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### 3. Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AES</td>
<td>Agricultural Experimental Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANR</td>
<td>Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Academic Personnel Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA&amp;ES</td>
<td>College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Committee on Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP-AC</td>
<td>Committee on Academic Personnel–Appellate Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP-OC</td>
<td>Committee on Academic Personnel–Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>College of Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Cooperative Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQ</td>
<td>Frequently Asked Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC</td>
<td>Faculty Personnel Committee (formerly College PC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-time Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYT</td>
<td>Fiscal-year Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&amp;R</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPC</td>
<td>Joint Academic Senate/Academic Federation Personnel Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Organized Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARC</td>
<td>Term Appointment Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td>University of California, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>United States Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is a Land-grant College?

A land-grant college or university is an institution that has been designated by its state legislature or Congress to receive the benefits of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The original mission of these institutions, as set forth in the first Morrill Act, was to teach agriculture, military tactics, and the mechanic arts as well as classical studies so that members of the working classes could obtain a liberal, practical education.

Over the years, land-grant status has implied several types of federal support. The first Morrill Act provided grants in the form of federal lands to each state for the establishment of a public institution to fulfill the act’s provisions. At different times money was appropriated through legislation such as the second Morrill Act and the Bankhead-Jones Act, although the funding provisions of these acts are no longer in effect. Today, the Nelson Amendment to the Morrill Act provides a permanent annual appropriation of $50,000 per state and territory.

A key component of the land-grant system is the agricultural experiment station program created by the Hatch Act of 1887. The Hatch Act authorized direct payment of federal grant funds to each state to establish an agricultural experiment station in connection with the land-grant institution there. The amount of this appropriation varies from year to year and is determined for each state through a formula based on the number of small farmers there. A major portion of the federal funds must be matched by the state.

To disseminate information gleaned from the experiment stations’ research, the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 created a Cooperative Extension Service associated with each U.S. land-grant institution. This act authorized ongoing federal support for extension services, using a formula similar to the Hatch Act’s to determine the amount of the appropriation. This act also requires that the states provide matching funds in order to receive the federal monies.

The Land-grant College: Why Was It Created?

Passage of the First Morrill Act (1862) reflected a growing demand for agricultural and technical education in the United States. While a number of institutions had begun to expand upon the traditional classical curriculum, higher education was still widely unavailable to many agricultural and industrial workers. The Morrill Act was intended to provide a broad segment of the population with a practical education that had direct relevance to their daily lives.

The Second Morrill Act (1890) sought to extend access to higher education by providing additional endowments for all land-grants, but prohibiting distribution of money to states that made distinctions of race in admissions. However, states that provided a separate land-grant institution for blacks were eligible to receive the funds. The institutions that, as a result of this act, were founded or designated the land-grant for blacks in each of the then-segregated Southern states came to be known as “the 1890 land-grants.” The 29 Native American tribal colleges are sometimes called the “1994 land-grants.”
**The Land-grant College: Where is It?**

There is now at least one land-grant institution in every state and territory of the United States, as well as the District of Columbia. Certain Southern states have two land-grant institutions as a result of the Second Morrill Act, and some western and plains states have several of the 1994 land-grant tribal colleges.

**The Land-grant College: Who Created It?**

Justin Smith Morrill, a representative and later a senator from Vermont, sponsored the land-grant legislation that bears his name and is generally credited as having secured its passage. Prior to Morrill’s support for land-grant legislation, Jonathan Baldwin Turner, a Yale-educated farmer, newspaper editor, and college professor, made education for the working class his cause in the mid-nineteenth century. His “Plan for a State University for the Industrial Classes” advanced ideas that are now fundamental to the land-grant system, such as experimental research in agriculture.

**The Land-grant College: When Was It Created?**

Morrill first introduced a land-grant bill in Congress in 1857, which after much struggle was passed in 1859 only to be vetoed by President James Buchanan. In 1861 Morrill introduced another land-grant bill that increased to 30,000 acres the grant for each senator and representative and added a requirement that recipient institutions teach military tactics. The newly felt need for trained military officers to fight in the Civil War, along with the absence of Southern legislators who had opposed the earlier bill, helped the Morrill Act through Congress in just six months. President Abraham Lincoln signed it into law on July 2, 1862.

