studio teaching, seminar and symposium presentations, tutorials, supervision and training of teaching assistants, and independent study endeavors, as well as the writing of textbooks and software.

**Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role.** Evidence of teaching may vary according to the level of the appointment and the extent of the candidate's previous teaching experience. In exceptional cases where no such evidence is available, the candidate's potential as a teacher may be indicated by closely analogous activities. The departmental recommendation letter should also clearly state how the candidate will be expected to contribute to the department's teaching program. Departments should develop appropriate procedures for evaluating the teaching performance of faculty at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels.

**In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate's command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate's learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups.**

**The committee should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total**

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VI. B and PPM 230-28. V. A. 2

performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which its appraisal of teaching competence has been based.

In those exceptional cases when no such evidence is available, the candidate's potentialities as a teacher may be indicated in closely analogous activities. In preparing its recommendation, the review committee should keep in mind that a redacted copy of its report may be an important means of informing the candidate of the evaluation of his or her teaching and of the basis for that evaluation.

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

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

#### **PPM 230-210-1 d (2) - Research and Creative Work**

Evidence of a productive and creative mind should be sought in the candidate's published research or recognized artistic production in original architectural or engineering designs, or the like. Publications in research and other creative accomplishment should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible.

**When published work in joint authorship (or other product of joint effort) is presented as evidence, it is the responsibility of the department chair to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort.** This is crucial for work judged most significant to the case, or when much of the work submitted is multi-authored. When the appointee's contributions to collaborative work are unclear, the department may:

- Request a personal statement from the appointee describing his or her individual contributions to collaborative research, and/or
- Solicit feedback from the appointee's collaborators regarding the nature and extent of the appointee's contributions to specific works.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VI. A and PPM 230-28. V. A. 1

**It should be recognized that special cases of collaboration occur in the performing arts and that the contribution of a particular collaborator may not be readily discernible by those viewing the finished work. When the candidate is such a collaborator, it is the responsibility of the department chair to make a separate evaluation of the candidate's contribution and to provide outside opinions based on observation of the work while in progress. Account should be taken of the type and quality of creative activity normally expected in the candidate's field. Appraisals of publications or other works in the scholarly and critical literature provide important testimony. Due consideration should be given to variations among fields and specialties and to new genres and fields of inquiry.**

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

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

The standing and importance of the journals in which publications have appeared should be indicated; in particular, the letter should state whether or not the journals are refereed.

Indices of the stature of journals (e.g., journal ratings by professional societies, acceptance/rejection rates, etc.) should be provided for key pieces of work, particularly if they are published in journals that are not likely to be familiar to campus reviewers.<sup>3</sup>

The candidate's success in obtaining research support, including support for graduate students, should be addressed. The role of the candidate on grants should be indicated (e.g., Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, or Co-Investigator, with the number of other investigators indicated). Evidence of successful grant funding may provide calibration of research impact and capacity for research training, and may be an *indicator* of research productivity or impact; however, grants are not required as a measure of productivity or impact. In large teams, the expectation of grant success should be moderated based on role in the team.

For appointment at or advancement to the Associate level or higher, independent academic and intellectual leadership in the field must be demonstrated. Although candidates must demonstrate independence from early-career mentors or advisors in order to be appointed at the Associate level, evidence is not restricted to independent research papers, other independent creative accomplishments, or garnering sole-P.I. grants, particularly if the candidate's research or creative activity takes place in a large-scale, collaborative team. However, if a traditional demonstration of independence is absent, more substantial documentation is needed to explain and support the case that appointment at the Associate level is warranted. In such a case, letters from non-independent referees (e.g., research team members) may be provided in addition to the usual complement of independent letters.<sup>4</sup>

If the department chair is unable to evaluate the candidate's research and other creative accomplishments, assistance should be obtained from someone within the department or University or from experts outside the University.

A mere listing of publications is inadequate; the work must be analyzed with regard to its nature, quality, importance, and impact on its field.

Department chairs in Health Sciences should make clear whether clinical case reports are merely historical or whether they contain new ideas or results.

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 6 and PPM 230-28. V. A. 1

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 8 and PPM 230-28. V. A. 1

**PPM 230-210-1 d (3) - Professional Competence and Activity<sup>5</sup>**

A candidate for appointment to this series must possess a Ph.D. degree or equivalent.<sup>6</sup> **In certain positions in the professional schools and colleges, such as architecture, business administration, dentistry, engineering, law, medicine, etc., a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for appointment or promotion.** In Health Sciences, candidates with clinical responsibilities must have a doctorate in a clinical discipline. If required for the position, the candidate must possess and maintain an appropriate valid license and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or the equivalent. Those appointed at the Associate rank or above should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.

**The candidate's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement and leadership in the field and of demonstrated progressiveness in the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems, including those that specifically address the professional advancement of individuals in underrepresented groups in the candidate's field. It is responsibility of the department chair to provide evidence that the position in question is of the type described above and that the candidate is qualified to fill it.**

APM 210-1. d (4) University and Public Service

APM 210-1. e

APM 210-1 Appendix A

---

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 1, PPM 230-20. VII. A 2, PPM 230-220- VII. A. 4, and PPM 230-28. V. A. 4

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 1, PPM 230-20. VII. A 2, and PPM 230-220- VII. A. 4

**PPM 230-210-2 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine) Series**

APM 210-2. a

APM 210-2. b (1) - Teaching

**PPM 230-210-2. b (2) – Professional Competence and Activity**

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

In the Health Sciences, faculty at the Associate rank or above who have clinical responsibilities should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.<sup>7</sup>

**PPM 230-210-2. b (2) (a) Standards for Appointment or Promotion**

**For entry level positions, the individual should have three or more years of training and/or experience post M.D., Ph.D. or equivalent terminal professional degree. In addition, an appointee should show evidence of a high level of competence in a clinical specialty. If required for the position, the candidate must possess and maintain an appropriate valid license and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or the equivalent.<sup>8</sup>**

**For promotion to or appointment at the Associate Professor rank, an appointee should be recognized at least in the local metropolitan health care community as an authority within a clinical specialty. Appointees at the Associate rank or above should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition. Appointees may receive patient referrals at the community and institutional levels.<sup>9</sup> A physician normally will have a regional reputation as a referral physician; another health professional normally will have a regional reputation as evidenced in such work as that of a consultant.**

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

APM 210-2. b (2) (b) Evaluation of Clinical Achievement

APM 210-2. b (3) Creative Work

APM 210-2. b (4) University and Public Service

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-28. V B. 2

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 3. g

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 3. C. ii



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

APM 210-3. a

**PPM 230-210-3. b**

The review committee shall judge the candidate with respect to the proposed rank and duties considering the record of the candidate's performance in (1) teaching, (2) professional achievement and activity, (3) University and public service, and (4). Educational leadership beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities

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

APM 210-3. (1) (Teaching)

APM 210-3. (2) (Professional Achievement and Activity)

APM 210-3. (3) (University and Public Service)

**PPM 230-210-3 (4) Educational Leadership and Contributions to Instruction-Related Activities**

A demonstrated record of educational leadership beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities (i.e., conducting TA training, supervision of student affairs, development of instructional materials/multimedia) is one of the criteria for advancement or promotion.

**PPM 230-210-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-210-4 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning  
Appointees in the Librarian Series**  
APM 210-4

**PPM 230-210-5 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning  
Appointees in the Supervisor of Teacher Education Series**  
APM 210-5

**PPM 230-210-6 Instructions to Review Committees which Advise on Actions Concerning  
Appointees in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series**  
APM 210-6



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-220-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Professor Series

#### PPM 230-220-4 Definition and Policy

APM 220-4. a

#### PPM 230-220-4. b<sup>1</sup>

Persons appointed to titles in the Professor series form the “regular ranks” faculty of the University. This series is distinct from the following series:

**Acting Professor series**

**Adjunct Professor series**

Professor of Practice series

**Health Sciences Clinical Professor series**

**Professor In Residence series**

**Visiting Professor series**

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

#### PPM 230-220-8 Types

APM 220-8. a

APM 220-8. b

APM 220-8. c

APM 220-8. d.

APM 220-8. e

#### PPM 230-220-8. f<sup>2</sup>

A retention occurs when a department prepares an academic review file for a faculty member who is being recruited by another institution.

#### PPM 230-220-8. g<sup>3</sup>

A. deferral occurs when an appointee delays the regularly scheduled academic review for one year by request.

#### PPM 230-220-8. h<sup>4</sup>

A no change action occurs when, following an academic review, a faculty member does not advance because productivity is not sufficient to justify advancement, or if the appointee is unresponsive to departmental requests to submit updated file materials.

#### PPM 230-220-8. i<sup>5</sup>

Accelerated advancement is early advancement to a higher step and/or rank. For series lacking established ranks and/or steps, accelerated advancement is an early increase in salary, or an increase greater than is expected based on the time since the appointee’s last review.

#### PPM 230-220-8. j<sup>6</sup>

A Career Equity Review (CER) is an evaluation to determine whether a faculty member’s rank and step are correctly calibrated. It is not a means of appeal for or expression of disagreement with a single

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.1. a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. E

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 1

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 2

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 4

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. C

personnel decision. The CER process examines cases in which normal personnel actions, from the initial hiring onward, may have resulted in an inaccurate rank and/or step designation. When warranted, a CER review may result in the recalibration of the faculty member to a higher rank and step consistent with prevailing UC San Diego standards.

**PPM 230-220-10 Criteria**

APM 220-10

**PPM 230-220-14 Eligibility**

APM 220-14

**PPM 230-220-16 Restrictions**

APM 220-16

APM 220-16. a

APM 220-16. b

APM 220-16. c

APM 220-16. d

APM 220-16. e

**PPM 230-220-16 f<sup>7</sup>**

University of California graduate students may not be appointed to titles in the Professor series.

**PPM 230-220-16 g.<sup>8</sup>**

For UC San Diego faculty with a current, salaried Professor (Ladder-Rank) appointment, a 0% Professor appointment may be proposed to reflect a secondary department affiliation. If a 0% Professor appointment is proposed:

- the candidate will be afforded voting rights in the secondary department;
- eligible faculty in both departments must vote on the file; and
- the candidate is required to fulfill responsibilities for research, teaching, and service in both departments.

Such 0% Professor appointments will be limited to a term equal to one review cycle. Reappointments may only be proposed at the time of review.

No guarantee of future appointment or funding is accorded with a 0% Ladder-Rank appointment.

**PPM 230-220-17 Terms of Service**

APM 220-17. a

APM 220-17. b

APM 220-17. c

**PPM 230-220-17. d<sup>9</sup>**

**Effective Date and Beginning Date of Service**

**(1) The effective date of an appointment is the initial date of the new status for payroll or other recordkeeping purposes and indicates the first day on which salary or change in rate of salary commences.**

- Academic-year appointments must be effective at the beginning of quarterly pay periods (i.e., July 1 for fall quarter; November 1 for winter quarter; March 1 for spring quarter).
- Fiscal-year appointments may be effective on any date, preferably the first day of a month.
- If an appointment that represents a series change coincides with an advancement, the advancement must be effective on July 1, regardless of the effective date of the proposed new appointment.

Whenever possible, appointments subject to the eight-year limit should be made effective July 1.

APM 220-17. d. (2)

APM 220-17. d. (3)

**PPM 230-220-18 Salary**

APM 220-18

APM 220-18. a

APM 220-18. b

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.2. d

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.2. h

<sup>9</sup> 230-20. V. E

APM 220-18. b. (1)

APM 220-18. b. (2)

APM 220-18. b. (3)

**PPM 230-220-18. b. (4)**

**Professor:** The normal period of service at step is three years in each of the first four steps. Service at Step V may be of indefinite duration. Advancement to Step VI usually will not occur after less than three years of service at Step V. This involves an overall career review and will be granted on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following three categories: (1) scholarship or creative achievement, (2) University teaching, and (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching. Service at Professor, Step VI or higher may be of indefinite duration. Advancement from Professor, Step VI to Step VII, from Step VII to Step VIII, and from Step VIII to Step IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the lower step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing achievement at the level required for advancement to Step VI.

Those Professors who are on the special Law School scale that has nine steps for the range are subject to the same criteria as Professors as outlined above.

Advancement to an above-scale rank involves an overall career review and is reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact; (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX. Moreover, mere length of service and continued good performance at Step IX is not justification for further salary advancement. There must be demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step IX was based. A further merit increase in salary for a person already serving at an above-scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of merit and distinction. Continued good service is not an adequate justification. Intervals between such salary increases may be indefinite, and only in the most superior cases where there is strong and compelling evidence will increase at intervals shorter than four years be approved.

The normal salary increase for a person in the Above Scale category is either 50% or 100% of the difference between the top two steps of the salary scale (i.e., 50% or 100% of the salary increase between Steps VIII and IX for the Professor and Research Scientist series.) Files proposing 100% of the difference between the top two steps must demonstrate exemplary performance in all areas (research and creative activity, teaching, service, and professional competence and activity). Files proposing more than 100% of the difference between the top two steps will be considered acceleration files.

**PPM 230-220-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 230-20

**PPM 230-220-24 Authority to Approve Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions<sup>10</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-220-80 Recommendations and Review: General Procedures**

**PPM 230-220-80. a<sup>11</sup>**

Formal considerations of appointments and reappointments, merit increases, appraisals, non-reappointments, and promotions are normally initiated by the department chair, after appropriate consultation with members of the departmental faculty. For actions affecting the chair, the vice chair, the Dean or Provost, or an appropriate officer may take the initiative.

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>11</sup> 230-20. V. A. 3

If the department chair and the candidate proposed for appointment are close collaborators, the department chair should not participate in the preparation of the appointment file. The vice chair or another independent senior faculty member should oversee the process and prepare the departmental recommendation letter.

If the department 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 should recuse themselves from contributing to the appointment file.

When an appointee holds joint appointments in two or more departments, all departments should be involved in the appointee's academic review; however, only one academic review file should be submitted.

Each department should act independently in arriving at its recommendation for inclusion in the academic review file.<sup>12</sup>

APM 220-80. b

**PPM 230-220-80. c<sup>13</sup>**

**Early in the course of a personnel review, before departmental consideration of a case, the chair shall notify the candidate of the impending review and in one or more conferences with the candidate make certain that the candidate is adequately informed about the entire review process and is given the appropriate opportunity to ask questions, to supply pertinent information and evidence to be used in the review, and, where relevant, to suggest names of persons to be solicited for letters of evaluation.**

Academic appointees must provide evidence of achievement in each of the criteria specified for their series. Appointees are also responsible for meeting the department's deadlines for submission of academic review file materials.

