

Appraising Appraisals

From "News from Academic Personnel," Volume 1, issue 1, Spring 2007
http://www.apo.ucla.edu/docs/Newsletter_Spring07.pdf

During an Assistant Professor's fourth year of service, the department is required to conduct a formal appraisal. The purpose of the appraisal is to provide an early assessment of the likelihood that the individual will eventually qualify for promotion to Associate Professor. This is an extremely useful evaluation for Assistant Professors because it is the first opportunity for them to receive official feedback from other groups of faculty besides those in their department and their Dean. The Appraisal also can identify weaknesses or imbalances in their record to allow sufficient time for correction before coming up for promotion. It is important for Assistant Professors to understand that the appraisal is not intended to compromise or guarantee their eventual candidacy for Associate Professor and tenure. It is meant only to be a method to provide them with appropriate and official feedback.

There are three possible outcomes of the Appraisal: **Favorable** indicating that it appears likely that the individual will eventually qualify for promotion, **With Reservation** indicating that there is identified weakness or imbalance that appears to require correction

for the individual to qualify for promotion, and **Unfavorable** indicating that, based on the present evidence, it appears unlikely that the individual will qualify for promotion.

The criteria include teaching, research and creative work, professional activity, and University and public service. The standard of performance is "*superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and research or other creative achievement.*" A common reason for "With Reservation" and "Unfavorable" Appraisals is weakness in research productivity and/or quality. This can take a number of forms, such as too few publications, or research or creative activities that were not clearly identified as independent contributions. Another reason is that teaching did not meet a high standard. An imbalanced record means that too much time is devoted to one of the criteria for advancement, such as service and/or professional activity, compared to teaching and research and creative work. Typically, an "Unfavorable" Appraisal will result when these deficiencies are of such a nature that it seems unlikely that they can be remedied in the time remaining before promotion to Associate Professor.

A typical Appraisal process begins in the Assistant Professor's primary department with a review and a faculty

vote. The Assistant Professor receives feedback from the Chair after the departmental vote and has the opportunity to respond. The Chair communicates the results of the Appraisal to the Dean, who then sends it to the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP). CAP reviews the Appraisal and then makes a separate evaluation (which may or may not agree with the department's outcome). This is forwarded to the Dean. The Dean typically makes the final decision. The final result is communicated back to the Chair, who then provides feedback to the Assistant Professor.

Following the Appraisal, the Assistant Professor will typically have three years to address any concerns, weaknesses and/or imbalances uncovered by the Appraisal. **One little known fact** is that the Appraisal for Assistant Professors, while mandatory by the 4th year, may occur any time before the 4th year if requested by the individual or his/her department or Dean. This may be an option if the faculty member was an Assistant Professor at another university before coming to UCLA. In such a situation, although not required, an appraisal is recommended before being considered for promotion to Associate Professor, even if the latter occurs during the first four years at UCLA.

Self Statements

From “*News from Academic Personnel*,” Volume 1, issue 1, Spring 2007

http://www.apo.ucla.edu/docs/Newsletter_Spring07.pdf

Candidates for advancement at every level are encouraged to provide a statement explaining their goals and describing them within the context of their field of interest and the priorities of their Department. Such a statement can help the Chair, the Dean, a campus Review Committee, the Council on Academic Personnel, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel to better understand candidate’s career plans and goals for attaining them.

Writing such a statement can be a challenge – most of us don’t like to boast, and false modesty can be even more difficult. Here are some suggestions:

- Remember that the document will be read by multiple audiences, some of whom will not be familiar with your field of expertise. So make an effort to explain your accomplishments in words and concepts that can be understood by all. Try to emphasize the importance of the research, the major questions it addresses, and how it fits into a broader context.
- Be honest. None of us is perfect, and there are likely to be certain areas in which your accomplishments are stronger than others. A self statement that exaggerates accomplishments and brushes away weaknesses will be dismissed by reviewers. If you had a really dreadful semester of teaching, acknowledge that, explain why you think it was, and tell people what you think you learned from it. By the same token, if you think an apparently minor publication or award was important, explain why.
- Be brief. Although there is no limit, try to not exceed 3 pages.
- From among the publications that have appeared since your last CAP action (or a longer interval, if the action requires a career review), it is often helpful to choose up to 5, and explain their significance. Assistant Professors seeking promotion should consider the entire period at that rank, not just the time that has elapsed since the 4th year review.
- If you publish with co-authors, clarify your role in the work. This is especially important for individuals at the Assistant Professor level, since evidence of independence in research and creativity are important factors in decisions about promotion. Especially when the majority of publications also have your mentor as a co-author, there may be questions about independence.
- Address all the areas that are important for advancement: teaching, research and creativity, University and public service, and professional activity.
- Self-statements should be tailored to the specific academic action and deal with the issues that are specific to that action. For example, CAP’s decision to give a “Favorable” 4th year appraisal often rests on evidence that the candidate is achieving research independence and will receive peer reviewed funding (in disciplines where that is expected) in the next few years, prior to coming up for tenure. So address those issues. When a candidate is being considered for advancement to Professor VI (or Above Scale), the review not only considers the accomplishments of the entire career, but also ongoing and current activities over the years that have elapsed since advancement to Professor V (or IX). The candidate should provide convincing evidence for significant accomplishments over both time periods.

Merit Equity Reviews (MERs)

From “News from Academic Personnel,” Volume 2, issue 1, Fall 2007

http://www.apo.ucla.edu/docs/Newsletter_Fall07.pdf

The UC personnel system provides for the advancement of its ladder faculty through regularized academic reviews. Recently, a new review alternative – the Merit Equity Review (MER) – was added to provide a mechanism for ensuring that faculty members are at the appropriate rank and step consistent with their achievement.

This relatively new review option was introduced in July 2003, and the revised version, adopted in 2005, is detailed in Appendix 35 of The UCLA CALL (<http://www.apo.ucla.edu/call/append35.htm>). Here is a summary of the MER process.

- 1. Purpose of the Merit Equity Review.** A MER is intended to correct a documented and significant discrepancy between a faculty member’s current rank or step and a more appropriate rank or step consistent with the prevailing UC and UCLA standards as reflected in the status of his/her peers in the discipline. The purported discrepancy may be the result of a variety of factors, including initial appointment at an inappropriately low rank, uneven advancement practices in the department, or inappropriate evaluation standards. Alternatively, there may be no identifiable errors in past processes, but the faculty member may, nevertheless, be at a lower rank than appropriate. The MER allows a faculty member to seek redress through a systematic review procedure that focuses on the faculty member’s career performance and on the claim that there is serious inconsistency in rank in view of the candidate’s achievement.
- 2. Who Can Request a MER?** Those at Associate Professor and above (including Lecturers with Security of Employment and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment) may initiate a MER; and a MER may be proposed as well by the relevant Chair or Dean in the interest of the faculty member.
- 3. What are the Limitations for a MER?** There are a number of provisos that apply: (a) a MER cannot be used as a recourse for overturning a negative personnel decision that was made in the current or prior academic year; (b) the MER is not a mechanism for salary adjustment; its focus is on the academic status of the candidate (i.e., rank or step); (c) the MER process is limited in its frequency: it can be used only once at the Associate Professor level, and twice at the full Professor level (once prior to advancement to Step VI, and once after Step VI); (d) a MER cannot be scheduled soon after a prior personnel review that involved a review by the Council on Academic Personnel and a decision by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel (“soon” means before two years for Associate Professors and three years for full Professors).
- 4. What are the Requirements in a MER?** The dossier needs to make the case in a documented and persuasive way that the candidate’s achievements – in all the requisite areas (research, teaching, service, and professional activity) are seriously undervalued in comparison with the comparable peers in his/her department and the standards in the discipline. If the recommended action requires extramural letters, such letters need to be included in the dossier. The dossier should include requisite information regarding the candidate’s employment at UCLA, including rank, step and salary at appointment; the history of personnel actions; and a discussion of the grounds for the perceived discrepancy in rank. All of the safeguards regarding personnel reviews are to be observed – those, for example, regarding confidentiality and transparency (e.g., the candidate is provided the opportunity for rebuttal or commentary). The

review is conducted in accordance with the deadlines that are established for MER actions (available at the Academic Personnel Office website) at: <http://www.apo.ucla.edu/deadlines.asp> In all cases, the department will discuss and vote on the requested action according to its bylaws and practices governing decision-making for the relevant rank and step.