**The Land-grant College: How Was It Created?**

The United States Department of Agriculture plays a large role in the administration of federal land-grant funds and the coordination of agricultural land-grant activities at the national level. The USDA’s Cooperative State Research Service (CSRS), for example, administers both Hatch Act and Morrill-Nelson funds. A portion of the Hatch Act funding supports regional research, enabling scientists to collaborate and coordinate activities and thus avoid duplication of research efforts. The Extension Service of the USDA administers Smith-Lever funding, cooperating with state governments (which also provide funding for extension programs) to set priorities and facilitate the sharing of information within the entire Cooperative Extension System.

Because the 1890 land-grants do not receive Hatch Act or Smith-Lever funds, special programs have been created to help finance agricultural research and extension at these institutions. The Evans-Allen program supports agricultural research with funds equal to at least 15 percent of Hatch Act appropriations. Another program funds extension activities at the 1890 land-grants with an emphasis on reaching socially and economically disadvantaged people.

Today, America’s land-grant universities continue to fulfill their democratic mandate for openness, accessibility, and service to people, and many of these institutions have joined the
ranks of the nation’s most distinguished public research universities. Through the land-grant university heritage, millions of students are able to study every academic discipline and explore fields of inquiry far beyond the scope envisioned in the original land-grant mission.

**Federal Funding**

From these purposes has grown a system of colleges and universities managed by each state but conforming to certain broad policy stipulations of federal law. The federal support contemplated in the initial Morrill Act was to be the income from public lands (30,000 acres or equivalent in scrip for each representative and senator) made available to each state. The state was expected to contribute to the maintenance of its land-grant institution as well as to provide its buildings.

From this modest beginning, the federal government has significantly expanded its contributions to the land-grant colleges and universities. Recognizing the need for research as a basis for developing agriculture, Congress passed the Hatch Act in 1887. This authorized federal funding for an agricultural experiment station in connection with each land-grant institution.

In 1890, the second Morrill Act was passed, supplementing by direct appropriation the income from the land-grants. To receive the money, a state had to show that race or color was not an admissions criterion or else designate a separate land-grant college for blacks. Thus was born in the then-segregated South a group of institutions known as the “1890 land-grants.”

In 1914 the Smith-Lever Act established the system of cooperative extension services to bring people the benefits of current developments in the field of agriculture, home economics and related subjects. Land-grant institutions, designed to foster a program of education suited to the needs of the agricultural and industrial classes, came to encompass a program of on-campus instruction, research, and off-campus extension work. In the decades following 1914, several acts were passed expanding the scope and increasing the support of all three aspects of the program. Now, in addition to the income from the original land-grants, the appropriations of federal funds to aid the states in the maintenance of land-grant institutions amount to more than $550 million annually.

These funds are distributed to the states on several different bases. Some funds go in equal amounts to all states; some go to the states on the basis of their farm population or on their total population in relation to the total population of the United States.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) plays a key role in the administration of federal land-grant funds and the coordination of land-grant activities at the national level. The USDA’s Cooperative State Research Service (CSRS), for example, administers both Hatch Act and Morrill-Nelson funds. The Extension Service of the USDA administers Smith-Lever funding, though it cooperates with state governments — which provide additional funding for extension — in setting priorities and sharing information nationally.

Because the 1890 land-grants do not receive Hatch Act or Smith-Lever funds, special programs have been created to help finance agricultural research and extension at these institutions. The Evans-Allen program supports agricultural research with funds equal to at least 15 percent of
Hatch Act appropriations. Another program funds extension activities at the 1890 land-grants with an emphasis on reaching socially and economically disadvantaged people.

What is Cooperative Extension?

The Cooperative Extension System is a nationwide, non-credit educational network. Each U.S. state and territory has a state office at its land-grant university and a network of local or regional offices. These offices are staffed by one or more experts who provide useful, practical, and research-based information to agricultural producers, small business owners, youth, consumers, and others in rural areas and communities of all sizes.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) is the federal partner in the Cooperative Extension system. It provides federal funding to the system and, through program leadership, helps the system identify and address current issues and problems.