If eligible, appointees may initiate a Career Equity Review (CER). An appointee is responsible for requesting a CER at the time of his or her regular, on-cycle academic review (see PPM 230-220-89, Professor Series/Procedures for Career Equity Review.)<sup>14</sup>

Department chairs should establish in writing a deadline (no later than the established campus deadline) for the submission by candidates of all materials for their Review Files. Departments may establish an earlier deadline, but, in these cases, candidates must have a reasonable period of time to gather and submit the material. Departmental deadlines may not be later than the established campus deadline. For equity reasons, an appointee may not add bibliographic or other documentation reflecting activities or accomplishments beyond the established campus deadline. If material is received after the departmental meeting and vote, the chair shall determine whether or not the added material is of such significance that it should be reviewed by all voting members and whether a new departmental meeting should be scheduled to reconsider the case. If the chair determines that the new material is not of such substance as to require a new departmental meeting and/or vote, the chair should take steps to include the material in the File and describe the degree of departmental review of the material. The candidate also should be informed of the degree of departmental review and asked to sign Certification C as an indication of his/her awareness that the material has been added to the File.<sup>15</sup>

**The chair has an obligation to consider the interests of both the candidate and the University, and to see to it that the departmental review is fair to the candidate and rigorous in maintaining University standards.**

**The candidate should be made aware of APM - 210-1 and 220, of the University's policies about academic personnel records (APM - 160), and of the candidate's rights to make any desired addition to the personnel review file. The chair should be helpful in responding to the candidate's**

---

<sup>12</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. F

<sup>13</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 1. c. (4)

<sup>14</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. C

<sup>15</sup> PPM 230-29. III. G. 6 and PPM 230-28-IV.A. 3 and 4



**questions and in considering whether additions to the file by the candidate are needed. In accordance with established policy applicable to the personnel action under consideration, the chair shall solicit letters of evaluation of the candidate from qualified persons, including a reasonable number of persons nominated by the candidate.**

#### External Referee Letters

The department chair should solicit evaluations from individuals who are independent of the candidate, who are expert in the candidate's field, and who are able to provide an objective appraisal of the candidate's work. External referees should be senior scholars who are at the same rank as that proposed for the appointee, or higher.

**All such letters received shall be included in the file;** unsolicited letters received by the department but NOT added to the file by the appointee may be included in the file at the department chair's discretion.<sup>16</sup> **In soliciting or receiving unsolicited letters of evaluation, the chair should include, attach or send a statement regarding the confidentiality of such letters.** This statement must include the following (or its equivalent):

“Although a candidate may request to see the contents of letters of evaluation, your identity will be held in confidence. The material made available will exclude the letterhead, the signature block, and material below the signature block. Therefore, material that would identify you, particularly information about 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.”<sup>17</sup>

Sample solicitation letters are provided on the Academic Personnel Services Web site. External referee letters are required as follows:

#### Appointment:<sup>18</sup>

For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step I or II, external letters of evaluation from the candidate's mentors and others at the home institution are acceptable; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if available.

For Assistant-level appointments proposed at Step III or higher, and for all appointments at the Associate or Full level, letters should be from external referees who are senior scholars (Associate level or higher) and who are independent of the candidate.

#### Advancement:<sup>19</sup>

- For advancement to Step VI, external referee letters are not required, but may be solicited at the department's discretion when they are needed to demonstrate evidence of nationally or internationally recognized and highly distinguished scholarship, highly meritorious service, or excellent teaching.
- For advancement in the LPSOE/LSOE series, external evaluation letters must be solicited from individuals who are professionally independent from the appointee; however, additional evaluation letters may be solicited from referees from within UC San Diego as a tool to assist the effective evaluation of an appointee's contributions to pedagogy on campus.
- For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, evaluation letters may be solicited from within UC San Diego; however, the majority of required letters should be obtained from individuals external to UC San Diego
- For advancement in the Project Scientist and Specialist series, external evaluation letters may be solicited from individuals who are not professionally independent from the appointee; however, additional letters from more independent sources should be obtained if possible.

Depending on the discipline of the appointee under review, additional evidence provided in lieu of external letters may include, but is not limited to: published reviews of the candidate's work; Readers' Reports from publishers; or presentations of the research in competitive and prestigious venues.

In cases in which the department chooses not to solicit letters from external referees, campus reviewers

---

<sup>16</sup> PPM 230-20. V. A

<sup>17</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 2. b

<sup>18</sup> PPM 230-20. V. A

<sup>19</sup>

may later recommend that the department do so. In all other cases, external referee letters should not be solicited unless there is no department faculty member with sufficient expertise to evaluate the appointee.

**The candidate may provide in writing to the chair names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth, might not objectively evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance. Any such statement provided by the candidate shall be included in the personnel review file.**

Based upon the above, candidates occasionally have asked that the department chair, Deans, Provosts, members of the Committee on Academic Personnel, and other individuals within and outside the department be excluded from participation in their academic personnel review. CAP does not consider it appropriate to honor requests to exclude particular members of CAP from participation in the review of any file. CAP members routinely exclude themselves from review of candidates at the departmental level, and to exclude them at the CAP level would essentially disenfranchise them. It would, in general, be inappropriate to exclude them from consideration of any cases involving candidates from their own or other departments because their expertise is needed by CAP. Any member of CAP can, however, on his/her own initiative, voluntarily withdraw from a review.

Candidates occasionally name reviewers, inside and outside the University, who, for reasons stated in writing, might not provide an objective evaluation of the candidate's work. The department chair, in consultation with the voting members of the department, should decide whether or not to solicit letters from those named. If a named reviewer is used, the chair should explain the reasons for consulting the named individual so that the file will show not only the candidate's reasons for the exclusion, but also the reason for the department's decision to seek the opinion of the named person.

On rare occasions, candidates ask that the department chair not prepare the review file. Such requests will be decided by the Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs following consultation with CAP. In instances where someone other than the department chair is asked to prepare the review file, the department chair will participate in the review as a voting member of the department.

Members of the candidate's department, Deans, Provosts, and members of the Committee on Academic Personnel cannot be barred from participation in the personnel process on the basis of a challenge to their objectivity. To do so would infringe on rights granted to faculty by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(c) and rights granted to the Academic Senate by The Regents in Standing Order 105.2(d). Individuals may voluntarily withdraw from participation in the review process.

**PPM 230-220-80. c (footnote 1)<sup>20</sup>**

**1The provisions of APM - 220-80-c, 220-80-d, 220-80-e, 220-80-h, 220-80-i, 220-80-j, and 220-84-b, modified as appropriate, apply to the following series: Professor, Professor in Residence, Acting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Visiting Professor, Clinical Professor, University Professor, Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), Professor of Practice, Agronomist, Astronomer, Lecturer, Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Lecturer with Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer, Senior Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment, Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, Supervisor of Teacher Education, Teacher of Special Programs, Professional Research (Research Scientist), Project Scientist, Specialist, Postgraduate Research, Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator, Coordinator of Public Programs, Continuing Educator, Cooperative Extension Specialist (Advisor), Supervisor of Physical Education, Librarian.**

For appointees covered by a Collective Bargaining Agreement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), this policy applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.

**PPM 230-220-80. d<sup>21</sup>**

**Before the departmental recommendation is determined, the chair shall provide the candidate the opportunity to inspect all documents in the personnel review file other than confidential academic review records (as defined in APM – 160-20-b (1)), and shall provide to the candidate upon request a redacted copy (as defined in APM - 160-20-c (4)) of the confidential academic review records in the file. Within seven days of receiving redacted copies, the candidate may submit for inclusion in the**

---

<sup>20</sup> PPM 230-29. II

<sup>21</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D 3

**personnel review file a written statement in response to or commenting upon material in the file.**

The candidate's response must be made available to the faculty prior to the meeting at which the departmental recommendation is determined. The candidate's signature on Certification A (Exhibit A) certifies that these procedures have been followed. Certification A should be signed and dated on the date this action occurs and must be included in each Personnel Review File.

The chair has the responsibility of making the complete Review File available for inspection by the voting members of the department before the departmental vote is taken. Copies of the files or portions thereof should not be distributed to members of the faculty.

"Complete Review File" refers to the review file prepared for the proposed personnel action and generally does not include previous review files or other material which are not relevant for the proposed personnel action. The department or the candidate can, of course, make material in a previous review file a part of the current file.

**PPM 230-220-80. e.<sup>22</sup>**

**The departmental recommendation is made in accordance with the procedural regulations of the Academic Senate and established governance practices of the department, and is based upon the evaluation of the appointee by all eligible members of the department.**

Department chairs are responsible for ensuring compliance with the provisions of Bylaw 55 and should review them carefully prior to initiating departmental votes.<sup>23</sup>

Except in unusual circumstances, whenever University or departmental policy requires a vote on a proposed action, the action must be supported by at least 50% of the members eligible to vote and in residence on campus in the quarter when the vote is taken.

Except for appraisals, votes should be "for," "against," "abstain," or "absent," as defined below:

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| <b>FOR</b>     | The voter is in favor of the proposed action.  |
| <b>AGAINST</b> | The voter is not in favor of the proposed action.  |
| <b>ABSTAIN</b> | The voter is available, but has elected to refrain from voting.                            |
| <b>ABSENT</b>  | The voter is unavailable for voting due to an approved leave or other absence from campus. |

Departments should develop their own rules, when necessary, for consultation or voting on academic personnel actions not covered by Academic Senate Bylaw 55.<sup>24</sup>

**The chair initiates a personnel action for an appointment, promotion, merit increase, appraisal, reappointment, non-reappointment, or terminal appointment by addressing a letter setting forth the departmental recommendation to the approval authority.**

**This departmental letter shall:**

**1. Discuss the proposed personnel action in the light of the criteria set forth in APM - 220-10 and shall be accompanied by supporting evidence.**

a. For appointments, the letter should provide a thorough evaluation of the candidate's qualifications in accordance with the specific criteria established for the proposed series. This includes a full and detailed evaluation of the candidate's scholarly and creative achievements, a description and evaluation of the candidate's teaching experience and effectiveness, and assessment of his or her professional reputation in the academic community.

Utilizing information from the candidate's previous institution, the departmental recommendation letter should include a meaningful assessment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at both the undergraduate and graduate levels of instruction.

---

<sup>22</sup> PPM 230-20. V A. 4

<sup>23</sup> PPM 230-20. V. F

<sup>24</sup> PPM 230-28. VIII. A

b. For all actions but appointments, the appointee's performance in each area should be evaluated in terms of the department's established performance norms and expectations, using established departmental evaluation methods.<sup>25</sup>

**2. Report the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department (including any vote taken) and present any significant evidence and differences of opinion which would support a contrary opinion.**

**3. Discuss the proposed title, rank, step, salary, effective appointment date(s).**

4. [Justify] the recommended rank, step, and salary based on the criteria specified for the series, including justification for an market off-scale salary, if applicable.

5. Include verification that a complete file was presented for voting members' consideration

6. Provide information about the nature and extent of consultation on the matter within the department (including the results of any vote taken and the reasons (if known) for any negative votes.)

7. Include a statement regarding external referees' recommendations, **ensuring that individuals who have provided confidential letters of evaluation are not identified in the departmental letter except by code.**

8. Include a statement from the chair regarding any conflicts of interest.<sup>26</sup>

For appointments, the letter should include:<sup>27</sup>

1. The proposed title, rank, step, salary, effective appointment date(s), and discussion of any funding contingencies.

2. A brief description of the open recruitment conducted by the department for the position and how the candidate was selected. (Other applicants should not be identified in this description.)

3. Documentation of the participation and membership of the departmental ad hoc committee

4. A description of the candidate's expected role in the department: research to be conducted and/or classes the candidate will teach; the candidate's anticipated contribution to the department's instructional mission at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; and a description of the department's teaching requirements and how the candidate's teaching load meets those requirements (for applicable titles).

For Visiting Titles:<sup>28</sup>

The departmental recommendation letter should describe clearly the special expertise that the visitor brings to the campus and should clearly state that the individual will be returning to the home institution upon completion of the visiting appointment.

**The department shall adopt procedures under which the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation shall be available, before being forwarded, for inspection by all those members of the department eligible to vote on the matter or by a designated committee or other group of such members.** The operating word is inspection, not approval; dissenting faculty may add dissenting letters into the File. Dissenting letters are considered non-confidential and will be available to the candidate.<sup>29</sup> **Pursuant to campus procedures, the chair may also, in a separate letter, make an independent evaluation and recommendation, which may differ from the departmental recommendation.** This letter should be shown to all voting members of the department, and will be accessible to the candidate, upon request, in redacted form.<sup>30</sup>

**Before or at the time of forwarding the departmental letter and the personnel review file, the candidate shall be informed orally or, upon request, in writing of the departmental recommendation and of the substance of departmental evaluations under each of the applicable University criteria (teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and University and public service). If the chair provides this information to the candidate in writing, a copy of the written statement is to be included in the personnel review file. Upon request, the chair shall provide to the candidate a copy of the letter setting forth the departmental recommendation. As stated above, the identities of persons who were the sources of confidential**

---

<sup>25</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. A. 5

<sup>26</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. A. 7

<sup>27</sup> PPM 230-28. IV. A. 4

<sup>28</sup> PPM 230-28. V. N.

<sup>29</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 4. e

<sup>30</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 5. d

documents are not to be disclosed in this letter. The candidate has the right to make a written comment on the departmental recommendation. The candidate should in such a case request a written statement from the chair as described above, and the candidate's comment shall be transmitted, at the option of the candidate, either to the chair, Dean, or Provost. This should be done within a time limit prescribed by the Chancellor. This written comment shall become part of the personnel review file as the review proceeds.

APM 220-80. f

APM 220-80. g

**PPM 230-220-80. h.**<sup>31</sup>

**If, during Academic Senate or administrative review of a departmental recommendation, the personnel review file is found to be incomplete or inadequate, additional information shall be solicited** from the chair through the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor-- Academic Affairs or the applicable Dean/Director in cases where the Dean/Director is the approving authority. **Such new material shall be added to the personnel review file, and the department shall be invited to comment on the new material. The candidate shall be informed by the chair of the new material which has been added to the personnel review file (without disclosing the identities of sources of confidential academic review records), and may be provided access to the new material in accord with APM - 220-80-d. The candidate shall be provided the opportunity to make a written statement for inclusion in the personnel review file.** The candidate's statement should be received by the department within seven days of the candidate being informed of the new material. The candidate's signature on Certification C (Exhibit C) certifies that these procedures have been followed. **The review shall then be based upon the personnel review file as augmented.**

APM 220-80. i

**PPM 230-220-80. j**<sup>32</sup>

**If the Administrative Authority's preliminary assessment is contrary to the recommendation of the department, or of reviewers, the Executive Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs (or applicable dean, where appropriate) shall notify the candidate, chair or applicable reviewers, indicating the reasons and asking for any further information which might support a different decision.** The chair or applicable reviewers will have an opportunity to accept the preliminary decision or to respond to it, within fourteen days, before a final decision is made. **When additional information is furnished, appropriate reviewers will be given opportunity to comment on the augmented file before a final decision is made.** If the candidate chooses to comment, such comments should be received by the department chair within seven days from the date the candidate was informed of the preliminary decision. Any response to the preliminary decision and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C.