5. ***The Role of the Council on Academic Personnel.*** As an important player in the personnel process, the Council has the advantage of being an interdisciplinary body with a campus-wide perspective and broad knowledge of the standards and

practices in a variety of disciplines. It has the ability to collect and compare files drawn from across the campus; hence, its evaluation is a central aspect of the MER process, and it may employ a campus ad hoc committee as well. As usual, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel makes the final decision in consultation with the Council.

As noted, further information on Merit Equity Reviews is found in Appendix 35 of The CALL, and faculty who may have further questions can seek advice from the staff of the Academic Personnel Office in 3109 Murphy Hall.

Letters of Evaluation

From "News from Academic Personnel," Volume 2, issue 2, Spring 2008
http://www.apo.ucla.edu/docs/Newsletter_Spring08.pdf

All parts of a candidate's dossier are important and are used to document the candidate's accomplishments in the areas of scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and service. Contributions to teaching are verified by student and peer evaluations. Service is indicated by membership on committees, administrative positions within the University, active participation in professional organizations, and community service. Judgment about a candidate's scholarship/creative activity also requires documentation from multiple sources. At a research university, the quality of the scholarship/creative activity is paramount. Although there are several metrics, such as number of papers, books, or other creative activity, quantity is not a substitute for quality.

In this regard, the external letters of evaluation are crucial. For re-

view purposes, external refers to any evaluator outside UCLA. Thus, reviewers at any other University, including other campuses of the University of California, are considered external. Internal letters, which may be solicited from faculty at UCLA, provide important information about the candidate's teaching, mentorship, and citizenship, as well as further input on the scholarship/creative activity. For the clinical compensated series, for whom primary emphasis is clinical teaching and professional competence, the internal letters are most important. The following comments about the external letters refer to the Regular and In-Residence series.

It is through external letters that members of each discipline have the opportunity to provide expert judgment on the candidate's creative contributions, originality, and standing in the field. External letters then are important at every level of the

academic personnel process. The procedure for soliciting letters is specified in the CALL (Summary of Procedures # 2: Guide to Preparation of a Dossier, Section III. Letters of Evaluation). External letters are solicited by the proposing department from experts in the candidate's area of research/creative activity. Both the department and the candidate suggest individuals from whom letters will be solicited. The most useful letters are analytical and provide a detailed evaluation of the candidate's contributions. The academic review process provides the candidate with a mechanism to alert the reviewing bodies of potential issues that may bias the letters of evaluation. As stated in The CALL (Appendix 1, section VI), "The candidate may provide in writing names of persons who, in the view of the candidate, for reasons set forth might not objectively

evaluate the candidate's qualifications or performance. Persons so named are not, however, necessarily disqualified from being asked to provide an evaluation." The candidate has the opportunity to review redacted copies of the letters and comment on them. "Under normal circumstances, five to eight such letters are suffi-

cient" (The CALL, Appendix 1, section VI). If, after examination of letters in a dossier, the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) decides that the number of letters is insufficient, or that the letters are not sufficiently analytical, additional external letters will be requested. Because external letters are solicited by departments, CAP's request requires the propos-

ing Department to solicit additional external letters. After the appropriate number of letters has been received, all letters are carefully considered by the Council. In practice, letters from the Chair's list tend to be more independent evaluations, and CAP traditionally gives more weight to these letters.

Use of Review Committees

From "News from Academic Personnel," Volume 2, issue 2, Spring 2008
http://www.apo.ucla.edu/docs/Newsletter_Spring08.pdf

At one time, many academic personnel cases, such as promotions to Associate Professor, other promotions, and new hires, routinely were sent by CAP to Review Committees (RCs) for analysis. In academic year 1996-97 160 such committees were created. The creation and use of these committees, however, delays decision-making, and such delays can be particularly costly to the university when they involve competitive hiring or retention situations. As a result, the usage of RCs began to decline in 2001-02. Although the number of RCs appointed each year varies, last year a total of 49 were appointed, which is a reasonable indication of the likely usage of such committees in the future. Of these, 6 were for new faculty appointments, 26 for promotion to Associate Professor, 6 for promotion to Professor, 9 for advancement to Professor Step VI, and 2 for advancement to Professor Above Scale.