How is “Extending Knowledge” in Cooperative Extension different from AES mission-oriented outreach and from outreach by University Extension (e.g., UC Davis Extension)?

In principle, Cooperative Extension and the Agricultural Experiment Station are reaching out to the same audiences using similar tools and there are no rigid boundaries between “Cooperative Extension” and “outreach” in AES. “What’s the Difference between Extension and Engagement?”, a white paper by George McDowell at the University of Vermont [http://www.aaec.vt.edu/faculty/mcdowell/book/diff-ext-eng.html](http://www.aaec.vt.edu/faculty/mcdowell/book/diff-ext-eng.html), provides a recent discussion in the national context of Cooperative Extension. The discussion of “extension” in this article applies to the portion of the specialist’s job description that is called “extending knowledge,” while scholarship is synonymous mostly with the “research” and “professional competence” portion of the specialist’s job description.
Mission Statements

College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, UC Davis:

- To develop students into scholars, mentors, and responsible citizens of the state of California, the United States and the world;
- to advance, integrate, evaluate and communicate knowledge of the sciences and technologies of natural resource utilization and conservation, agriculture, food, nutrition, human development, and related environmental, health, safety, and policy concerns;
- to seek out, anticipate, and lead in addressing the needs of citizens, communities, and governmental agencies, particularly in California.

Agricultural Experiment Station, UC Davis:

The mission of the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) at the University of California, Davis, is to conduct research that encompasses the continuum of fundamental and applied research for the purpose of developing new knowledge and technologies that address specific problems of importance to the people of California. Key to this mission is a broad range of research focused on the discovery of solutions and the development of educational programs that disseminate knowledge and technology to an identified clientele. The Agricultural Experiment Station mission focuses on agricultural, environmental and societal issues that are impacted by, or impact upon, agriculture and the environment.
5. General Description of Cooperative Extension Appointments

A. Specialist in Cooperative Extension Series, 100% CE, Rev. 12/14/00
   a. 334-4 Definition
      The Specialist in Cooperative Extension series is used for academic appointees who are qualified by formal education and/or experience to conduct educational activities and mission-oriented research in their area of specialty, and who have responsibility for the interpretation, adaption, and transmission of the results of relevant research. Teaching of regular undergraduate or graduate courses is not a responsibility of this series.
   b. 334-8 Types
      i. Titles (and ranks) in this series are:
         1. Assistant specialist in Cooperative Extension
         2. Associate specialist in Cooperative Extension
         3. Specialist in Cooperative Extension
      ii. An appointment occurs when an individual is employed in one of the ranks above if the individual’s immediately previous status was:
          1. Not in the employ of the university, or
          2. In the employ of the university, but not with a title in this series.
      iii. A promotion is an advancement from one rank to a higher rank within this series, usually the next rank as listed in APM-334-8-a. A change from a title in another series to a title in this series (possibly involving an increase in salary) is not defined as a promotion or merit increase, but as an appointment.
      iv. A merit increase is an advancement in salary step or to an above-scale salary rate without change of rank. (See APM-615.)
      v. The term reappointment is used for the renewal of a previous appointment immediately following the ending of the previous appointment in this series. A reappointment may or may not be accompanied by a promotion or merit increase.
   c. Additional information on the following topics related to the specialist in Cooperative Extension title is available under specified Academic Personnel Manual (APM www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-334.pdf) sections:
      i. 334-10 Criteria
      ii. 334-17 Terms of service
      iii. 334-18 Salary
      iv. 334-20 Conditions of employment
      v. 334-24 Authority
      vi. 334-80 Procedures
      vii. 334-83 Procedure for the formal appraisal of assistant specialist in Cooperative Extension
      viii. 334-84 Procedures for non-reappointment for academic reasons of an assistant specialist in Cooperative Extension
      ix. 334-85 Procedure for appointment or promotion to the rank of associate specialist in Cooperative Extension or specialist in Cooperative Extension
      x. 334-96 Reports
B. Specialist in Cooperative Extension/Organized Research (OR) Split Appointments — Agricultural Experiment Station