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>31</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 6

<sup>32</sup> PPM 230-29. III. D. 7

**PPM 230-220-82 Procedure for Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion to the Rank of Assistant Professor**

**The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:**

APM 220-82. a

APM 220. 82. b

APM 220-82. c

**PPM 230-220-82. d**

a. First Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>33</sup>

The first reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs during the second year of appointment. The department may propose:

1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

3. *Non-Reappointment*

If an appointee is not making acceptable progress, the eligible department faculty may vote to recommend non-reappointment at the end of the first two-year appointment period in accordance with APM 220-20. C., and APM PPM 230-220-84.

b. Second Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>34</sup>

The second reappointment/merit review of an Assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the fourth year of appointment, and is usually combined with an appraisal in accordance with PPM-220-83. The department may propose:

1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

3. *Termination*

If an appointee's performance is unacceptable, the department may consider termination. A recommendation to terminate an assistant-rank appointee requires a vote of the eligible department faculty and may only be recommended after the department has conducted an appraisal in accordance with PPM 230-220-82.

c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>35</sup>

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review of a Senate Faculty Member, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

1. Promotion is Recommended

---

<sup>33</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D.4

<sup>34</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D.4

<sup>35</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D.7

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Termination is Recommended

If the department believes an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, the department may vote to recommend termination with notice.

g. Reconsideration<sup>36</sup>

An appointee who has received notice of termination may be reconsidered for promotion.

Reconsideration is appropriate only when there is substantial evidence of significant improvement in the appointee's record of scholarly achievement since the termination decision was reached, particularly with respect to those elements of the record previously identified as areas of weakness.

A reconsideration file must be received in the Academic Personnel office no later than February 15 of the terminal year. Neither submission of a reconsideration file nor a failure to meet the file deadline will postpone a terminal appointment ending date.

If a final decision has not been made by the ending date of the terminal period of service, the appointment will end as scheduled. If reconsideration results in a decision to promote, the promotion action becomes effective retroactive to July 1, regardless of when the decision is reached.

---

<sup>36</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D. 10

### PPM 230-220-83 Procedure for the Formal Appraisal of an Assistant Professor

Formal appraisals of Assistant Professors shall be made in order to arrive at preliminary assessments of the prospects of candidates for eventual promotion to tenure rank as well as to identify appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence desired for continued membership in the faculty.

The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:

a. 1. Normally each Assistant Professor shall be appraised well in advance of possible promotion to tenure rank (at least two and one-half years before the anticipated effective date of the promotion). A case of initial appointment from outside the University, with anticipation of promotion within two or three years after appointment, obviously calls for an exception to the general rule. Each Assistant Professor shall be appraised no later than the first half of the appointee's sixth year of service in the University with the title Assistant Professor or with this title in combination with other titles as defined in APM - 133-0-a and 133-0-b. Earlier appraisals are permissible. Subject to these guidelines and restrictions, each Chancellor shall establish general schedules and rules for the timing of formal appraisals on the respective campus.

The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with the second reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.<sup>37</sup>

**No formal appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of an appraisal, the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.**

a.2<sup>38</sup>. The following factors should be evaluated when conducting an appraisal:

- Published research and other completed creative activity, and potential for continued research and creative activity.
- teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

a.3. Appraisal Vote<sup>39</sup>

...

The eligible department faculty should vote on an appraisal rating, as follows:

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| FAVORABLE                   | Indicates that promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining the current trajectory of excellence and on appropriate external validation. |
| FAVORABLE WITH RESERVATIONS | Indicates that promotion is likely, if identified weaknesses or imbalances in the record are corrected.                                    |

---

<sup>37</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D. 6. b

<sup>38</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D. 6. b

<sup>39</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. D. 6. c



|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| PROBLEMATIC | Indicates that promotion is possible if substantial deficiencies in the present record are remedied. |
| UNFAVORABLE | Indicates that substantial deficiencies are present; promotion is unlikely.                          |

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees in accordance with PPM 230-220-85.

If the majority of eligible department faculty vote for an appraisal rating of “unfavorable,” a second vote of the faculty should be taken to determine whether the department wishes to continue the appointment or recommend termination in accordance with PPM 230-220-84.

a.4. When the appraisal is combined with a reappointment/merit review, the department must make a recommendation regarding reappointment and merit advancement. The department may propose:

- *Reappointment with Merit Advancement:*  
indicates that sufficient work has been completed during the review period to justify merit advancement, and the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.
- *Reappointment without Merit Advancement:*  
indicates there has not been sufficient work completed in the review period to justify merit advancement, but the potential exists for an appointee to make marked improvements prior to consideration for promotion.
- *Termination:*  
Termination should be considered in accordance with PPM 230-220-84 if the majority of voting faculty are convinced that substantial deficiencies in the record cannot be corrected in time for consideration for promotion and therefore further effort will not result in promotion.

APM 220-83. b

**PPM 230 220-83.c**

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

APM 220-83. d

APM 220-83. e

**PPM 230-220-84 Procedure for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor**  
The general rules of APM - 220-80 apply here. In addition:

- a. <sup>40</sup>A proposal not to reappoint an Assistant Professor may originate with the department chair as a result of departmental review during consideration of reappointment. Also, during a formal appraisal of an Assistant Professor/Supervisor/Research Scientist/Scholar, a department may recommend that a candidate be notified of a terminal appointment. **In either event, the case shall be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of APM Sections 220-82, 220-83, and 220-84.**
- b. <sup>41</sup>During a review of a formal appraisal, or consideration of reappointment or promotion of an Assistant Professor (or other appointee of equivalent rank), , there is a recommendation to make a terminal appointment or not to reappoint by a Dean, Provost, campus ad hoc review committee, and/or the Committee on Academic Personnel; and-if the Academic Vice Chancellor's (or designee's) preliminary assessment is to make a terminal appointment, is not to reappoint or promote, or is contrary to the departmental shall be notified of this in writing (including a statement of reasons)-by the Academic Vice Chancellor (or applicable dean, where appropriate). **The candidate also shall be notified of the opportunity to request access to the records placed in the personnel review file subsequent to the departmental review in accordance with APM - 160-20-c. When the candidate is provided copies of such records, the department chair also shall be provided with copies of the extradepartmental records. The candidate and the chair, after appropriate consultation within the department, shall then have the opportunity to respond in writing within fourteen days and to provide additional information and documentation. The candidate may respond either through the department chair or directly to the Academic Vice Chancellor within seven days of being informed of the preliminary decision (or within seven days of receipt of the extra- departmental records as outlined above). The personnel review file, as augmented by the added material, shall then be considered in any stage of the review process as designated by the Academic Vice Chancellor before a final decision by the Chancellor is reached.** The departmental response and/or submission of additional material must be accompanied by a signed and dated Certification C. **The Chancellor's final decision to make a terminal appointment, or not to reappoint or promote, shall not be made without the appropriate preliminary assessment notification process and opportunity to respond being provided to the candidate as specified herein.**

---

<sup>40</sup> PPM 230-29. III. E. 1

<sup>41</sup> PPM 230-29. III. E. 2

**PPM 230-220-86 Procedure for Deferral of the Academic Review**<sup>42</sup>

A. deferral occurs when an appointee delays the regularly scheduled academic review for one year by request. An appointee may request a deferral of his or her academic review when:

1. there is evidence that work in progress will come to fruition within the year and that having the additional year will make a difference in the result of the next review; or
2. circumstances beyond the appointee's control have impacted his or her productivity (i.e., illness, family member's illness, etc.).

In general, the following appointees are not eligible to defer academic reviews: Assistant-rank appointees (except when approved as a family accommodation; see [\[Link to PPM 230-15\]](#), non-salaried Adjunct Professors, and appointees with established ending dates (term appointments).

Deferral requests must be submitted to the appointee's department(s) no later than October 15.

An appointee may request a maximum of two consecutive deferrals.

---

<sup>42</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 1

**PPM 230-220-87 Procedure for No Change Action**<sup>43</sup>

The general Rules of PPM 230-220-80/APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:

An academic review file must be prepared and submitted for review for an appointee serving in the final year of the normal period at step<sup>44</sup>, even if the appointee is not recommended for advancement. A department should propose a no-change action if productivity is not sufficient to justify advancement, or if the appointee is unresponsive to departmental requests to submit updated file materials. For appointees subject to [APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment](#), the department may allow the appointment to expire instead of recommending a no-change action.

After a no-change action takes effect, the appointee's review cycle will be reset for the normal two-, three-, or four-year cycle. Should the department propose advancement prior to the end of the appointee's normal review cycle, this action will not be considered an acceleration.

**Consecutive No Change Actions**

In cases in which an appointee is proposed for a consecutive no change action, the department must discuss the reasons for the no change action in the departmental letter. Potential reasons include:

1. **Full Service at a Barrier Step**  
An appointee's failure to advance resulting from insufficient career accomplishments to pass through a barrier step, while continuing to provide full service to the University. For example, an appointee may continue to be productive in research and/or creative activities, teaching, and service at a level that would support normal merit advancement, but may not be sufficiently productive at a level that would support promotion, advancement to Step VI, or advancement to Above Scale.
2. **Extenuating Circumstances**  
An appointee's failure to advance resulting from extenuating circumstances, such as the appointee's own illness, the illness of a family member, or other significant event outside of his or her control that impacted productivity and/or performance.
3. **Insufficient Contributions**  
In the absence of extenuating circumstances, an appointee's failure to advance resulting from contributions which are insufficient in quality and/or quantity to support normal advancement.

When an appointee is proposed for a consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose the reduction or elimination of a market off-scale salary component at the time of future range adjustment actions. See [\[Link to PPM 230-620\]](#).

In cases in which an appointee receives a second consecutive no change action due to insufficient contributions:

- The department chair, in consultation with the dean, must meet with the appointee to develop a plan to correct the deficiencies in the record contributing to the lack of advancement. This plan must be included in the next academic review file.
- The appointee is ineligible to defer a regularly scheduled review until deficiencies in the record are corrected and the appointee advances.

---

<sup>43</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. B. 2

<sup>44</sup> For appointees subject to APM 137, this applies only if the appointee is to be reappointed.

**PPM 230-220-88 - Procedure for Accelerated Advancement**

The general Rules of PPM 230-220-80/APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:

a. Criteria for Accelerated Advancement.

An appointee whose performance is at an exceptional level over a period may be considered for accelerated advancement. Exceptional performance is defined as work that significantly exceeds the normal departmental expectations in one or more of the areas of review: research and other creative activities, teaching, professional competence and activities, and university and public service. The candidate for acceleration must also meet the departmental criteria for advancement in every area of review. Acceleration proposals should not be made if there is any evident weakness in the case.

Acceleration proposals must address the department standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the candidate's performance is exceptional. In parallel with normal merit advancement progress, the criteria for both good and exceptional performance become more rigorous with rank and step.

1. Series requiring research and/or creative activity:

For series in which research and/or creative activity is among the performance criteria, above-average research and/or creative activity is a prerequisite to accelerated advancement.

2. Evidence that a candidate's productivity is double that which is expected for normal advancement in the review period is typically sufficient to demonstrate a candidate's performance is exceptional for purposes of a one-step acceleration. In cases in which research productivity is greater than that required for normal advancement, but falls short of twice the expected rate, extraordinary achievements in additional performance criteria are necessary to justify accelerated advancement.

An acceleration case based on exceptional productivity in research must be documented with evidence of the appointee's contributions and their impact using norms appropriate to the research field. The department recommendation should articulate the grounds for acceleration beyond simple numerical tabulation of papers and citations; for example, demonstration of the special impact of research, the quality of publications, the awarding of prizes or election to national or international learned academies.

b. Other series:

An acceleration proposal based primarily on the quality and quantity of contributions other than research and/or creative activity must contain documentation and evidence of these extraordinary achievements and of their impact characterizing their exceptional nature of effort and outcomes. Documentation substantiating the significant and extraordinary nature of the achievements and their impact is needed; for example, the awarding of prizes, exceptional service of significant duration and/or importance (not otherwise rewarded or compensated), or professional recognition of contributions.

c. Timing of Accelerated Advancement

Except in remarkable circumstances (such as in the case of the appointee's receipt of an extraordinary award during the review period, or in the case of a parallel retention review) accelerated advancement should be proposed only at the time of the regularly scheduled review.

Normally, the activities considered for acceleration pertain to the complete review period only. Acceleration proposals occurring before the normal time for a merit review are discouraged unless extraordinary circumstances, such as the awarding of a major prize or an off-cycle review due to retention, warrant their consideration.

Accelerations may also be proposed as part of a case for recalibration of rank and step at the time of career review; e.g., tenure, promotion, or advancement to Step VI. Such a case requires documentation of activity and impact spanning the expanded review period and must contain evidence supporting the case for acceleration.

Normally, either the candidate or the department will propose accelerated advancement. When a

candidate requests to be considered for acceleration, this must be stated in the departmental recommendation letter. In addition, any campus reviewer may propose acceleration and all subsequent campus reviewers must provide comment on this proposal with regard to these acceleration criteria.

d. General Considerations

- i. The previous award of bonus off-scale salary is immaterial to the consideration of any acceleration proposal.
- ii. Acceleration proposals based on unpublished work or work yet to be evaluated by scholarly review are inappropriate.
- iii. Acceleration is an inappropriate mechanism to address purely salary-related issues.
- iv. Promotion from the Assistant level to the Associate level, regardless of when proposed, is not considered an acceleration. Assistant-level appointees should be proposed for promotion whenever they are deemed ready for such advancement. However, a promotion to a higher-than-normal step at the Associate level is considered an acceleration.
- v. If an Associate Professor is promoted to Professor after two years at Step III, it is considered a normal promotion even if the individual has not spent six years as Associate Professor.
- vi. For Professors at Step IX and Above Scale, a merit advancement is an acceleration if it becomes effective after the individual has spent less than four years at the current step. There must be rare and compelling reasons for accelerated advancement to or as Professor, Above Scale, and departments must address the rare and compelling reasons when proposing such advancement.

**PPM 230-220-89 Procedure for Career Equity Review**<sup>45</sup>

A CER is available to Senate faculty members (excluding those at the LPSOE, Assistant, or Above Scale levels). A CER may be requested only once while the faculty member is at the Associate Professor level, once while at the Full Professor level prior to advancement to Professor, Step VI, and once after advancement to Professor, Step VI, prior to advancement to Above Scale.

The decision to initiate a CER rests solely with the faculty member, and may be initiated by the faculty member only at the time of his or her regular on-cycle academic review. A request for a CER must contain the specific rank and step desired and justification for the recalibration. Possible justification may include, but is not limited to, the following assessments: 1) the cumulative record warrants an acceleration, even though no one review period did; 2) the rank/step was low at the time of initial appointment; 3) particular work and contributions should be reevaluated by the department and/or other reviewing bodies.

The CER is conducted in parallel with the regularly scheduled academic review. The department chair should compile an academic review file that addresses the appointee's entire academic record for the purposes of the CER, as well as the regular action for the current review period. 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 department must seek external referee letters addressing the barrier step advancement for inclusion in the file.

If recalibration is approved, the effective date will be the same as that which would have applied to the regular action.

CERs are intended to supplement regular academic reviews, and they neither replace nor affect existing procedures for regular reviews.

The Executive Vice Chancellor's decision on the CER is not subject to appeal and is not retroactive.

**PPM 230-220-96 Reports**

APM 230-96

---

<sup>45</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. C



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-230-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 (**3/13/2017 DRAFT**)

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 (**TARGET**)

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Visiting Appointments

#### PPM 230-230-4 Definition and Policy

APM 230-4

#### PPM 230-230-10 Criteria<sup>1</sup>

The criteria for evaluation of a candidate for appointment with a Visiting title shall be the same as for the corresponding regular title. Because the appointment is temporary, reasonable flexibility may be employed in the application of these criteria. Care should be taken to inform the appointee of the provisions of Section 230-4-d.