CAP now mainly appoints RCs in cases of promotion to Associate Professor where the record suggests some likelihood that Associate Professor might be denied and in cases where CAP feels it lacks sufficient expertise to make a judgment. The reduction in use of RCs has had several effects. First, it obviously places a greater burden on CAP to make recommendations on cases. Second, there is a reduced burden on Senate faculty who otherwise would serve on RCs. Third, because fewer RCs are appointed, those Senate members who are asked to serve may be less familiar with what is expected than in the past when such service was common.

Because of the decline in general familiarity, this article explains the purpose of RCs, how they are formed, how they function, and what they are expected to do.

Purpose

RC members are chosen because their academic backgrounds and interests are anticipated to give in-

sight into the merits of the case. The RC report provides additional information to CAP and to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel when the case is reviewed. RCs receive the current dossier for review. It should be noted that the 4th year appraisal document and any past academic action(s) are not included in the dossier seen by the RC. Rather, they remain in the "backfile" that is accessible to CAP and the Vice Chancellor.

As an end product, the RC produces a report that becomes part of the permanent record. The report indicates the committee's views of the case and whether it endorses or opposes the proposed action. Where there are splits within the RC, majority and minority opinions should be explained in the report. (A separate minority statement can be included but often it is possible to explain the majority and minority positions in a single document.) The RC report is then con-

sidered by CAP and the Vice Chancellor in making a judgment on the case. Note that since CAP already has reports from the department, it is looking for an independent judgment by the RC as opposed to a summary of previous documents. Since the RC process inherently delays the progress of the case, it is important that the RC report be produced on a timely basis. Reports need not be lengthy but they should be thorough enough so that CAP can understand the nature of the deliberations and the RC's view of controversial elements of the case.

Membership on RCs

When CAP determines an RC is needed, it recommends specific individuals whom it believes could provide insight on the case. Typically, deans and department chairs are required to submit nominations of possible RC candidates. CAP is not obligated to select from the recommended names but does consider them. It also uses a computerized database of faculty expertise in nominating possible members. CAP members may also have personal knowledge of individuals who have relevant expertise.

In general, individuals who have administrative responsibilities such as department chairs and deans are not chosen for RC membership. Usually, there will not be more than one person from any academic department appointed (including individuals with zero-time appointments in a department). One member is

chosen to act as a departmental representative from the candidate's department. The departmental representative is expected to provide insight into the views of the department to the other RC members.

One member of the RC – not the departmental representative – is selected to be the chair of the RC. The chair is responsible for producing a draft of the RC report for member consideration and then the final report. Staff of the Academic Personnel Office will assist the chair in scheduling meetings and other matters including gathering signatures on the final report.

Although it is not required, CAP will sometimes suggest the name of a non-voting assistant professor to serve as an observer on an RC. The purpose of such a nomination is to give junior faculty a chance to learn about an important aspect of the academic personnel process.

Candidates for personnel actions have the right to suggest names that should be excluded from the review process - including potential members of RCs. It is expected, however, that some reason be given for such exclusions. CAP will consider such requests but is not bound by them.

Confidentiality

Members of RCs operate in strict confidence. The names of the members are known to CAP and to the Vice Chancellor. But unlike the names of CAP members or names of elected personnel committees within departments and schools, the names of those serving on RCs are not available to the candidate. In particular, CAP members will not dis-

close membership on RCs to anyone. Of course, the members of RCs are expected to observe strict confidentiality with regard to all aspects of their deliberations and the dossier documentation received. RC members – including the departmental representative – should not discuss the fact that they have been appointed with anyone, including their dean and/or department chair.

Conclusion: Maintaining Peer Review

A critical part of academic governance is the role of the faculty in peer reviews of academic performance. Such peer review activity is expressed in service on internal personnel committees in departments, in voting on departmental recommendations in personnel cases, in service on CAP, and in membership in RCs. Thus, service on RCs is a normal and expected activity of Senate faculty. CAP encourages all faculty to respond positively to requests for service on RCs.