The Cooperative Extension percentage of the split appointment would follow the same guidelines described above under APM-334.

a. The Agricultural Experiment Station percentage of the split appointment

http://manuals.ucdavis.edu/apm/334-b.htm (and page 19 in this document)

C. Specialist in Cooperative Extension/Instruction and Research (I&R) Split Appointments

a. The Cooperative Extension percentage of the split appointment would follow the same guidelines described above under APM-334.

b. The Instruction and Research percentage of the split appointment

http://manuals.ucdavis.edu/apm/334-a.htm (and page 19 in this document)
6. Academic Review Periods for Specialists in Cooperative Extension

Review Periods#

**Assistant Specialist in Cooperative Extension**

(Maximum Years at Rank = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step IV</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mandatory review in the seventh year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step V</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step VI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Associate Specialist in Cooperative Extension**

(Normal years at rank = 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step IV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step V</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specialist in Cooperative Extension**

(Normal years at rank = indefinite)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step IV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step V</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Upper Level Steps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step VI</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step VII</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step VIII</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step IX</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above Scale

#NOTE: All titles reviewed by JPC (Agronomist ______ in AES, Professional Researcher, Project Scientist, Specialist in AES) follow a similar time table.

*Indefinite Steps* but not less than three years may be served in this step

*Overlapping Steps*

A faculty member is eligible to be considered for a merit increase to an overlapping step if the initial appointment was made at assistant specialist in CE, Step II or above. Assistant specialists in Cooperative Extension who were appointed at Step II may be considered for a merit to Step V.
Assistant specialists in Cooperative Extension who were appointed at Step III may be considered for a merit to Step V and VI. Promotion after one year at Step V will be to associate specialist in CE, Step I. Promotion after two years at Step V will be to associate specialist in CE, Step II. Promotion after one year at Step VI will be to associate specialist in CE, Step II. Promotion after two years at Step VI will be to associate specialist in CE, Step III.

A. Review Periods

1.) Appraisals: Appointment to date

2.) Promotion:
   a. to associate specialist in CE Since terminal degree to date (see APM UCD-220 IV-D-4a, Exhibit A, for special instructions regarding seventh-year cases)
   b. to full specialist in CE Period since appointment or promotion to associate specialist in CE

Specialists in CE are normally eligible for promotion to:

– Associate specialist in CE after two years at assistant specialist in CE, Step IV.
– Full specialist in CE after two years at associate specialist in CE, Step III.

1.) Merit Increase:
   a. to specialist in CE, Step V Period since advancement to current step
   b. to specialist in CE, Step VI Period since advancement to full specialist in Cooperative Extension
   c. to specialist in CE, Step VII–IX Period since advancement to current step
   d. to first above-scale advancement: Period since advancement to full specialist in Cooperative Extension
   e. subsequent above-scale advancements: Period since advancement to current salary level

B. Specialist in Cooperative Extension

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, and will be granted on evidence of great scholarly distinction and national recognition, highly meritorious service, and evidence of excellent university teaching. Advancement of specialist in CE to Step VI will be granted on evidence of great distinction in Cooperative Extension activities and service at state or national recognition, as outlined in the position description.

Advancement to specialist in CE, Step VI, VII, VIII, and IX usually will not occur after less than three years of service at the current step, and will only be granted on evidence of continuing great distinction, national recognition, and highly meritorious service.

Advancement to an above-scale salary is reserved for scholars and teachers of the highest distinction, whose work has been internationally recognized and acclaimed. Similarly advancement to an above-scale is reserved for specialists in CE of the highest distinction in extension and services, with wide state and national recognition. 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 a 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.