The departmental recommendation letter should describe clearly the special expertise that the visitor brings to the campus and should clearly state that the individual will be returning to the home institution upon completion of the visiting appointment.

#### PPM 230-230-14 Eligibility

APM 205-14

#### PPM 230-230-16 Restrictions

APM 205-16

#### PPM 230-230-17 Terms of Service

Each appointment or reappointment with a Visiting title shall be for a specified term not to exceed one year. The total period of consecutive service with a Visiting title shall not exceed two years, unless a longer period is approved by the Chancellor. The combined initial period of service in the Acting or Visiting Assistant Professor title and the Assistant Professor title should not exceed two years.

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.

#### PPM 230-230-18 Salary

##### PPM 230-230-18. a

Salaries for visitors are not restricted to the published salary scale.<sup>2</sup> The salary of an appointee with a Visiting title shall be determined according to the special circumstances of the case, with due consideration given to the individual's regular salary or professional income. In some cases, it will be appropriate to separate considerations of rank from those of salary. Although no steps are assigned to Visiting appointees, the departmental recommendation letter must justify the salary level recommended.<sup>3</sup>

##### PPM 230-230-18. b

Since the negotiated salary for an appointment to a Visiting title may take into account certain

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. V N

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. V. E. 2

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. V N

relocation expenses, it should not necessarily be regarded as the appropriate salary for any subsequent regular appointment. (Relocation expenses are not the same as travel expenses; for travel expense reimbursement to a Visiting appointee, see the provisions of APM - 230-20-h.) The salary paid may not include travel expenses but may include an amount to cover relocation expenses if the department chair and the respective Dean agree that University funding is available to cover such relocation expenses. Any relocation costs included in the salary must be justified in the departmental recommendation letter.<sup>4</sup>

APM 230-18.c  
APM 230-18. d

**PPM 230-230-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 230-20

**PPM 230-230-24 Academic File Review and Final Authority<sup>5</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-230-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-230-96 Reports**

APM 230-96

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. V. E. 2

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X





[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-235-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Acting Appointments

#### PPM 230-235-4 Definitions

**a. The “Acting” prefix will be accorded only to a person on a temporary appointment. The prefix thus will signify the conditional, probationary, or emergency status of the appointment, as well as the privilege and responsibility of conducting research, and will often be applied to a person under consideration for appointment to a regular professorial title.**

i. A probationary appointment in an Acting title is appropriate when a department or the appointing authority has reservations about recommending an individual for a regular professorship and wishes to observe the appointee's teaching or research for a one- or two-year probationary period. If the expressed doubts are removed, the person will be “regularized”—that is, proposed for a regular professorship—at the end of the probationary period.

ii. An Acting title in the Ladder-Rank series can be used for an individual who does not have an appropriate visa, or when an academic condition that would justify a regular Ladder-Rank appointment is lacking—i.e., the terminal degree of the field, such as the Ph.D. A conditional appointment is made with the intention of converting the Acting title to a regular title when the candidate acquires the requisite academic or immigration credential.

iii. When the Acting prefix is used to indicate the lack of the Ph.D. for an Assistant Professor candidate whom the department intends to transfer to the regular ranks Assistant Professor title, the appointment file proposing the Acting title must indicate clearly the department’s recommendation regarding regularization. A change to a regular appointment may be made upon receipt of official certification that an appointee has completed all formal degree requirements.

APM 235-4. b.

APM 235-4. c.

#### PPM 230-235-18 Salary

APM 235-18

#### PPM 230-235-20 Conditions of Employment<sup>1</sup>

APM 235-20. a

APM 235-20. b

APM 235-20. c

#### PPM 230-235-20 d

Acting appointments do not accord tenure or security of employment.

#### PPM 230-235-20 e

Assistant-level acting appointments do not convey membership in the Academic Senate.

#### PPM 230-235-20 f

Acting appointments are subject to APM 137, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment.

#### PPM 230-235-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII E. 1

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-235-25 Transfer to Regular Status**

**An Acting appointee may be transferred to a regular appointment at regular-scale salary provided the appointment has had appropriate Academic Senate review and approval of the Chancellor.**

APM 235-25. a

**PPM 230-235-25 b. When a change to a regular appointment is approved** for an academic-year appointee, **the change in title shall be effective with the beginning of the quarter following the date of completion of all formal degree requirements and the change in salary shall be effective at the beginning of the pay period for that quarter.** For a fiscal-year appointee, the change in title will be effective at the beginning of the month following the date of completion of all formal degree requirements.

**PPM 230-235-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-255-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Non-Salary Instructional Positions

#### PPM 230-255-4 Definitions

Occasionally, eminent scholars and scientists, either already appointed at UC San Diego or not affiliated with the University, are appointed to non-salaried instructional titles (e.g., non-salaried Lecturer or Adjunct Professor) to assist in the teaching of undergraduate and graduate students. Non-salaried instructional appointees do not assume full responsibility for a course. The series assigned to such appointees should be determined by the degree of teaching involvement as described in [policy](#) (See, [PPM 230-230](#), Visiting Appointments; [PPM 230-235](#), Acting Appointments; and [PPM 230-280](#), Adjunct Professor Series.)

When a research appointee whose full-time salary is administered by the University participates in an instructional program, s/he must be appointed in a salaried instructional title for formal instruction and/or significant participation. Appointees also may be appointed to and perform services under a non-salaried instructional title. For example, a non-salaried instructional title may be accorded for an occasional lecture or seminar dealing with the research being sponsored by the funding agency and is required for a researcher to supervise a doctoral thesis, provided the thesis is appropriate to the investigator's line of research.

Department chairs must ensure that the use of non-salaried instructional appointees is not abused. The departmental recommendation letter should clearly outline the type and amount of teaching the candidate will do, as well as the effectiveness of his or her teaching in any previous period of appointment.

#### PPM 230-255-10 Types

- a. Non-salaried instructional titles for individuals funded from sources not administered by the University (e.g., Salk Institute appointees)
- b. Non-salaried instructional titles for individuals whose full time salaries are administered by the University

#### PPM 230-255-16 Restrictions

For non-salaried instructional titles for individuals whose full time salaries are administered by the University:

- a. If an appointee is paid under another title from a federal contract or grant and participates in the instructional program under a non-salaried instructional title, the department chair must assure compliance with the University's contractual agreement with the funding agency.
- b. Under no circumstances should appointees paid entirely from federal funds be permitted to be officers of instruction in regularly scheduled courses, unless they are paid from non-federal funds for the proportion of time spent on teaching. In such cases, the appointee should be appointed to a salaried instructional title and paid for the proportion of time spent on teaching. His or her salaried appointment will be reduced accordingly so that the total percentage does not exceed 100%. The occasional lecture or seminar, dealing with the research and creative activity being sponsored, is considered part of the normal research and creative process and should be encouraged.
- c. A federally funded appointee may supervise a doctoral thesis occasionally, provided the research topic is appropriate to the investigator's line of research. Such supervision is contingent upon the approval of

the department chair and the subsequent administrative approval of an appropriate instructional title for the investigator. In such cases, departments should consult the Office of Research Affairs to determine the necessity of a non-salaried lecturer appointment in order for an appointee to qualify to serve on a thesis committee.

d. It is appropriate for research personnel totally funded from federal sources to supervise the activities of Research Assistants or other students if the supervision is directly connected with the objectives of the contract.

**PPM 230-255-17 Terms of Service<sup>1</sup>**

- a. Non-salaried instructional titles  
For individuals funded from sources not administered by the University (e.g., Salk Institute appointees), an appointment may be made for a period of two or three years, depending on the appointee's rank (e.g., two years for the Assistant rank).

Appointment files should include the same documentation required for salaried appointees in the title or series.

- b. Non-salaried instructional titles for individuals whose full time salaries are administered by the University:

An appointment may be made for two to three years, corresponding to the appointment period in the appointee's salaried title. In such instances, only one academic review file should be submitted for both the appointment in the non-salaried instructional title and the recommendation for action in the salaried title. The departmental recommendation letter must evaluate the service in each area and clearly outline the type and amount of teaching the appointee will do.

**PPM 230-255-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-255-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. E. 7. d

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-270-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Professor of (e.g., *Psychology*) In Residence Series

#### PPM 230-270-4 Definition

**a** Titles in this series are assigned to academically qualified individuals who engage in teaching, research or other creative work, and University and public service to the same extent and at the same level of performance as those holding corresponding titles in the Professor series in the same department. For School of Medicine clinical appointments, this may also include patient-related care.<sup>1</sup>

Such assignments, however, shall be made only under conditions and restrictions (see APM - 270-16, 270-17, and 270-20) which serve to make a clear distinction between appointments in this series and appointments in the Professor series (defined in APM - 220). Professor in Residence titles are intended to be used for individuals supported by non-State funds.

#### PPM 230-270-8 Types of Appointments

APM 270-8

#### PPM 230-270-10 Criteria

APM 270-10

#### PPM 230-270-16 Restrictions

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

APM 270-16. a.

#### PPM 230-270-16. b. Limits on State Funding:

**Fifty percent or more of the base salary of the appointee shall come from funds other than General (State) funds;** at UC San Diego, 100% funding from other than state sources is typically required<sup>2</sup>, **except that the Chancellor is authorized, under justifying circumstances, to fund more than 50 percent of the base salary from General (State) funds for a period normally not in excess of two years.**

If the salary of a Professor In Residence is fully funded from federal sources administered by the University, non federal funds should be provided to fund a portion of the salary during periods when that individual is significantly involved in teaching.<sup>3</sup>

APM 270-16. b

APM 270-16. c

#### PPM 230-270-16. d

**An initial appointment for less than full-time service with a title in this series may be authorized under appropriate circumstances, provided that the Chancellor specifically approves the arrangement as being in the best interests of the University. Such part-time appointments will ordinarily be limited to cases in which the professional commitment is to the University. In the rare case of a part-time appointment of an individual with a professional commitment other than the**

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. A. 2. a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. A. 2. f

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. A. 2. f

one to the University, the Chancellor must be assured that the appointee will fulfill all the obligations entailed in the University appointment. When an appointment for less than full-time service is approved, the University is not obligated to increase the percentage of time of the appointment, even if the appointee and the department should desire such an increase in the future. An initial part-time appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or subsequent promotion to one of these ranks on a part-time basis shall be subject to the provisions which apply in the case of a full-time appointment; and the appointee shall execute a memorandum of understanding agreeing that the tenure status and other benefits of the appointment as described below are limited to the specified percentage of time. The memorandum of understanding also shall specify expectations as to workload, productivity, reviews, and any other applicable conditions of the appointment. A copy of the memorandum of understanding should be included in the personnel review file. The memorandum of understanding shall be set forth in a letter from the Chancellor advising the individual that the part-time appointment is subject to the specific understanding that there are no implied rights to a full-time tenure appointment; and, further, that the rate at which credit for University service accrues for various University fringe and retirement benefits as well as related academic privileges will likewise be affected. The individual shall be asked to sign and return a copy of such letter to indicate consent. A voluntary permanent part-time appointment or a voluntary temporary reduction by an appointee in the percentage of time of the appointment shall be subject to the same restrictions stipulated above for an initial part-time appointment.... Membership and voting privileges in the Academic Senate for part-time appointees to this series are the same as for full-time appointees.

APM 270-16. e

**PPM 230-270-17 Terms of Service**

APM 270-17

**PPM 230-270-18 Salary**

APM 270-18

**PPM 230-270-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 270-20

**PPM 230-270-24 Authority<sup>4</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-270-80 Review Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-270-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Professor of (e.g., Psychology) in Residence**

APM 270-82

**PPM 230-270-83 Procedures for the Appraisal of an Assistant Professor of (e.g., Psychology) in Residence**

APM 270-83

**PPM 230-270-84 Procedures for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor of (e.g., Psychology) in Residence**

APM 270-84

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

**PPM 230-270-85 Procedures for Appointment or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor of (*e.g., Psychology*) in Residence or Professor of (*e.g., Psychology*) in Residence**

APM 270-85



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-275-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

#### Professor of Clinical X (e.g. *Medicine*) Series

#### PPM 230-275-4 Definition

Titles in this series are assigned to academically qualified individuals who are occupied full time in the service of the University, whose predominant responsibilities are in teaching and clinical service, and who also engage in creative activities. These *appointments* are reserved for salaried positions in the health sciences with the University and/or an affiliated hospital. For an exception to the requirement of full-time service, see APM - 275-16-a.

An appointee to a title in this series will normally carry a heavier load of teaching and/or clinical service than appointees in the regular Professor series or in the Professor in Residence series.

For more information on the Professor of Clinical X series, please see [PPM 230-275, Appendix A, Guidelines for the Professor of Clinical X \(e.g., Medicine\) Series](#), and [PPM 230-275, Appendix B, Guidelines for the Professor of Clinical X \(e.g., Pharmacy\) Series](#).

#### PPM 230-275-8 Types of Appointments<sup>1</sup>

a. Titles and (and ranks) in this series are:

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

(2) Associate Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine)

(3) Professor of Clinical X (e.g., Medicine)

APM 275-8. b

APM 275-8. c

APM 275-8. d

APM 275-8. e

#### PPM 230-275-10 Criteria

APM 275-10

#### PPM 230-275-16 Restrictions

APM 275-16. a

#### PPM 230-275-16. b Funding

Titles in this series are intended to be used for individuals supported by non-state funds.<sup>2</sup>

(1) On a campus where all appointees in this series have one-year appointments or less, funding may come from General (State) funds or from other sources. The use of State funds in this case does not involve any commitment of tenure or security of employment. The State money is a temporary funding source for one year or less, and may be renewed.

The Chancellor shall notify appointees on State funds of the above conditions and restrictions.

(2) Limits on State funding for campuses not covered by (1) above. On campuses not covered by (1) above, 50 percent or more of the base salary of the appointee shall come from funds other than General (State) funds, except that the Chancellor is authorized, under justifying circumstances, to fund more than 50 percent of the base salary from General (State) funds for a limited period of time. When an appointment in any title in this series is supported by General (State) funds for

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.3. b.

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.3. d



more than 50 percent time (0.5 FTE), the total period of such appointment, in combination with any other State funded appointments in those titles specified in APM - 133-0-b and -c, shall not exceed eight years. In other words, there is a cumulative eight-year limit on State funding on these particular campuses for an individual who holds any title or titles in this series, i.e., Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor of Clinical (e.g., *Medicine*).

APM 275-16. c

APM 275-16. d

APM 275-16. e

APM 275-16. f

APM 275-16. g

**PPM 230-275-17 Terms of Service**

APM 275-17

**PPM 230-275-18 Salary**

APM 275-18

**PPM 230-275-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 275-20

**PPM 230-275-24 Authority**<sup>3</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-275-80 Review Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-275-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*)**

APM 275-82

**PPM 230-275-83 Procedures for the Appraisal of an Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*)**

APM 275-83

**PPM 230-275-84 Procedures for Non-Reappointment of an Assistant Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*) for Academic Reasons**

APM 275-84

**PPM 230-275-85 Procedures for Appointment or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*) or Professor of Clinical X (e.g., *Medicine*)**

APM 275-85

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28 X



[Search](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-278-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series

#### PPM 230-278-4 Definition

##### PPM 230-278-4. a

Faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series are salaried appointees in the health sciences who teach, participate in patient care, and also <sup>1</sup>participate in University and/or public service and scholarly and/or creative activities.

Faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series teach the application of basic sciences and the mastery of clinical procedures in all areas concerned with the care of patients, including dentistry, medicine, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, psychology, veterinary medicine, the allied health professions, and other patient care professions.

The Health Sciences Clinical Professor series is separate from the volunteer Clinical Professor series, which is governed by APM - 279.

For more information on this series, please see PPM 230-278, Appendix A, Guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series.<sup>2</sup>

APM 278-4. b

APM 278-4. c

APM 278-4. d

#### PPM 230-278-8 Types of Appointment

APM 278-8

#### PPM 230-278-10 Criteria

A candidate in this series shall be evaluated using the criteria specified below. The criteria shall be appropriately weighted to take into account this series' primary emphasis on direct patient care services and clinical teaching. See APM - 210-6 and PPM 230-278, Appendix A, Guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series.

The criteria are:

- a. Professional competence and activity
- b. Teaching
- c. University and public service
- d. Scholarly and creative work

The departmental recommendation letter must provide a description of the proposed allocation of the candidate's time among the areas of activity. Candidates with part-time appointments are expected to demonstrate the same quality of performance as full-time appointees, but the amount of activity may be less.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 5.a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 5 a

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 5 c

These criteria and standards are set forth in **APM - 210-6, Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series** and PPM 230-278, Appendix A, Guidelines for the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series.

**PPM 230-278-16 Restrictions**

APM 278-16

**PPM 230-278-17 Terms of Service**

APM 278-17

**PPM 230-278-18 Salary**

APM 278-18

**PPM 230-278-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 278-20. a

APM 278-20. b

**PPM 230-278-20. c**

Faculty in this series must have a doctorate in a clinical discipline.<sup>4</sup> **Unless not required for the position, appointees in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series must possess and maintain an appropriate valid license and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or equivalent. Loss of license or active Medical Staff privileges will result in, at department discretion, reassignment of duties or termination of appointment for cause under APM - 150.**

APM 278-20. d

APM 278-20. e

APM 278-20. f

APM 278-20. g

APM 278-20. h

APM 278-20. i

APM 278-20. j

**PPM 230-278-24 Authority<sup>5</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-278-80 Review Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-278-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Health Sciences Clinical Professor**

**The general rules of APM 278-80 apply here. In addition:**

a. Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>6</sup>

When a non-Senate appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A 5.g

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 4

1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*  
If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.
2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*  
If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>7</sup>

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review of a Senate Faculty Member, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

1. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Non-reappointment<sup>8</sup>

If the department believes that an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

4. Notice of Non-Reappointment<sup>9</sup>

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

**PPM 230-278-83 Procedures for the Formal Appraisal of an Assistant Health Sciences Clinical Professor Who May Be a Candidate for Promotion**

An assistant-rank appointee in the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, or Professional Research (Research Scientist) series must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of his or her

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6.c

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 7

achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for academic appointees.

Departments may conduct appraisals for appointees in other non-Senate series if the department believes such an assessment would be valuable to the department and/or appointee.

**The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:**

a.1 The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with a reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.<sup>10</sup>

**No formal appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of an appraisal, the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.**

a.2<sup>11</sup>. The following factors should be evaluated, if appropriate for the series when conducting an appraisal:

- Published research and other completed creative activity, and potential for continued research and creative activity.
- teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

a.3 Appraisal Vote

An appraisal vote is not required for non-Senate appointees; however, departments and/or divisions may choose to establish voting procedures for non-Senate appraisals.

A department may form a departmental ad hoc committee in order to assess the appointee's achievements and activities.

The departmental recommendation letter should discuss the nature and extent of department consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result of a vote, if taken.

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees.

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E.

<sup>11</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 5. b



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-279-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Volunteer Clinical Professor Series

#### PPM 230-279-0 Policy

Appointees in the Clinical Professor series are community volunteer clinicians who teach the application of clinical and basic sciences in areas of patient care. These appointments constitute a valuable way to utilize the interest and expertise of practitioners from the community on a part-time unsalaried voluntary basis in the areas of teaching, patient care, and clinical research.

For an individual who is employed by the University as a staff physician or clinician or who holds a clinical appointment paid by an affiliated site, a concurrent without salary appointment should be made in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series (see APM - 278) not in the volunteer Clinical Professor series.

An appointment in the Clinical Professor, Voluntary series does not create an employment relationship with the University of California, San Diego.<sup>1</sup>

#### PPM 230-279-8 Types of Appointment

APM 279-8

#### PPM 230-279-10 Criteria

**An appointee must have** a doctorate in a clinical discipline. If required for the position, the candidate must possess and maintain an **appropriate** valid **license** and board certification<sup>2</sup> **to practice in his or her field** and active membership as a Medical Staff member, or the equivalent,<sup>3</sup> **and must contribute significantly to the clinical teaching program. The Chancellor shall establish campus guidelines that specify the minimum number of required hours per year; the number of minimum hours may vary in different schools or departments.**

Clinical competence and excellence in teaching will be the primary basis for appointment, reappointment, and promotion in this series. Clinical competence should be determined by primary verification of licenses, written peer recommendations from recent supervisors, National Practitioner Data Bank (NPDB) report (may be self-query by applicant), evidence of current medical malpractice insurance, chronology of employment with no unexplained gaps since completion of residency, and list of malpractice claims and suits in which the applicant has been involved with narrative description of the underlying allegations, facts and resolution of the complete case. If the individual has participated in professional organizations, University and community service, and/or research, a description of these activities should be included in the appointee's personnel file as part of the review material.

#### PPM 230-279-17 Terms of Service

APM 279-17

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.6.f

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.6.c

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.6. d

**PPM 230-279-20 Conditions of Employment**

An appointment in this series with a specified ending date expires by its own terms on that date. Written notice should be provided when the appointment is not renewed. It is within the University's sole discretion not to reappoint an individual. APM - 137, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment, does not apply.

An appointment may be terminated before the ending date for cause, such as failure to serve the required minimum number of hours, or when in the judgment of the Dean, upon the recommendation of the chair, there is no longer a need for the appointee's services or the conduct or performance of the appointee does not warrant continued appointment with the University. The Dean shall give the individual 30 (thirty) days written notice with a statement of the reason for the termination. APM - 145, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Layoff and Involuntary Reduction in Time, and APM - 150, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal, do not apply to appointees in this series.

An appointee may present a written complaint about his or her appointment or early termination of the appointment to the Chancellor for administrative review. A complaint must be filed within 30 (thirty) calendar days from the date on which the appointee knew, or could reasonably be expected to have known, of the event or action that gave rise to the complaint.<sup>4</sup> The Chancellor shall consult with the appropriate University official, such as the department Chair or Dean, and shall make a written response to the appointee. The written response shall normally be made within 90 days of the receipt of the complaint. APM - 140, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances, does not apply to appointees in this series.

**PPM 230-279-24 Authority<sup>5</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 279-75 University Defense and Indemnification**

APM 279-75

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A.6.f

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-280-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Adjunct Professor Series

#### PPM 230-280-4 Definition

##### PPM 230-280-4. a

Titles in the Adjunct Professor series are assigned to academically qualified research or other creative personnel who contribute meaningfully to teaching either in formal courses or in guidance of graduate students.<sup>1</sup>

**Titles in this series may be assigned (1) to individuals who are predominantly engaged in research or other creative work and who participate in teaching, or (2) to individuals who contribute primarily to teaching and have a limited responsibility for research or other creative work; these individuals may be professional practitioners of appropriate distinction. Appointees with titles in this series also engage in University and public service consistent with their assignments.**

APM 280-4. b

APM 280-4. c

#### PPM 230-280-8 Types of Appointments

APM 280-8

#### PPM 230-280-10 Criteria

**A candidate for appointment or advancement in this series shall be judged by the four criteria specified below. Evaluation of the candidate with respect to these criteria shall take appropriately into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities and shall adjust accordingly the emphasis to be placed on each of the criteria. For example, a candidate may have a heavy workload in research and a relatively light workload in teaching.** The relative distribution of responsibilities among the four criteria may differ but must be clearly defined for each individual at the time of appointment. The departmental recommendation letter must document how the candidate will fulfill all criteria for appointment in this series.<sup>2</sup>

**The four criteria are:**

**a. Teaching**

**b. Research and creative work**

**c. Professional competence and activity**

**d. University and public service**

For appointments in which research is the primary activity, the candidate need not teach a formal course, however meaningful contributions to the graduate or undergraduate instructional program are required and the candidate's expected contributions in this area must be clearly articulated at the time of appointment. Clinical teaching may also satisfy the teaching requirement.

Flexibility is expected to be exercised in judging the character of research and creative work.

The productivity rate expected for advancement and promotion is proportionate to the percentage of appointment, and the relative distribution of responsibilities among the four review criteria as defined for the individual at the time of appointment.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.c



For Adjunct Professors whose appointments are primarily based on their professional distinction, the continuing value of their professional distinction to the University's teaching mission may be considered in the evaluation of an appointee's research and creative work.

In the Health Sciences, faculty at the Associate rank or above who have clinical responsibilities should be certified by one of the medical specialty boards or demonstrate equivalent achievement and recognition.<sup>3</sup>

#### **PPM 230-280-16 Restrictions**

##### **PPM 230-280-16. a**

**For appointments in which teaching is the main activity, it should be demonstrated clearly before appointment to the Adjunct Professor series that a "teaching only title" such as Lecturer is not appropriate (e.g., a faculty member who also has clinical responsibilities). If, during an appointment in the Adjunct Professor series, research and/or creative work cease to be a part of the appointee's duties, the individual should be considered for transfer to an instruction-only title.**

Similarly, if meaningful contributions to instructional responsibilities cease to be part of the appointee's duties,<sup>4</sup> **the individual should be considered for transfer to a research-only title. Clinical teaching may satisfy the teaching requirement.**

**If, during an appointment in the Adjunct Professor series, research ceases to be part of the appointee's duties, the individual should be considered for transfer to another academic title.**

APM 280-16. b

APM 280-16. c

APM 280-16. d

#### **PPM 230-280-17 Terms of Service**

APM 280-17. a

APM 280-17. a. (1)

##### **PPM 230-280-17. a. (2) Assistant Adjunct Professor**

**Each appointment and reappointment is limited to a maximum term of two years. The appointment may be made for a shorter term.**

##### **PPM 230-280-17. b**

**An appointment or reappointment to the title of Associate Adjunct Professor or Adjunct Professor should be proposed with a specified ending date.<sup>5</sup>**

**For an Associate Adjunct Professor (Steps I, II, III), each appointment is limited to a maximum term of two years. For an Associate Adjunct Professor (Steps IV and V) and for an Adjunct Professor, each appointment period is limited to a maximum term of three years. These appointments may be made for a shorter term.**

...

**Appointment or reappointment with no specified ending date (indefinite) may only be made when there is a reasonable expectation of long-term funding.** If the appointment is indefinite, academic review of the appointee must be conducted on a biennial or triennial basis corresponding to normal periods of service for the rank and step. Non-salaried appointments and reappointments in the Adjunct series must be made with a specified ending date.<sup>6</sup>

...

##### **PPM 230-280-17. c**

**Rules concerning effective dates of appointments are stipulated in APM - 200-17, except that an appointment period normally will coincide with the University's fiscal year of July 1 through June 30. The effective date of a promotion or merit increase is normally July 1. However, exceptions may be approved by the Chancellor, subject to the provisions of APM - 280-24-a (6) and (7).**

#### **PPM 230-280-18 Salary**

APM 280-18

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. V. C

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.d

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.e

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20.VII A. 4.e

## PPM 230-280-20 Conditions of Employment

APM 280-20

### PPM 230-280-24 Authority<sup>7</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

### PPM 230-280.80 Review Procedures

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

### PPM 230-280-81 Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment of an Adjunct Instructor

APM 280-81

### PPM 230-280-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Adjunct Professor

**The general rules of APM 280-80 apply here. In addition:**

APM 280-82. a

APM 280. 82. b

APM 280-82. c

#### **PPM 230-280-82. d**

#### a. Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>8</sup>

When a non-Senate appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

##### 1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

##### 2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

#### c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>9</sup>

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

##### 1. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 4

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6

or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Non-reappointment<sup>10</sup>

If the department believes that an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

4. Notice of Non-Reappointment<sup>11</sup>

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

**PPM 230-280-83 Procedures for the Formal Appraisal of an Assistant Adjunct Professor Who May Be a Candidate for Promotion**

An assistant-rank appointee in the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, or Professional Research (Research Scientist) series must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of his or her achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for academic appointees.

Departments may conduct appraisals for appointees in other non-Senate series if the department believes such an assessment would be valuable to the department and/or appointee.

**The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:**

a. 1. The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with a reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file..<sup>12</sup>

**No formal appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of an appraisal, the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.**

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6.c

<sup>11</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 7

<sup>12</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E.

a.2<sup>13</sup>. The following factors should be evaluated, if appropriate for the series when conducting an appraisal:

- Published research and other completed creative activity, and potential for continued research and creative activity.
- teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

### a.3. Appraisal Vote

An appraisal vote is not required for non-Senate appointees; however, departments and/or divisions may choose to establish voting procedures for non-Senate appraisals.

A department may form a departmental ad hoc committee in order to assess the appointee's achievements and activities.

The departmental recommendation letter should discuss the nature and extent of department consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result of a vote, if taken.

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees.

### **PPM 230-280-84 Procedures for Non-Reappointment for Academic Reasons of an Assistant Adjunct Professor Who Is a Candidate for Promotion**

APM 280-84

### **PPM 230-280-85 Procedures for Appointment or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Adjunct Professor or Adjunct Professor**

APM 280-85

---

<sup>13</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 5. b



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-281-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Professor of Practice Series

#### PPM 230-281-4 Definition<sup>1</sup>

a. Appointees in the Professor of Practice series are distinguished professionals, either practicing or retired, with specific expertise in their fields. Professors of Practice, though leaders in their fields, do not have traditional academic backgrounds.

Professors of Practice provide students and faculty additional opportunities to interact with and to benefit from the presence of experienced professionals who have distinguished practical accomplishments in their fields.

Professors of Practice primarily contribute to teaching and/or research programs by providing faculty, undergraduate students, and graduate students with a deeper understanding of the practical applications of a particular field of study, and help promote the integration of academic scholarship with practical experience. Professors of Practice teach courses, advise, and collaborate in areas directly related to their specific expertise and unique professional experience. Professors of Practice may also contribute to the less traditional research and scholarly mission of the University and/or provide service to the University based upon their practical professional experience.

Appointees in the Professor of Practice series may contribute predominantly to the University's instructional program, with lesser contributions to the University's research and/or creative programs; or, they may contribute primarily to the University's research and/or creative programs, and have limited responsibility in teaching. In all cases, however, successful reappointment and/or advancement in the Professor of Practice series is contingent upon documented contributions in all four criteria as listed above (professional competence and activity, teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service).

b.<sup>2</sup> The Visiting Professor of Practice title is used to designate one who is appointed temporarily to perform the duties of the Professor of Practice series, and who holds, is on leave from, or is retired from the professional position that is the basis for qualification in the series.