The UCLA CALL

The Call includes UCLA specific policies and procedures pertaining to the various faculty series and describes compensation, merits and promotions, tenure review and termination. Below is the table of contents to The Call. Visit the Call online at <http://www.apo.ucla.edu/call/>.

Table of Contents

Introduction

- Introduction to The CALL
- The Review Process: A Capsule Description

Professorial Series

- Regular Professor Series
- Professor-in-Residence Series
- Adjunct Professor Series
- Acting Professor Series
- Visiting Professor Series
- Professor of Clinical (X) Series
- Clinical Professor (Compensated) Series

Lecturer Series

- Lecturer Series – PSOE and SOE
- Professional Research Series
- Professional Research Series
- Visiting Professional Research Series

Appendices

- Appendix 1 - Guidelines for Department Chairs and Other Recommending Officers
- Appendix 2 - Synopsis of Academic Personnel Manual – Section 220
- Appendix 3 - Guide to the Documentation of Effective Teaching
- Appendix 4 - Voting Rights - Senate Bylaw 55
- Appendix 5 - Instructions to Review and Appraisal Committees
- Appendix 6 - Appointment and Advancement of Assistant Professors at UCLA
- Appendix 7 - Instructions to Review and Appraisal Committees for the Professor of Clinical (X) Series
- Appendix 8 - Instructions to Review and Appraisal Committees for the Clinical Professor – (Compensated) Series
- Appendix 9 - Procedure and Criteria for the Review of Lecturers (PSOE and SOE)
- Appendix 10 - Criteria for Appointment and Advancement in the Professional Research Series
- Appendix 11 - Evaluating Administrative Titles
- Appendix 12 - Five-Year Reviews

Appendix 13 - Policy Applicable to the Use of Steps IV & V of the Associate Professor Series
Appendix 14 - Guide to the Computation of Years of Service Which Count Toward the Eight-Year Limit
Appendix 15 - Joint and Split Appointments
Appendix 16 - Guidelines for the Use of Studio Professor
Appendix 17 - Summary of UCLA Policy on Off-Scale Salaries
Appendix 18 - Policies and Procedures for UCLA Endowed Chairs, Endowments, and Professorial Name Chairs
Appendix 19 - Annual Report on Outside Professional Activities
Appendix 20 - Access to Academic Personnel Records
Appendix 21 - Employment of Near Relatives
Appendix 22 - Summary of Recruitment Policy
Appendix 23 - Faculty Search Guidelines
Appendix 24 - Sabbatical Leaves
Appendix 25 - Leaves of Absence
Appendix 26 - Change in Series Actions
Appendix 27 - Jury Service
Appendix 28 - Recall Appointments
Appendix 29 - Non-Senate Emeritus Conferrals
Appendix 30 - Campus Policy Statement on Office and Laboratory Space for Emeriti Faculty
Appendix 31 - Guidelines for Processing Actions for the Academic Administrator and Academic Coordinator Series
Appendix 32 - Specialists Series
Appendix 33 - Policy Governing Layoff of Non-Senate Academic Appointees
Appendix 34 - Non-Senate Academic Appointees Corrective Action and Dismissal
Appendix 35 - Merit Equity Review (MER)
Appendix 36 - Project (e.g., Scientist) Series
Appendix 37 - Interdisciplinary Activity

Summary of Procedures

Summary #1 - Submission Deadlines for Academic Actions
Summary #2 - Guide to the Preparation of a Dossier
Summary #3 - Guide to Bibliography Preparation and Publication Submission Requirements
Summary #4 - Appointment to the Professorial Series
Summary #5 - Merit Increases for the Professorial Series
Summary #6 - Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
Summary #7 - Fourth-Year Appraisals for the Professorial Series
Summary #8 - Promotion to Associate, Eight-Year Limit Review and Non-Renewal of Appointments for the Assistant Professor Rank
Summary #9 - Dossiers for the Professional Research Series
Summary #10 - Statement of Confidentiality
Summary #11 - Sample Solicitation Letter for Appointments
Summary #12 - Sample Solicitation Letter for Promotions
Summary #13 - Sample Solicitation Letter for Advancement to Step VI
Summary #14 - Sample Solicitation Letter for Initial Advancement to Above-Scale Status
Summary #15 - Sample Letter of Invitation to Assistant Professors

University of California

Academic Personnel Manual (APM)

available at: <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/>

The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) includes policies and procedures pertaining to the employment relationship between an academic appointee and the University of California. For academic appointees covered by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the APM applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.