III. Off-Scale Salaries

For specific guidelines for use of off-scale salaries, refer to Academic Personnel Manual 620.
A. Table. 1. Review Committees for Merits and Promotions for Specialists in CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Rank/Step</th>
<th>Review Committee</th>
<th>Approval Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialist in CE (100%) and Specialist in CE, and ___ in AES</td>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>Asst I–III</td>
<td>JPC</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>Asst IV and above</td>
<td>JPC</td>
<td>Vice provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>Asst I–Full V</td>
<td>JPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full V–VI</td>
<td>JPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full VI–IX</td>
<td>JPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full IX–Above Scale</td>
<td>JPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Asst–Assoc</td>
<td>JPC</td>
<td>Vice provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc–Full</td>
<td>JPC</td>
<td>Vice provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist in CE and Professor</td>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>Asst I–III</td>
<td>JPC¹ &amp; FPC</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>Asst IV and above</td>
<td>JPC¹ &amp; CAP</td>
<td>Vice provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>Asst I–Full V</td>
<td>JPC¹ &amp; FPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full V–VI</td>
<td>JPC¹ &amp; CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full VI–IX</td>
<td>JPC¹ &amp; FPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full IX–Above Scale</td>
<td>JPC¹ &amp; FPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Asst–Assoc</td>
<td>JPC¹ &amp; CAP</td>
<td>Vice provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc–Full</td>
<td>JPC¹ &amp; CAP</td>
<td>Vice provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ – JPC recommends on Cooperative Extension title; CAP/FPC makes overall recommendation on both titles to approval authority.
7. Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship in the UC Davis College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CA&ES)

Scholarship encompasses discovery, integration, application, and teaching. Faculty in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences pursue their scholarship within a diverse mix of Instruction and Research (I&R), Lecturer, Agricultural Experiment Station (AES), and Cooperative Extension (CE) appointment titles. Faculty scholarship, in all areas of consideration, will reflect a balance consistent with individual appointment splits and the context of the departmental mission. Evaluation of scholarship in a department must acknowledge this diversity and the range of scholarly activities it includes. The primary expectation is for demonstrated excellence and superior intellectual attainment in the context of the candidate’s appointment responsibilities.

The criteria outlined here for evaluating scholarship are developed for Academic Senate and Academic Federation faculty who have an I&R appointment, an appointment in the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES), a Cooperative Extension appointment, or a professional researcher appointment. Academic Senate and Academic Federation faculty can have split appointments in I&R, AES, and CE. Academic Federation faculty can have lecturer (without salary) appointments, in some circumstances.

I&R and lecturer appointments include responsibilities for formal undergraduate and graduate instruction, student mentoring, and advising. AES appointments include an active, research-based commitment to the mission of the Agricultural Experiment Station. Responsibilities of specialists in Cooperative Extension, which include extension teaching, applied research, and statewide leadership, are more completely defined in individual job descriptions. All AES and CE appointments carry implied or explicit outreach responsibilities.

Research

Excellence in research and a continuing commitment to a productive program of ongoing research are clear requirements for all faculty. In this regard, research will be evaluated using both qualitative and quantitative standards. Because collaborative, multidisciplinary investigation is an important aspect of research, the college encourages faculty to share their research expertise as members of ad hoc research teams. However, each member of the faculty is expected to provide the intellectual leadership for an established program of creative, independent research.

Factors that enter into the assessment of the quality of a body of research scholarship include intellectual creativity in setting research goals and objectives, application of appropriate research methodologies in devising experiments and conducting investigations that address those goals and objectives, and intellectual rigor in the interpretation and presentation of research results.

Publication of results in refereed journals is the clearest measure of research productivity. While it is not reasonable or desirable to set strict quantitative expectations or guidelines, regular reporting of research results in the open, peer-reviewed literature is an essential responsibility of academic researchers.
Useful criteria for assessing the quality of a body of research include such factors as the quality and reputation of the journals in which research results appear, the assessments of peers in the research community, successful competition for extramural research funding, and invitations to present research results at other institutions or at meetings of scholarly societies.

Research results should appear in peer-reviewed journals respected for rigorous publication standards in the candidate’s subject matter area. The choice of journals will reflect the context of the scholarship; thus research may appear in journals devoted to applied science, as well as those journals that emphasize basic discovery.