#### PPM 230-281-8 Types

a.<sup>3</sup> The titles (and ranks) in the Professor of Practice series at UC San Diego are:

- Professor of Practice
- Visiting Professor of Practice<sup>4</sup>

#### PPM 230-281-10 Criteria

a.<sup>5</sup> Criteria for appointment, advancement and reappointment in this series are:

- Professional competence and activity
- Excellent teaching contributions

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. a

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 9. a

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. b

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. b

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. c. and PPM 230-28. V. F

- Contributions to the research and/or creative mission of the University, with emphasis on professional practice and leadership contributions
- Service contributions

Evaluation of the candidate with respect to these criteria should take into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities, which must be clearly explained in the departmental or ORU recommendation letter.

The criteria for appointment as a Visiting Professor of Practice are the same as those for the regular Professor of Practice title.

**1. Professional competence and activity**

Professional competence and activity and exemplary professional practice and leadership in the field should be evaluated by comparison to peers in the field and with regard to the viewpoints, skills, and experience the appointee brings to the teaching mission (including research training). Credentials from practice should be established and documented, with emphasis on eminence, innovation, rigor, and depth.

2. Teaching of truly exceptional quality and so specialized in character that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by ladder-rank faculty members or by strictly temporary appointees. Appointees in the Professor of Practice series teach primarily at the graduate level. Instruction at the undergraduate level is permissible when an appointee's individual expertise and professional skills warrant such a teaching assignment; however, it is not expected that Professors of Practice teach core courses at the undergraduate level.

The teaching requirements may be satisfied by meaningful engagement in and significant contributions to the graduate or undergraduate instructional program, including efforts in the research and professional training of students, and/or the development and instruction of specialized courses.

At the time of appointment, the anticipated teaching contributions must be discussed in detail. Particularly, the program requirements addressed by the candidate should be explained, including why they are important to the quality of the UC San Diego program, how the candidate is unusually highly qualified to contribute this teaching, and how the area is unsuited to teaching by the tenured faculty, Lecturers with Security of Employment, or Lecturers (Unit 18).

3. Contributions to the research and/or creative mission of the University, with emphasis on professional practice and leadership contributions.

Candidates proposed for appointment in the series should have an eminent reputation for superior accomplishments and creative contributions within his or her field, and these should serve as the basis for a detailed discussion of the candidate's potential for contributions to the University's teaching and research/creative mission. The individual will normally have a leadership role in the field and/or in a relevant professional organization. The degree of his or her success achievement in practical endeavors must be described.

**4. Service contributions**

The appointee's potential service contributions to the department, the school, the campus, the University, and the public must be discussed in detail at the time of appointment. Service activities should be related to the candidate's professional expertise and achievement.

**b. Standards for Reappointment and/or Advancement**

At the time of review, the department must demonstrate that the appointee has maintained a significant presence in the department during all periods of active service. Active and meaningful participation and excellence with respect to the duties assigned upon appointment are essential for reappointment and eligibility for a merit increase. The department must fully document the appointee's contributions and demonstrate the quality of work performed and its impact on the department. A change of duties to a different mixture from those within the above categories may be requested as part of consideration for reappointment.

At the time of review, the department must demonstrate the appointee's continued trajectory of professional competence and activity, exemplary professional practice, and leadership in the field. The departmental recommendation letter must also provide a description of service activities and an analysis of the quality of this service, paying particular attention to that service which is directly related to

the appointee's professional expertise and achievement.

Professional activity, teaching, and creative contributions may differ from standard ladder-rank professorial activities, and can also be judged on the basis of professional competence, intellectual contribution, originality, and the total value of the appointee's engagement with the department. Evaluation of the candidate with respect to these criteria should take into account the nature of the University assignment of duties and responsibilities.

In all cases, however, successful reappointment and/or advancement in the Professor of Practice series is contingent upon documented contributions in all four criteria as listed above (professional competence and activity, teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service).

### **PPM 230-281-16 Restrictions**

#### a.<sup>6</sup> Professor of Practice

1. Appointments in the Professor of Practice series must be supported by non-state funds.
2. The number of Professors of Practice within a department cannot exceed one eighth of the number of ladder-rank faculty. Likewise, the number of Professors of Practice within a division or ORU cannot exceed one-eighth of the number of ladder-rank faculty.
3. Salaried Professors of Practice are subject to the restrictions set forth in APM 025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members.

#### b.<sup>7</sup> Visiting Professor of Practice

1. Visiting titles at UC San Diego are not intended for candidates who are under consideration for or whom the department plans to propose for a permanent appointment
2. If an academic appointee with a Visiting Professor of Practice title is later considered for transfer to the regular Professor of Practice title, the proposal for such transfer should be treated as a new appointment subject to full customary review.

### **PPM 230-281-17 Terms of Service**

#### a.<sup>8</sup> Professor of Practice

1. Appointment or reappointment in the Professor of Practice series must have a specified ending date.
2. An appointment or reappointment as Professor of Practice may be for a period not to exceed three years, normally ending on the third June 30 following the date of appointment or reappointment. Appointment or reappointment may be for a shorter duration.
3. Faculty in the Professor of Practice series may serve full time or part time, and with or without salary. Salaried Professors of Practice may be appointed up to 100% time, but are normally appointed at 50% time or less. If appointed at 100% time, it is expected that the appointee's full professional commitment will be to the University.
4. A Professor of Practice appointed at greater than 50% time may serve a maximum of six consecutive years in the series.

#### b.<sup>9</sup> Visiting Professor of Practice

Visiting Professor of Practice appointments may be made for a period of up to one year. The total period of service as Visiting Professor of Practice may not exceed two consecutive years

### **PPM 230-281-18 Salary**

a. The salary paid to a Professor of Practice or Visiting Professor of Practice will be at a negotiated annual rate based upon, but not necessarily equivalent to, the appointee's professional income, and consistent with the service rendered. The departmental recommendation letter must clearly justify the salary level recommended.

The minimum pay level for the Professor of Practice series is no less than that of Professor, Step I. The full range of allowable salaries for appointees in the Professor of Practice series is listed in Table 50 of the Academic Salary Scales located on the Academic Personnel Services Web Site.

---

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. d

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 9. c

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. e

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 9. d

b. Salary Increases

1.<sup>10</sup> Professor of Practice

Upon successful performance as Professor of Practice, the appointee will be eligible for a standard salary increase of 5% of the current salary.

2.<sup>11</sup> Visiting Professor of Practice

Salaries paid to appointees in the Visiting Professor of Practice title are fixed and not subject to adjustment by any general increase that may be approved by the Regents of the University of California.

**PPM 230-281-20 Conditions of Employment<sup>12</sup>**

a. This series does not accord tenure or security of employment.

b. This series does not convey membership in the Academic Senate.

c. Appointees in this series are subject to APM 137, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment.

d. Appointees in this series are not eligible for sabbatical leave; however, appointees not in Visiting titles are eligible for leave with pay in accordance with APM 758 Other Leaves with Pay.

**PPM 230-281-24 Authority<sup>13</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-281-80 Recommendation and Review: General Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. F

<sup>11</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. f

<sup>12</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 8. g

<sup>13</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X





# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-283-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Series

#### **PPM 230-283-0 Policy**

APM 283-0

#### **PPM 230-283-2 Purpose**

APM 283-2

#### **PPM 230-283-14 Eligibility**

The terms and conditions of appointment in the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer series are covered by a [Memorandum of Understanding \(MOU\)](#) entered into by the Regents of the University of California and the University Council, American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT).

#### **PPM 230-283-16 Restrictions**

APM 283-16

#### **PPM 230-283-18 Salary**

APM 283-18

#### **PPM 230-283-20 Terms and Conditions of Employment**

APM 283-20

#### **PPM 230-283-24 Academic File Review and Final Authority<sup>1</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-281-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

### Section: 230-285-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Lecturer with Security of Employment (Teaching Professor) Series

#### PPM 230-285-0 Policy

APM 285-0

#### PPM 230-285-4 Definition

APM 285-4. a

APM 285-4. b

#### PPM 230-285. c

Appointees in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series may use the working title “Teaching Professor,” as indicated in [PPM 230-285-8. a](#), below.<sup>1</sup>

#### PPM 230-285-8 Titles<sup>2</sup>

##### PPM 230-285-8 a.

Titles in the Lecturer with Security of Employment series are:

- (1) Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (LPSOE) (Assistant Teaching Professor)
- (2) Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (LPSOE) (Assistant Teaching Professor)
- (3) Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) (Associate Teaching Professor)
- (4) Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (Senior LSOE) (Teaching Professor)

Lecturer PSOE and Senior Lecturer PSOE positions are “security of employment–track” positions in the same way that the Assistant Professor position is a “tenure-track” position.

APM 285-8. b

APM 285-8. c

#### PPM 230-285-10 Criteria

##### PPM 230-285-10 a.<sup>3</sup>

**A candidate for appointment, merit increase, or promotion in this series shall be judged by the following criteria:**

- **Teaching**, of truly exceptional quality and so specialized in character that it cannot be done with equal effectiveness by Professor (Ladder-Rank)
- **Professional achievement and activity**; an appointee in the LSOE series is expected to maintain currency in the profession and pedagogy
- **University and public service.**
- Educational leadership beyond the campus and contributions to instruction-related activities (i.e., conducting TA training, supervision of student affairs, development of instructional materials/multimedia)

The departmental recommendation letter should state what the candidate's teaching load will be and how it compares with the normal load for professors in the department.

**Criteria for examining achievement in these areas are set forth in [PPM 230-210-3, Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of](#)**

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. A and PPM 230-28. V. G

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. b

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. C and PPM 230-28. V. G

**Employment (SOE) Series.**

**PPM 230-285-10. b<sup>4</sup>**

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

An appointee holding the title Lecturer PSOE or Senior Lecturer PSOE is eligible for reappointment, merit increase, and promotion. Decisions about reappointment, merit increase, and promotion of the appointee are based on careful reviews of the appointee's progress, promise, and achievement, and may be affected by fiscal and programmatic considerations.

For merit advancements, there should be evidence of the professional achievement required for an equivalent salary in the Professor series.<sup>5</sup>

APM 285-10. c

APM 285-10. d

APM 285-10. e

**PPM 230-285-16 Restrictions**

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

**a. Normally an appointment to this series is for full-time service to the University;** however, an appointment must be at least 51% time.<sup>6</sup>

APM 285-16. b

APM 285-16. c

APM 285-16. d

APM 285-16. e

**PPM 230-285-17 Terms of Service – Appointment Review**

The candidate's experience and record of accomplishment will determine the appropriate rank for appointment.

APM 285-17. a

APM 285-17. b

**PPM 230-285-18 Salary<sup>7</sup>**

**The Office of the President publishes a salary range for this series. The rate of advancement may be more variable, and in many cases slower, than for professorial positions.**

Salaries for Lecturer PSOEs will normally begin in a range approximately equivalent to that for Assistant Professors, with academic review occurring every two years. The salary for a Senior Lecturer PSOE must be equal to or above that of a Professor, Step I.

Salaries for Lecturer SOEs normally begin in a range approximately equivalent to that for Associate Professors, with academic review occurring every two years. If a Lecturer SOE is being paid at a level equivalent to the salary of a Professor, the academic review will occur every three or four years.

Advancement of an LSOE to a salary level equivalent to that of Professor, Step VI, may be granted on evidence of great distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in the areas of professional achievement and educational leadership, teaching, and University and public service.

**The period of service in the rank of Lecturer SOE may be of indefinite duration. Promotion to Senior Lecturer SOE is not normally expected, but may occur when warranted. Review for promotion to the Senior Lecturer SOE title will normally occur only after a minimum of six years in title of Lecturer SOE.**

---

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. c

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-28. V. G

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. d

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. F and PPM 230-28. V. G

Senior Lecturer SOE titles should be paid at a level no less than Professor, Step I. Normally, an appointee shall be reviewed every three years for a merit increase, until the salary is equivalent to that of Professor Step V. Service at that level and higher may be of indefinite duration, and review for advancement will not usually occur after less than four years.

**Senior Lecturers SOE of the highest distinction, whose work has been nationally or internationally acclaimed**, and who demonstrate a level of distinction equivalent to that required of Distinguished Professors in the areas of professional achievement and educational leadership, teaching, and University and public service **are eligible for salaries above the top of the range**. In these cases, the departmental recommendation letter must provide an analysis of the candidate's achievements throughout his or her career and evidence of work of great distinction. Mere length of service and continued good performance at the top of the salary range are not a justification for further salary advancement. The academic review file must reflect a critical career review.

Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement to a base salary above the top of the salary range should not occur after less than four years at the top of the salary range. Further, acceleration to this high level should be a rare event requiring evidence of extraordinary performance beyond the already exceptional standard required for advancement to the top of the range.

Files proposing a full merit advancement to a base salary above the top of the salary range, or a full merit advancement further above the top of the salary range, must demonstrate exemplary performance in all areas (teaching, service, educational development and professional competence and activity).

The honorary title "Distinguished Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment" may be conferred upon Senior LSOEs with a salary above the top of the range who demonstrate a level of distinction equivalent to that required of Distinguished Professors.

#### **PPM 230-285-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 285-20. a

APM 285-20. b

APM 285-20. c

#### **PPM 230-285-20. d.**

**Since appointment to a title in this series does not imply the responsibility of engaging in research, an appointee will be assigned a heavier instructional load than that of an appointee in the regular professorial series.**- The departmental recommendation letter should state what the candidate's teaching load will be and how it compares with the normal load for professors in the department.<sup>8</sup>

APM 285-20. e

APM 285-20. f

#### **PPM 230-285-20. g<sup>9</sup>**

A candidate for appointment to this series must possess a Ph.D. degree or equivalent.

#### **PPM 230-285-24 Authority to Approve Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions<sup>10</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-285-80 Review Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

#### **PPM 230-285-95 Letters of Invitation and Notification**

APM 285-95

---

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. c

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. A. 7. g

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-289-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

#### Guest Lecturers *(Including Lecturers, Miscellaneous Part-Time)*

##### PPM 230-289-4 Definitions

Individuals who will participate in the instructional program for a short period of time (i.e., two weeks or less in a quarter) and do not have full or partial responsibility for a course may be eligible for payment as Guest Lecturers. These are individuals who do not hold titles with the University but who are brought to the University for their expertise in given subjects.<sup>1</sup>

The Lecturer, Miscellaneous Part-Time title is appropriate for individuals who are being proposed to teach a course or courses for more than two weeks in a quarter, but less than a full quarter, who do not hold a title with the University, who are brought to the University for their expertise in a given subject, and who are paid a "By Agreement" (BYA) salary.<sup>2</sup>

##### PPM 230-289-6 Responsibility

APM 289-6

##### PPM 230-289-8 Types of Appointment

APM 289-8

##### PPM 230-289-24 Authority<sup>3</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

##### PPM 230-289-80 Procedures

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. E.5

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20.VII. A. 10

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-290-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Regents' Professors and Regents' Lecturers

#### **PPM 230-290-0 Policy**

APM 290-0

#### **PPM 230-290-1 Terms**

APM 290-1

#### **PPM 230-290-4 Definitions**

APM 290-4

#### **PPM 230-290-6 Responsibility**

APM 290-6

#### **PPM 230-290-8 Types of Appointment**

APM 290-8

#### **PPM 230-290-10 Criteria**

APM 290-10

#### **PPM 230-290-16 Limitations**

APM 290-16.