Table of Contents

I. General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees

- APM 005 Privileges and Duties of Members of the Faculty
- APM 010 Academic Freedom
- APM 015 The Faculty Code of Conduct
- APM 016 University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline
- APM 020 Special Services to Individuals and Organizations
- APM 025 Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members
- APM 028 Disclosure of Financial Interest in Private Sponsors of Research
- APM 035 Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination in Employment
- APM 036 Employment
- APM 075 Termination for Incompetent Performance
- APM 080 Medical Separation
- APM 100 Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures/General
- APM 110 Academic Personnel Definitions
- APM 112 Academic Titles
- APM 113 Academic Title Codes
- APM 115 "Equivalent" Titles and Ranks
- APM 120 Emeritus Titles
- APM 130 Tenure
- APM 133 Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles
- APM 135 Security of Employment
- APM 137 Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Term Appointment
- APM 140 Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Grievances
- APM 145 Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Layoff and Involuntary Reduction in Time
- APM 150 Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal
- APM 158 Rights of Academic Appointees, Including Rights Regarding Records
- APM 160 Academic Personnel Records/Maintenance of, Access to, and Opportunity to Request Amendment of
- APM 190 Selected Presidential Policies
 - APM 190, Appendix A-1 - University of California Policy on Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Suspected Improper Governmental Activities (Whistleblower Policy) & Appendix A-2 - University of California Policy for Protection of Whistleblowers from Retaliation and Guidelines for Reviewing Retaliation Complaints (Whistleblower Protection Policy)
 - APM 190, Appendix B - University Policy on Integrity in Research
 - APM 190, Appendix C - University of California Policy on Substance Abuse
 - APM 190, Appendix D - Policy Governing Travel to Scholarly Meetings and Field Research Travel
 - APM 190, Appendix E - The Faculty Recruitment Allowance Program

APM 190, Appendix F – Policy on the Use of Non-19900 Fund Sources to Support Ladder-Rank Faculty

APM 190, Appendix G – Program Description Retirement Contributions on Academic Appointee Summer Salary

- APM 191 Endowed Chairs and Professorships
- APM 200 General
- APM 210 Review and Appraisal Committees
- APM 220 Professor Series
- APM 230 Visiting Appointments
- APM 235 Acting Appointments
- APM 240 Deans and Provosts
- APM 242 Directors of Organized Research Units
- APM 245 Department Chairs
- APM 260 University Professor
- APM 265 Presidential Chairs
- APM 270 Professor of (e.g., *Psychology*) in Residence Series
- APM 275 Professor of Clinical (e.g., *Medicine*) Series
- APM 278 Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series
- APM 279 Clinical Professor Series
- Volunteer Series
- APM 280 Adjunct Professor Series
- APM 283 Lecturer and Senior Lecturer
- APM 285 Lecturer with Security of Employment Series
- APM 289 Guest Lecturers
- APM 290 Regents' Professors and Regents' Lecturers
- APM 300 Supervisor of Physical Education Series

II. Appointment and Promotion

- APM 310 Professional Research Series
- APM 311 Project (e.g., *Scientist*) Series
- APM 320 Agronomist Series
- APM 330 Specialist Series
- APM 334 Specialist in Cooperative Extension Series
- APM 335 Cooperative Extension Advisor Series
- APM 340 Continuing Educator
- APM 350 Postgraduate Research (e.g., *Physicist*) Series
- APM 355 Non-Salary Research Positions
- APM 358 Faculty Fellows Program
- APM 360 Librarian Series
- APM 365 Associate University Librarian and Assistant University Librarian
- APM 370 Academic Administrator Series
- APM 375 Academic Coordinator Titles
- APM 380 Faculty Consultant
- APM 385 Independent Contractor
- APM 390 Postdoctoral Scholars
- APM 410 Student Teachers
- APM 415 Language Assistant
- APM 420 Reader