For candidates with major research components, their publications should be categorized according to the following format:

- **Category I**: Refereed and non-refereed journal articles; books and monograph chapters; proceedings chapters (only if refereed).
- **Category II**: Compendia of data; reports, regular distribution items; proceedings chapters (non-refereed); extension teaching materials; video or audio tapes; popular articles; bulletins; leaflets; all publications distributed electronically.
- **Category III**: Items with limited distribution; progress or annual reports to funding agencies or commissions; comments for commodity group newsletters.
- **Category IV**: Published abstracts; book reviews, editorials.

The research should be consistent with the department’s stature in providing international leadership in its disciplines. A successful research program requires funding beyond the resources that the university can provide. Thus, research may be funded with regular extramural support from appropriate sources such as commodity boards and commissions, state and federal granting agencies, nonprofit agencies, and private companies and foundations. Receipt of competitive grants, especially on a national scale, are indicative of a highly regarded research program and hence an indication of research quality.

Quantitative measures of research productivity should be balanced against other scholarly contributions such as teaching, student mentoring, and outreach activities, but such activities cannot substitute for demonstrated intellectual leadership, creativity, and productivity in research. Similarly, faculty whose appointment responsibilities do not include teaching or extension activities are expected to demonstrate a commensurately greater commitment to research which should be reflected in the quantitative measures of productivity.

CA&ES faculty that share either an AES or CE title are responsible to the Agricultural Experiment Station mission, and their research must be informed and guided by that mission. This mission is sufficiently broad to encompass a full spectrum of research activity from basic discovery to research directed toward integration and application beyond the community of university scholarship. Whatever the mode of research, the amount of research effort directed toward addressing issues pertinent to the mission of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences is expected to be proportional to the faculty member’s AES appointment and similarly apparent in the career achievements of the faculty member.
The Agricultural Experiment Station appointment also carries a responsibility for outreach, thus the department considers the communication of scholarship beyond the academic audience to be an essential role for AES faculty.

**Teaching**

The College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences considers that excellence in teaching entails the stimulation of creative, analytical thinking among one’s students at all levels. Clarity in communicating current thinking at an appropriate class level is a primary consideration. Other aspects of importance include availability to students, class organization, and continued curriculum development and improvement.

Direct mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students is a second important component of teaching that is expected of I&R faculty in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. This may be done directly in the laboratory or field, but also includes student advising, active participation on thesis and dissertation committees, service on qualifying examination committees, involvement in student seminars, and participation in graduate groups and undergraduate major programs. The extent of involvement in these areas is expected to vary among individuals and over the course of a career; however, there should be a continuing commitment to student mentoring activities.

**Guidelines for Outreach Expectations**

Faculty in CA&ES with an Agricultural Experiment Station appointment will be evaluated on their performance in AES in accordance with the Academic Personnel Manual. It is expected that individual faculty members will participate in a wide variety of mission-oriented outreach activities.

The college seeks a balance between I&R and AES expectations. Depending on the I&R/AES split appointment, faculty with an AES appointment of >0.7 FTE will have higher expectations of mission-oriented research and outreach activities than faculty members with an Agricultural Experiment Station appointment of <0.3 FTE.

**Cooperative Extension**

Cooperative Extension faculty have direct extension responsibilities that necessarily inform and direct their scholarship. In general, scholarship by specialists in CE will focus more on integration and application. Specialists in CE have responsibilities for extension teaching and research, and for providing statewide leadership in their individual area of expertise. Specialists in Cooperative Extension are expected to develop and maintain programs that are recognized nationally and, when appropriate, internationally as being among the leading programs in their areas.

Extension teaching includes a statewide liaison function linking disciplinary research to clientele groups (growers, processors, and consumers). Statewide leadership responsibilities for extension may take many forms, including developing statewide educational programs, professional
interactions with county-based extension advisors, and formal extension advisor training activities.

Expectations and criteria for evaluation of research quality and productivity for specialists in Cooperative Extension are similar to those of I&R/AES faculty in that the record should demonstrate excellence in the context of the candidate’s appointment criteria. Specialists in CE are expected to regularly report research results in appropriate peer-reviewed journals as well as in literature accessible to the clientele groups their programs serve.