#### **PPM 230-290-17 Terms of Service**

APM 290-17

#### **PPM 230-290-18 - Compensation**

APM 290-18

#### **PPM 230-290-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 290-20

#### **PPM 230-290-24 Authority<sup>1</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-310-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

#### Professional Research (Research Scientist) Series

#### PPM 230-310-4 Definition

**a. The Professional Research series is 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.** Appointees in the Professional Research series (referred to as the Research Scientist series at UC San Diego) function as independent investigators, have complete responsibility for their research programs, and are leaders or have the potential for leadership in their fields. The ability to sustain an independent research program is a necessary but not sufficient criterion for appointment as a Research Scientist. **Appointees with Professional Research titles do not have teaching responsibilities.**

**b. Appointees can with campus approval be Principal Investigators and have the major responsibility and leadership for their research programs.**

**Appointments in this series may also be made to individuals who are not Principal Investigators, if they meet the research qualifications and demonstrate the accomplishment and the independence of research equivalent to that required for the Professorial ranks. For example, these individuals may be funded from a large center or collaborative program grant on which many independent investigators are working, or they may hold a Visiting title.** Assistant Research Scientists also may be funded as Co-Principal Investigators on grants. They should demonstrate strong potential to become independent and distinguished researchers and should work independently on grants.

**The ability to secure independent funding does not automatically qualify individuals for appointment to the Professional Research series.**

APM 310-4. c

APM 310-4. d

#### PPM 230-310-8 Types of Appointments

APM 310-8

#### PPM 230-310-10 Criteria

APM 310-10. a – Research

APM 310-10. b – Professional Competence and Activity

**PPM 230-310-10. c<sup>1</sup> – University and/or Public Service**

**An Assistant Research (e.g., Physicist) is not required to participate in service activities. An Associate Research (e.g., Physicist) and a Research (e.g., Physicist) are expected to engage in University and/or public service, within the constraints of the applicable funding source(s). This service requirement may be interpreted flexibly; service activities should be focused on the professional development of the appointee, such as service on research review boards.** If there are limitations on potential service contributions due to constraints imposed by a funding source, this should be discussed.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 1

**An appointee in this series must demonstrate continuous and effective engagement in independent and creative research activity of high quality and significance, equivalent to that expected of the Professor series. Proposed merit increases and promotions in the Professional Research series shall be reviewed with the same rigor accorded to proposed merits and promotions in the Professor series. See APM - 210-1.**

#### **PPM 230-310-16 Restrictions**

##### **PPM 230-310-16. a<sup>2</sup>**

A Research Scientist funded entirely from extramural funds is not permitted to be an officer of instruction in a regularly scheduled course. In order to engage in formal instruction and/or significant participation in the instructional program, the individual must be appointed in a salaried instructional title paid from state funds for the proportion of time spent on teaching. The combined percentage of appointment cannot exceed 100%.

Appointees also may be appointed to and perform services in a non-salaried instructional title. For example, a non-salaried instructional title may be accorded for an occasional lecture or seminar dealing with the research being sponsored by the funding agency. A non-salaried instructional title also is required for a Research Scientist to supervise a doctoral thesis, and the thesis should be related to the investigator's line of research.

Appointees totally funded from extramural sources may also supervise the activities of Research Assistants or other students if the supervision is directly connected with the objectives of the grant award.  
APM 310-16. b

##### **PPM 230-310-16. c<sup>3</sup>**

A registered student or candidate for a degree at UC San Diego or another campus of the University of California is not eligible for appointment in the Research Scientist series.

#### **PPM 230-310-17 Terms of Service<sup>4</sup>**

APM 310-17. a

##### **PPM 230-310-17. b**

**An appointment or reappointment to the title of Associate Research (e.g., Physicist) or Research (e.g., Physicist) should be proposed with a specified ending date. For written notification, see APM - 137-17.**

**Appointment or reappointment with no specified ending date (indefinite) may only be made when there is a reasonable expectation of long-term funding.**

Non-salaried appointments and reappointments in the Research Scientist series must be proposed with specified ending dates.

**The appointee shall be notified in writing that the appointment does not carry either tenure or security of employment.**

**For provisions concerning termination see APM - 310-20-c.**

##### **PPM 230-310-17. c<sup>5</sup>**

**There is an eight-year limit for an appointee who holds the Assistant Research Scientist title, either in that title alone or when combined with an Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist, or Visiting Assistant Research Scientist title, with or without salary on any campus of the University of California. The Chancellor may grant an exception to the eight-year limitation of service.<sup>6</sup>**

APM 310-17. d

APM 310-17. e

##### **PPM 230-310-17. f**

Research Scientists are to be provided use of space and facilities during their appointment periods. Space should be made available in accordance with departmental or ORU guidelines used to assign research space. The assignment of permanent space is not required.

#### **PPM 230-310-18 Salary**

---

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B.1

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B.1. d

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B.1. e

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. V. D.1. c

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-20. V. D, Table 4



#### **PPM 230-310-18 a**

##### **Authorized salary scales are issued by the Office of the President.**

New appointees are normally paid at the minimum salary rate for the rank to which they are appointed. Salary increases are based on merit. The normal period of service prescribed for each salary level does not preclude more rapid advancement in cases of exceptional merit, nor does it preclude less rapid advancement.

Research Scientists of the highest distinction, whose work has been nationally or internationally acclaimed, may be appointed with salaries above the top of the salary scale. The honorary title “Distinguished Research Scientist” may be conferred upon Research Scientists with a salary above the top of salary scale who demonstrate a level of distinction equivalent to that required of Distinguished Professors.

APM 310-18. b

#### **PPM 230-310-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 310-20

#### **PPM 230-310-24 Authority<sup>7</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-310-80 Recommendation and Review**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

#### **PPM 230-310-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Research Scientist**

**The general rules of APM 310-80 apply here. In addition:**

##### **a. Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>8</sup>**

When a non-Senate appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

##### **1. Reappointment with Merit Advancement**

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

##### **2. Reappointment without Merit Advancement**

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

##### **c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>9</sup>**

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the

---

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 4

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6

assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review of a Senate Faculty Member, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

1. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Non-reappointment<sup>10</sup>

If the department believes that an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

4. Notice of Non-Reappointment<sup>11</sup>

Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

**PPM 230-310-83 Procedure of Appraisal of an Assistant Research Scientist Who May Be a Candidate for Promotion**

An assistant-rank appointee in the Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, or Professional Research (Research Scientist) series must receive an appraisal, which is a formal evaluation of his or her achievements and progress toward promotion. The appraisal also identifies appointees whose records of performance and achievement are below the level of excellence expected for academic appointees.

Departments may conduct appraisals for appointees in other non-Senate series if the department believes such an assessment would be valuable to the department and/or appointee.

**The general rules of APM 220-80 apply here. In addition:**

a.1 The appraisal is conducted in an appointee's fourth year of service at the Assistant rank (and is combined with the second reappointment/merit review), except when an extension of the probationary period has been granted. If the appraisal is not combined with a reappointment/merit review, the appraisal must be presented in a separate academic review file.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6.c

<sup>11</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 7

<sup>12</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E.

**No formal appraisal is required if, prior to the normal occurrence of an appraisal, the Assistant Professor is being recommended for promotion to take effect within a year, has given written notice of resignation, or has been given written notice of non-reappointment.**

a.2<sup>13</sup>. The following factors should be evaluated, if appropriate for the series when conducting an appraisal:

- Published research and other completed creative activity, and potential for continued research and creative activity.
- teaching effectiveness at the undergraduate and graduate levels
- Departmental, University and community service contributions.
- Expertise and achievement in clinical activities, if applicable
- An appointee's self-evaluation (if any)

a.3 Appraisal Vote

An appraisal vote is not required for non-Senate appointees; however, departments and/or divisions may choose to establish voting procedures for non-Senate appraisals.

A department may form a departmental ad hoc committee in order to assess the appointee's achievements and activities.

The departmental recommendation letter should discuss the nature and extent of department consultation on the appraisal, as well as the result of a vote, if taken.

If, as a result of the appraisal process, the department wishes to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full rank, the department must conduct a promotion review and solicit letters from external referees.

---

<sup>13</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 5. b



[Search](#) | [A-Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-311-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Project Scientist Series

#### PPM 230-311-4 Definition

APM 311-4. a

APM 311-4. b

APM 311-4. c

APM 311-4. d

APM 311-4. e

#### PPM 230-311-4. f<sup>1</sup>

**An appointee in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series may not serve as a Principal Investigator but may serve as Co-Principal Investigators with members of the Professor or Research Scientist series.**

For Project Scientists who demonstrate strong potential for independent research, the Vice Chancellor for Research Affairs will consider requests from department chairs for exceptions to the Principal Investigator eligibility policy.

**Serving as a Principal Investigator is not required or expected for an appointment, merit increase, or promotion.**

**The designation as Principal Investigator does not in itself justify an appointment to the Professional Research series.**

APM 311-4. g

APM 311-4. h

#### PPM 230-311-8 Types of Appointments

APM 311-8

#### PPM 230-311-10 Criteria

APM 311-10

#### PPM 230-311-16 Restrictions

APM 311-16

#### PPM 230-311-17 Terms of Service<sup>2</sup>

**a. An appointment or reappointment in the Project (e.g., Scientist) series shall have a specified ending date. The appointee shall be advised in writing that the appointment is for a specific period and that the appointment ends at the specified date. See APM - 137.**

**When there is a reasonable expectation of long-term funding, the Chancellor, by exception, may make an appointment in the Associate Project (e.g., Scientist) and Project (e.g., Scientist) title with no specific ending date. The appointee shall be advised in writing that the appointment does not carry tenure or security of employment.**

Non-salaried appointments and reappointments in the Project Scientist series must be proposed with a specified ending date.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 2

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 2. e

Appointments and reappointments may have shorter terms than the maximums described below.

(1) An appointment or reappointment in the Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist) rank shall be for a period of two years or less. Ordinarily, appointees serve in the first four steps with the corresponding salary levels. Steps V and VI may be used in exceptional situations, with proper justification, consistent with campus practice. Service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step V, may be in lieu of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I, for which the published salary is slightly higher. Likewise, service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step VI, may be in lieu of service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step II.

When service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step V, is followed by service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step I, the normal period of combined service with both titles at the steps indicated is two years. The same normal two-year period of combined service applies when service at Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist), Step VI, is followed by service at Associate Project (e.g., Scientist), Step II.

For campuses that adopt an eight-year limitation of service, there is an eight-year limit for an appointee who holds the Assistant Project (e.g., Scientist) title, either in that title alone or when combined with Associate Project Scientist, Project Scientist, Assistant Research Scientist, Associate Research Scientist, Research Scientist, or Visiting Assistant Research Scientist title, with or without salary on any campus of the University of California.<sup>3</sup>

APM 311-17. a. (2)

APM 311-17. a. (3)

APM 311-17. b

**PPM 230-311-17. c**

Project Scientists normally will be provided use of research laboratory space by the faculty member(s) or Research Scientists with whom they are working. In unusual cases, department chairs may assign departmental space to Project Scientists.

**PPM 230-311-18 Salary<sup>4</sup>**

**Authorized salary scales are issued by the Office of the President.**

New appointees are normally paid at the minimum salary rate for the rank to which they are appointed. Salary increases are based on merit. The normal period of service prescribed for each salary level does not preclude more rapid advancement in cases of exceptional merit, nor does it preclude less rapid advancement.

**For off-scale salaries, see APM 620**

**PPM 230-311-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 311-20

**PPM 230-311-24 Authority<sup>5</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-311-80 Recommendation and Review**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-311-82 Procedures for Appointment or Reappointment to the Rank of Assistant Project Scientist**

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. V. D, Table 4

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 2. f

<sup>5</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

**The general rules of APM 311-80 apply here. In addition:**

a. Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>6</sup>

When a non-Senate appointee is scheduled for reappointment/merit review, the department should first determine whether reappointment is warranted. If the department does not wish to reappoint, then in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

If reappointment is warranted, the department must prepare a reappointment/merit review file with one of the following recommendations:

1. *Reappointment with Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance is satisfactory, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with merit advancement.

2. *Reappointment without Merit Advancement*

If an appointee's performance does not justify merit advancement, the department may recommend a two-year reappointment with no merit advancement.

c. Final Reappointment/Merit Review<sup>7</sup>

The third reappointment/merit review of an assistant-rank appointee normally occurs in the sixth year of appointment. Absent an extension of the probationary period or a prior deferral of an academic review, an appointee's third merit/reappointment review is the appointee's final merit/reappointment review at the assistant rank.

Three outcomes are possible in the final merit/reappointment review of a Senate Faculty Member, and the eligible faculty must vote on the proposed action.

1. Promotion is Recommended

If the department is convinced that an appointee's record meets or exceeds the University's expectations for promotion, the department may vote to recommend promotion to the Associate or Full level, effective the following July 1.

2. Postponement of Promotion Review is Recommended

If the department believes there is significant work in progress that cannot be completed in time to justify promotion, but which should be completed prior to the promotion review and, when completed, would likely suffice for promotion, the department may propose postponement of the promotion review.

The department must demonstrate that the appointee's academic record is strong and that he or she is making active and timely progress on substantial work that:

- should be completed prior to the promotion review (the anticipated completion date must be indicated); and
- would likely suffice for promotion.

If the department proposes postponement of the promotion review, a reappointment file (recommending a two-year reappointment with or without merit advancement) must be submitted in accordance with the campus deadline for submission of reappointment and merit advancement files.

3. Non-reappointment<sup>8</sup>

If the department believes that an appointee's overall career achievements do not justify promotion, and that a postponement of the promotion review is not warranted, no promotion file is prepared and the appointee will not be reappointed. In accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date. In cases of non-reappointment, the department chair should consult with the dean.

---

<sup>6</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 4

<sup>7</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6

<sup>8</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 6.c

If promotion is proposed and denied, or if the department does not propose promotion and/or reappointment, in accordance with APM 137, Non-Senate Appointees/Term Appointment, the appointment will expire on the established ending date.

4. Notice of Non-Reappointment<sup>9</sup>  
Although notice of non-reappointment is not normally required, the department should provide written notice of non-reappointment whenever possible.

---

<sup>9</sup> PPM 230-28.VII. E. 7



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-330-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Specialist Series

#### PPM 230-330-4 Definition<sup>1</sup>

The Specialist series is used for academic appointees who are engaged in any specialized research, professional activity, and University and/or public service and who do not have any formal teaching responsibilities. Specialists are expected to use their professional expertise to make scientific and scholarly contributions to the research enterprise of the University and to achieve recognition in the professional and scientific community. Specialists may participate in University and/or public service depending upon funding source and the duties required by the job description for the position.

The Specialist may work without direct supervision, but usually not independently. He or she provides a service to a supervisor, a group, or the institution. Specialists may not serve as Principal Investigators, but may serve as Co-Principal Investigators by exception and with a member of the Professor or Research Scientist series.