III. Recruitment

- APM 500 General
- APM 501 From Other California Institutions
- APM 510 Intercampus Transfers
- APM 520 Employment of Near Relatives
- APM 530 Noncitizens
- APM 540 Travel Expenses
- APM 550 Moving Expenses for Intercampus Transfers
- APM 560 Removal Expenses/General
- APM 561 Removal Expenses/ Assistants
- APM 570 Travel Expenses for Short-Term Appointees on Extramurally Financed Projects

IV. Salary Administration (REV. 7/1/01)

- APM 600 General
- APM 610 Salary Increases/General Scale
- APM 615 Salary Increases/Merit
- APM 620 Off-Scale Salaries for Appointments and Advancements
- APM 630 Compensation of Divisional, Associate and Assistant Deans, and Directors of Organized Research Units
- APM 632 Stipends/ Assignment of FTE for Split Appointments with Stipends
- APM 633 Stipends/ Academic Appointees
- APM 640 Regents' Professors and Regents' Lecturers, Compensation
- APM 650 Technical Assistance Projects
- APM 660 Additional Compensation/General
- APM 661 Additional Compensation/Summer Session Teaching
- APM 662 Additional Compensation/Additional Teaching
- APM 663 Additional Compensation/University Extension Correspondence Courses
- APM 664 Additional Compensation/Services as Faculty Consultant
- APM 665 Additional Compensation/Reading Manuscripts
- APM 666 Additional Compensation/Lecturers and Similar Services
- APM 667 Additional Compensation/Extramurally Funded Research
- APM 670 Health Sciences Compensation Plan and Guidelines on Occasional Outside Professional Activities by Health Sciences Compensation Plan Participants
- APM 680 Salary Conversion for Transfer of Academic Appointees to Laboratories
- APM 690 Academic Salary Scales

V. Benefits and Privileges

- APM 700 Leaves of Absence/General
- APM 710 Leaves of Absence/Sick Leave/Medical Leave
- APM 711 Reasonable Accommodation for Academic Appointees with Disabilities
- APM 715 Leaves of Absence/Family and Medical Leave
- APM 720 Leaves of Absence/Holidays
- APM 730 Leaves of Absence/Vacation
- APM 740 Leaves of Absence/Sabbatical Leaves
- APM 750 Leaves of Absence/Leave for Service to Governmental Agencies
- APM 751 Leaves of Absence/Military Leave
- APM 752 Leaves of Absence/Leave to Attend Professional Meeting
- APM 758 Leaves of Absence/Other Leaves with Pay
- APM 759 Leaves of Absence/Other Leaves Without Pay
- APM 760 Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing

UCLA Faculty Handbook and Resource Guide

The *UCLA Faculty Handbook and Resource Guide* is designed as a reference guide to the services and facilities available to academic employees of UCLA and where to find them. You will also get a sense of the organization of the University (Section II) and read about key policies governing faculty duties and responsibilities (Section III). New faculty will find the information especially useful to ease their transition to campus and even seasoned faculty members may discover some helpful resources they were not aware of. The Faculty Handbook & Resource Guide is also available on the Academic Personnel web page at <http://www.apo.ucla.edu> or by direct access at <http://www.apo.ucla.edu/facultyhandbook>.

Table of Contents

I. Getting Started

- Introduction
- Getting Started Academically
 - Ordering Textbooks
 - Applying for Contracts and Grants
- Instructional Support
- Library Services
- Computing Services
- Housing
- Parking and Transportation
- Banking Services
- Child Care Services
- BruinCard

II. Organization of the University

- Academic Administration
 - The University of California
 - UCLA
 - Office of the Chancellor
- The Academic Senate

III. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities

- Academic Personnel
 - Academic Freedom
 - Faculty Code of Conduct
 - Sexual Harassment
 - Academic Personnel Policies
 - Academic Personnel Office
- Teaching
- Research
- Service
- Faculty Benefits

IV. Academic Resources & Programs

- Campus Bookstores
- UCLA Library
- Computing Services
- Research Programs
 - Sponsored Research
 - Office for Protection of Research Subjects
- Instructional Development
- Instructional Opportunities
 - Education Abroad Program (EAP)
 - UCLA Extension
 - UCLA Summer Sessions
 - Professional Schools Seminar Program