University Service

All faculty, regardless of appointment, have similar responsibilities for service and professional activity. These responsibilities will be met in many different ways and will take different forms at different career stages. Service to the institution will include active participation in the affairs of the department, college, and campus. Both the quality and the quantity of the service will be evaluated. A list of service activities and analysis of the quality of the service can be attached to the departmental letter. Specialists should check with their department chairs to determine what types of university service are expected at the assistant, associate, and full titles.

Public Service and Professional Activity

Professional activities may include service to professional or scholarly societies, editorial service to scholarly journals, and reviewing of grant proposals and manuscripts.

Public service responsibilities may include service to extramural constituency groups such as presentations of research results, service to governmental and community agencies, interactions with clientele groups, and similar activities.

Faculty members at the assistant level are encouraged to provide service by reviewing manuscripts and research proposals and participating in national scientific meetings.

Faculty members at the associate rank are encouraged to provide service by reviewing manuscripts and research proposals and participating in national scientific meetings. Professional service, recognition, and leadership is also reflected by serving on editorial boards of scientific journals, review panels of granting agencies, being members of the scientific advisory board of companies or commodities groups, serving as a liaison officer between commodities and university, being invited speakers at national or international meetings, etc. Evidence of a range of these activities will be expected at the time of promotion to full title.

Faculty members considered for advancement to full title Step VI and higher are expected to show increasing levels of national and/or international involvement in the above-listed activities. Service as a reviewer of research or teaching programs at the national or international level, being involved in the organizations of professional societies or in organizing scientific meetings, being invited to speak at national or international meetings are desirable evidence of public service and professional competence.
Specialists in Cooperative Extension (CE) are educators and researchers having a fundamental role within the land-grant universities. They develop educational and research programs within their discipline to address the needs of clientele, and they carry out those programs on and off campus. Each specialist in CE is charged to provide statewide leadership in his or her area of responsibility, develop outreach programs, train Cooperative Extension advisors and other clientele, and conduct research that addresses the needs of the state’s rural and urban constituencies. Specialists in CE work with Agricultural Experiment Station and professorial appointees to bring relevant knowledge and technology to bear on the problems of clientele. Specialists in CE are expected to demonstrate expertise in their disciplines as well as the ability to interpret, synthesize, adapt, and convey knowledge and information through traditional and nontraditional teaching methods.

In contrast, the professor’s role is to educate, primarily resident instruction for students matriculating in degree programs, and perform basic and/or applied research in a discipline. Their work may deal with applied issues as is done by the specialists in CE, but is frequently focused on the more fundamental issues of their disciplines. As with specialists in CE, professors are expected to demonstrate expertise in their disciplines as well as the ability to interpret, synthesize, adapt, and convey knowledge and information through traditional and nontraditional teaching methods.

The following summary and evaluation guidelines are intended to be used in personnel actions relating to specialists in CE nominated for or holding fractional professorial appointments.* Emphasis and clarification is offered primarily in the areas of (1) teaching, and (2) research, creative, and scholarly achievements.

Titles in the Specialist in Cooperative Extension and Agronomist (___ in the AES) series are complementary and increase the value of an appointee as an educator and researcher in both
roles. Therefore, persons with an appointment split between the Specialist in CE and Agronomist series can serve goals and missions of both without detriment to either. In order to achieve a synergy, the partial appointments in each series have to be realistically evaluated with an eye toward encouraging the synergy.

The following review guidelines are intended to be used in personnel actions relating to specialists in CE nominated for, or holding, fractional agronomist appointments.* Emphasis and clarification is offered primarily in the areas of (1) extending knowledge (or outreach), and (2) research, creative, and scholarly achievements, since the major responsibilities of specialists in CE differ from those of agronomists.

**Parallel and overlapping goals and missions**

The goals of the specialist in CE component of an appointment of a person with a split CE/OR appointment are parallel to the missions of the Agricultural Experiment Station and may overlap them.