The Specialist series, the Specialist in the Agricultural Experiment Station, and the Specialist in the Scripps Institution of Oceanography are the same title series, differing in their source of funding. Specialists in the Agricultural Experiment Station must follow the guidelines for appointments in the Agricultural Experiment Station

#### PPM 230-330-8 Types

APM 330-8

#### PPM 230-330-10 Criteria

APM 330-10

#### PPM 230-330-11 Qualifications

APM 330-16

#### PPM 230-330-16 Restrictions

APM 330-16

#### PPM 230-330-18 Salary<sup>2</sup>

a. Individuals appointed to the Specialist series are compensated on the fiscal-year salary scales issued by the Office of the President for the Specialist series. New appointees are normally paid at the minimum salary rate for the rank to which they are appointed.

APM 330-18. b

APM 330-18. c

APM 330-18. d

#### PPM 230-330-20 Term of Employment

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 3

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 3.f



APM 330-20

**PPM 230-330-21 Conditions of Employment**

APM 330-21

**PPM 230-330-24 Academic File Review and Final Authority<sup>3</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-330-80 Recommendation and Review**

APM 330-80. a

APM 330-80. b

**PPM 230-330-80. c.<sup>4</sup>**

**Advancement to Above-Scale Advancement to Above-Scale status involves an overall career review and is reserved for only the most highly distinguished Specialists whose (1) work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact, (2) professional achievement is outstanding, and (3) service is highly meritorious. Advancement requires demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Step V was based.**

At UC San Diego, advancement to Specialist, Above Scale, is reserved for Specialists with records of outstanding, distinguished performance, judged in an arena substantially broader than the particular research groups with which they are associated. Testimonials from outstanding extramural research groups in the same or related fields will be necessary in order to document the level of performance required for advancement to Specialist, Above Scale. In some instances, advancement to the Above Scale level may be justified on the basis of the Specialist's publications, or on his or her own scientific, technical, or otherwise creative contributions (as compared to contributions to a group effort).

**Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur in less than four years at Step V; mere length of service and continued performance at Step V is not justification for further advancement. A further merit increase for an individual already serving at Above-Scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of distinguished achievement; continued performance is not an adequate justification. Only in the most superior cases with strong and compelling evidence will a further increase be approved at an interval shorter than four years.**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-28. V. K



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-340-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

#### Continuing Educator Series

#### PPM 230-340-4 Definition

APM 340-0

#### PPM 230-340-8 Levels

APM 340-8

#### PPM 230-340-10 Criteria for Appointment

APM 340-10

#### PPM 230-340-17 Terms of Service

APM 340-17

#### PPM 230-340-18 Salary

APM 340-18

#### PPM 230-340-20 Conditions of Employment

APM 340-20

#### PPM 230-340-24 Authority<sup>1</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-340-80 Procedures<sup>2</sup>

Information about the Continuing Educator and Coordinator of Public Programs series may be obtained from University Extension.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. C. 3.



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-355-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

### Non-Salary Research Positions

#### PPM 230-355-4 Definitions

APM 355-2

#### PPM 230-355-10 Criteria

APM 355-10

#### PPM 230-355-17 Terms of Service<sup>1</sup>

Appointments may be made for a maximum of three years and may be renewed following academic review. Appointment or reappointment period may be for a shorter term.

Post-retirement appointment must be for one year or less, but may be renewed following academic review.

#### PPM 230-355-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-355-80 - Procedures

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. E. 7. d

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

#### Section: 230-360-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 (3/13/2017 DRAFT)

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 (TARGET)

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

#### Librarian Series

#### PPM 230-360-4 Definition

APM 360-4

#### PPM 230-360-6 Responsibility

APM 360-6

#### PPM 230-360-8 Types

APM 360-8

#### PPM 230-360-9 Recruitment

APM 360-9

#### PPM 230-360-10 Criteria

#### PPM 230-360-14 Eligibility<sup>1</sup>

For those appointees in the Librarian series covered by the [Memorandum of Understanding](#) (MOU) entered into by the Regents of the University of California and University Council, American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT), the terms and conditions of appointment may be found in the MOU.<sup>2</sup>

#### PPM 230-360-16 Restrictions

APM 360-16

#### PPM 230-360-17 Terms of Service

APM 360-17

#### PPM 230-360-18 Salary

APM 360-18

#### PPM 230-360-20 Conditions of Employment

APM 360-20

#### PPM 230-360-24 Authority to Approve Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions<sup>3</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. V. L. 3

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII. C. 3

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

**PPM 230-360-35 Records**

APM 360-35

**PPM 230-360-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-360, Appendix A**

APM 360, Appendix A



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

### Section: 230-370-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 (3/13/2017 DRAFT)

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 (TARGET)

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Academic Administrator Series

### PPM 230-370-4 Definition

APM 370-4

### PPM 230-370-10 Criteria

APM 370-10

### PPM 230-370-11 Criteria for Evaluating Performance<sup>1</sup>

Materials submitted in support of an appointment, merit increase, or a change in level must provide a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications and performance in the areas specified below. A job description must be provided, along with an explanation of the candidate's role in the program and within a larger unit, if appropriate.

i. Administration and Management of Programs

Normally, the Academic Administrator will have primary responsibility for the administration of one or more programs and may have responsibility for directing the activities of support staff. Ordinarily, evidence of superior promise and/or performance in areas such as those listed below will be expected:

- Effective administration of the unit managed by the Academic Administrator
- Program planning and development
- Development of proposals for extramural funding of campus programs
- Assessment of program and constituency needs
- Implementation of innovative program changes
- Evaluation of program activities and functions
- Creativity and originality in program development and usage of resources
- Supervision and leadership of staff
- Serving as a liaison with other agencies and institutions in the public and private sectors

ii. Professional Competence

Academic Administrators must provide intellectual leadership in the roles of administrator and supervisor.

Appointees should show evidence of:

- Continued professional growth to update and upgrade competency
- Ability to relate effectively with academic faculty, departments, and counterparts in other campus units
- Ability to forecast changing program and constituency needs
- Scholarship (not required but may be submitted as evidence of professional competence)

iii. University and Public Service

Academic Administrators participate in the administration of their home units and the University through appropriate roles in governance and policy formulation. In addition, they may represent the University in both the public and private sectors.

The effective performance of their duties may require productive participation in intra unit, University, and community service, as well as appropriate representation of the University in the private corporate environment.

### PPM 230-370-12 Exceptions

APM 370-12

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. C. 1

**PPM 230-370-18 Salary**

APM 370-18

**PPM 230-370-19 Normal Periods of Service at Salary Steps<sup>2</sup>**

**a. Positions with an Academic Administrator title may be established for relatively short periods of time.** Appointments may be finite or indefinite; however, indefinite appointments can be made only when the appointment file documents availability of long-term funding.

APM 370-19. b

APM 370-19. c

**PPM 230-370-19. d<sup>3</sup>**

Recommendations for merits and advancements normally will be reviewed every second year until an appointee reaches the level of Academic Administrator IV, Step 5, after which review for merit advancement will take place every three years. Once the appointee reaches the level of Academic Administrator VI, Step 7.0, review for merit advancement will take place every four years. Service as Academic administrator VII, Step 8.0, may be of indefinite duration, and appointees at this step will be reviewed every four years for reappointment.

Formal review by the appropriate campus committee is required every six years. **A performance review, in the absence of a merit or promotion review, shall take place at least every four years.**

**PPM 230-370-20 Conditions of Employment**

APM 370-20

**PPM 230-370-22 Funds**

APM 370-22

**PPM 230-370-24 Authority<sup>4</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-370-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20, VII. C. 1. g

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. V. L

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

---

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

### Section: 230-375-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION Academic Coordinator Series

### PPM 230-375-4 Definition

APM 375-0

### PPM 230-375-8 Levels

APM 375-8

### PPM 230-375-10 Criteria for Appointment

APM 375-10

### PPM 230-375-11 Criteria for Evaluating Performance

APM 375-11

### PPM 230-375-12 Exceptions

APM 375-12

### PPM 230-375-18 Salary

APM 375-18

### PPM 230-375-19 Normal Periods of Service at Salary Steps<sup>1</sup>

**a. Appointments to an Academic Coordinator title may be for one year or less, for longer periods, and/or for an indefinite period;** however, indefinite appointments can be made only when the appointment file documents availability of long-term funding.

Regular appointments may not exceed a total of two consecutive appointments/reappointments without formal campus review.

Temporary appointments of Academic Coordinators may be made for up to a one-year period and may not exceed a total of two consecutive years without formal campus review.

APM 375-19. b

APM 375-19. c

APM 375-19. d

### PPM 230-375-20 Conditions of Employment

APM 375-20

### PPM 230-375-22 Funds

APM 375-22

### PPM 230-375-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20, VII. C. 2. g

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

**PPM 230-375-80 Procedures**

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

**PPM 230-375-80, Appendix A**

**APM 375-80, Appendix A**



# UC San Diego

## Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-500-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## RECRUITMENT

### General

#### PPM 230-500-0 Policy

APM 500-0

#### PPM 230-500-2 Purpose

APM 500-2

#### PPM 230-500-14 Eligibility

APM 500-14

#### PPM 230-500-16 Restrictions

APM 500-16. a

#### PPM 230-500-16 b<sup>1</sup>

**Special conditions must be observed before initiating negotiations with the prospective employee:**

**(1) Who is employed by another California institution (see APM - 501).**

Combined teaching appointments at the University of California and the California State University (CSU) may not exceed 120% of full time, except for University Extension service. That is, CSU faculty who are employed 100% time may be appointed at UC San Diego up to 20% time with written authorization by the appropriate dean at the CSU campus.

**(2) Who is employed on another University of California campus (See APM 510).**

APM 500-16. c

#### PPM 230-500-18 Salary

APM 500-18

#### PPM 230-500-20 Terms and Conditions of Employment

APM 500-20

#### PPM 230-500-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### PPM 230-500-80 Procedures

*[APS Appointment and Advancement Instructions]*

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. IV. B.1

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



# UC San Diego Policy & Procedure Manual

[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

## PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

### Section: 230-610-00

Effective: 07/01/2017 (3/13/2017 DRAFT)

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 (TARGET)

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

## SALARY ADMINISTRATION Salary Increases

### PPM 230-610-0 Policy

APM 610-0

### PPM 230-610-8 General Salary Increases

APM 610-8

### PPM 230-610-9 Merit and Promotion Increases<sup>1</sup>

APM 610-9

APM 610-9. a

APM 610-9. b

APM 610-9. c

APM 610-9. c (1)

APM 610-9. c (2)

#### **PPM 230-610-9. c (3)**

A fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period July 1 through January 1 will receive credit for one year of service at rank and step. A fiscal-year appointee who is appointed during the period January 2 through June 30 will not receive credit for that year's service at rank and step.

### PPM 230-610-14 Eligibility

APM 610-14

### PPM 230-610-24 Authority<sup>2</sup>

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

### PPM 230-610-96 Reports

APM 610-96

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-28. VII. A. 2

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X



[Search](#) | [A–Z Index](#) | [Numerical Index](#) | [Classification Guide](#) | [What's New](#)

### PERSONNEL-ACADEMIC

**Section: 230-620-00**

Effective: 07/01/2017 **(3/13/2017 DRAFT)**

Supersedes:

Review Date: 07/01/2020

Issuance Date: 07/01/2017 **(TARGET)**

Issuing Office: [Academic Personnel Services](#)

---

### SALARY ADMINISTRATION

#### Off-Scale Salaries for Appointments and Advancement

#### **PPM 230-620-0 Policy**

APM 620-0

#### **PPM 230-620-4 Definition**

APM 620-4

#### **PPM 230-620-14 Eligibility**

APM 620-14

#### **PPM 230-620-16 Restrictions**

APM 620-16

#### **PPM 230-620-18 Effect of a General Scale Adjustment on Off-Scale Salaries**

APM 620-18

#### **PPM 230-620-20 Terms and Conditions of Employment**

APM 620-20

#### **PPM 230-620-24 Authority<sup>1</sup>**

No appointment, reappointment or academic review action is final until there has been an academic review and the individual with final authority has approved the action.

The UC San Diego [Authority and Review Chart](#) sets forth the individual(s) and/or committees responsible for review, as well as the final authority for approval.

#### **PPM 230-620-80 Campus Procedures**

**The Chancellor or the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, in consultation with the appropriate committee(s) of the divisional Academic Senate, shall develop local procedures for implementation of the off-scale policy. Procedures shall include the criteria for appointment or advancement to a position with an off-scale salary, as well as for an appointee's continuation with an off-scale salary or return to an on-scale salary. When an individual is placed on an off-scale salary, the appointee must be notified of this action and any limitation.**

##### a. Bonus Off-Scale <sup>2</sup>

A bonus off-scale is a temporary increase in salary which is generally awarded in recognition of outstanding achievements exceeding what is required for normal merit advancement, but insufficient to support accelerated advancement. In limited circumstances, a bonus off-scale may be awarded in conjunction with a no change action, when an appointee's achievements in the review period demonstrate both full service to the University and progress in all series criteria, but fall short of what is required for advancement.

---

<sup>1</sup> PPM 230-20. VIII and PPM 230-28. X

<sup>2</sup> PPM 230-20. VII. B. 5

Bonus off-scale proposals must address the department's standards for normal merit advancement and articulate the manner in which the appointee's achievements warrant the award of a bonus off-scale salary component.

Bonus off-scales are equivalent to half of the amount of the salary increase associated with normal advancement to the next higher step (or equivalent in series without formal steps).

**b. Market Off-Scale<sup>3</sup>**

A market off-scale may be proposed when marketplace conditions necessitate such measures to keep UC San Diego salaries competitive.

1. Departments may propose a market off-scale salary component when a candidate has received a competing offer from a peer academic institution for appointment in a similar position, and/or is currently similarly employed by a peer institution. Departments should specifically address how the competing institution compares to UC San Diego and take this information into consideration when determining the proposed value of a market off-scale salary component. Whenever possible, departments should discuss the ranking of the department of the competing institution relative to their own ranking.
2. Market considerations within a specific discipline may also justify an off-scale salary. Supporting information may include salary data from academic institutions of comparable stature and/or discipline-based salary studies by national organizations.
3. In disciplines in which market demands consistently require the award of market off-scale salary components, departments may propose an entry-level market off-scale agreement to establish department-specific market off-scale salaries for new assistant-level appointees. The proposal should specify whether the entry-level market off-scale applies to the entire department or only to specific fields or disciplines within the department. Departments should include information regarding entry-level salaries in the field, such as:

- o Data provided by a professional society (or by an academic institution) of salaries at comparable academic departments
- o Salary data published in trade journals
- o Salary data from departments in other University of California campuses
- o Information received from chairs of departments of comparable ranking departments in other Universities
- o Competing offers reported by candidates for recent entry appointments in the department

Proposals are reviewed by the divisional dean and CAP prior to a final decision by the EVC.

Market off-scale salary components are typically maintained indefinitely and do not require rejustification following the initial award; however, when there is evidence that an academic appointee with a market off-scale salary component has failed to sustain his or her career trajectory or stature in the field, the department or subsequent reviewers may propose reduction or elimination of the market off-scale salary component.

When an appointee whose salary includes a market off-scale salary component advances to Above Scale, the market off-scale salary component is folded into the new above-scale salary.<sup>4</sup>

*[APS Review/Appointment Instructions]*

---

<sup>3</sup> PPM 230-28. B. 5

<sup>4</sup> PPM 230-28. B. 5