V. Cultural Resources & Extracurricular Activities

- Cultural Resources
 - UCLA Fowler Museum of Cultural History
 - UCLA Hammer Museum
 - Geffen Playhouse
 - Grunwald Center for the Graphic Arts
 - UCLA Film and Television Archive
 - Franklin D. Murphy Sculpture Garden
 - Mildred E. Mathias Botanical Garden
 - UCLA Hannah Carter Japanese Garden
 - UCLA Center for the Performing Arts
 - Other Professional School Events
 - School of the Arts and Architecture
 - School of Theater, Film and Television
- Sports and Recreation
 - Intercollegiate Athletics
 - Cultural and Recreational Affairs
 - Bruin Woods Family Resort
 - Other Recreational Opportunities

Campus Organizations
UCLA Faculty Center
Association of Academic Women
UCLA Faculty Women's Club
Lesbian and Gay Faculty/Staff Network
UCLA Emeriti Association
UCLA Alumni Association

VI. Campus Services

Associated Students of UCLA (ASUCLA)
Banking Services
Conference/Event Services
Counseling and Conflict Resolution
Development
Services for People with Disabilities
Legal Services
Mail, Messenger and Postal Services
Photographic Services
Printing and Copy Services
Retirement Planning
Campus Safety
Campus Tours
Travel Services
University of California Press
External Affairs

VII. Management Services

Academic Planning and Budget
Business and Finance
Campus Human Resources
Capital Programs
Equal Opportunity/Diversity Programs
Facilities Management
Audit and Advisory Services
Communications Technology Services

VIII. Faculty Referral Information

Graduate Division
Undergraduate Education
Student Affairs
 Student Academic Services
 Financial Aid Office
 The Career Center
 Office of the Registrar
 Student Loan Services
 Undergraduate Admissions
 and Relations with Schools

Student and Campus Life
 Dean of Students Office
 Office of Residential Life
Student Development and Health
 Office for Students with Disabilities
 Student Health Service
 Student Psychological Services
 Women's Resource Center

IX. Appendices

I. Faculty Code of Conduct
II. Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in
 Employment
III. Membership of the Academic Senate
IV. Rights and Authority of Senate Members
V. Organized Research Units
VI. University of California Patent Policy
VII. Policy on the Requirement to Submit Proposals
 and to Receive Awards for Grants and
 Contracts Through the University
VIII. University of California Equity Policy
IX. Disclosure of Student Records
X. Official Publications and Sources of Information

X. Index

APM - 015 The Faculty Code of Conduct

The complete Code of Conduct is available at:

<http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-015.pdf>

This policy is the Faculty Code of Conduct as approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on June 15, 1971, and amended by the Assembly on May 30, 1974, and with amendments approved by the Assembly on March 9, 1983, May 6, 1986, May 7, 1992, October 31, 2001, and May 28, 2003, and by The Regents on July 18, 1986, May 15, 1987, June 19, 1992, November 15, 2001, and July 17, 2003. In addition, technical changes were made September 1, 1988.

Additional policies regarding the scope and application of the Faculty Code of Conduct and the University's policies on faculty conduct and the administration of discipline are set forth in APM - 016, the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline.

The Faculty Code of Conduct as Approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate

(Code of Professional Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct of University Faculty, and University Disciplinary Procedures)

The University seeks to provide and sustain an environment conducive to sharing, extending, and critically examining knowledge and values, and to furthering the search for wisdom. Effective performance of these central functions requires that faculty members be free within their respective fields of competence to pursue and teach the truth in accord with appropriate standards of scholarly inquiry.

The faculty's privileges and protections, including that of tenure, rest on the mutually supportive relationships between the faculty's special professional competence, its academic freedom, and the central functions of the University. These relationships are also the source of the professional responsibilities of faculty members.

It is the intent of the Faculty Code of Conduct to protect academic freedom, to help preserve the highest standards of teaching and scholarship, and to advance the mission of the University as an institution of higher learning.

Table of Contents

Preamble

Part I – Professional Rights of Faculty

Part II – Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Principles, & Unacceptable Faculty Conduct

- A. Teaching and Students
- B. Scholarship
- C. The University
- D. Colleagues
- E. The Community

Part III – Enforcement and Sanctions

- A. Required Principles
- B. Recommended Principles