The goal of specialists in CE is to develop and conduct a research-based education program aimed at appropriate clientele groups off campus, as noted in Section UCD-334-10. (Clientele are defined broadly as any constituency that makes use of disciplinary information from the appointee’s expertise.) Although research is part of the job, the driving force is the educational program.

On the other hand, the primary role of an agronomist is to carry out research or other creative activity, the work being aligned to the mission of the Agricultural Experiment Station and with the outreach component of the appointment subservient to the research function (as noted in Section UCD-320). Research done for the CE portion of the appointment in many cases may be identical to the research done for the agronomist portion of the appointment as the mission of the AES may align well with the academic direction of the appointee’s discipline and outreach program. However, work for the AES in some cases may differ substantially in content.

An agronomist is also expected to perform outreach activities, but the purpose of these activities is to provide people and groups served by the mission of the Agricultural Experiment Station with information derived from or related to the research of the appointee. Cooperative Extension outreach may involve any aspect of the discipline, not only information derived from the appointee’s own research. Outreach activities may occur on or off campus. To achieve the desired synergy, a person with a split appointment should include research-based information from the agronomist portion of the appointment in his or her Cooperative Extension education program.

Professional competence activities of both the Agronomist and Specialist in CE series should serve the academic discipline in a way appropriate to the professional interests and skills of the appointee. The professional competence activities for the agronomist portion of a split appointment clearly overlap with the professional competence activities of the CE portion of the appointment.
In a similar way, the service component of an agronomist’s appointment is guided by the organizational needs of the Agricultural Experiment Station and the needs of the clientele as they relate to the mission of the AES. The service work for the Cooperative Extension portion of an appointment may overlap considerably with the service work done for the agronomist portion of the appointment, because both are based upon the disciplinary competence of the appointee and organizational needs of the university and the community.

It should be clear to persons with split appointments, and to those evaluating accomplishments of those persons, that the goals and missions of both components of a split appointment must be met, whether they are met by identical or discrete accomplishments.

**Weighting accomplishments of a person with a split appointment**

Means of evaluating the quality of work for a person with a Specialist in CE series appointment are defined by Section UCD-334. Means of evaluating the quality of work for a person with an Agronomist series title are defined by Section UCD-320. The quality of work must be evaluated independently of the percentages of each portion of the split appointment.

The quantity of work for each aspect of the split appointment, however, will be influenced by the percentage of the appointment in the Specialist in CE and Agronomist series. Ideally, the appointee should have accomplishments aligning with the specialist in CE and agronomist appointments, consistent with the percentage of appointment in each title series. For example, if a person has a 75 percent appointment in the CE series and a 25 percent appointment in the Agronomist series, approximately 75 percent of the accomplishments should be aligned with the CE goals and 25 percent of the accomplishments should be aligned with the mission of the AES. In reality, this splitting of work cannot be done neatly because of the overlapping nature of goals and missions.

Therefore, it is necessary for the appointee, department chair, director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, and director of Cooperative Extension to come to an agreement on the balance of the appointee’s work. This understanding should be communicated to the committees and persons that evaluate the appointee’s accomplishments with regard to continuing appointment, merit raises, and promotions. The understanding should be communicated to the appointee in all the conventional ways that appointees interact with department chairs, the director of the AES (or designee), and the director of CE (or designee) and be done in full regard of the principles of academic freedom relevant to both titles.

With regard to the agronomist portion of the appointment, the approved project description (see Section UCD-320-4) should give a conceptual and specific overview of the expectations for that portion of the appointment. The Cooperative Extension job description should give an overview of the expectations for that portion of the appointment.

With regard to evaluations, the merit or promotion dossier of the appointee should have sections corresponding to all aspects of the split appointment. It is incumbent upon the appointee in his or her self-statement and upon the departmental letter to elucidate clearly the understanding concerning the balance of activities in a way that the evaluators can determine whether an
appropriate balance has been met. The evaluative letter written by the department chair is a document of utmost importance to the evaluation process. The understanding between the appointee, department chair, director of the AES (or designee), and director of CE (or designee) with regard to the balance of work expected with a split appointment must follow the guidelines below.

**Evaluation guidelines**

The primary instrument for evaluating the professional accomplishments of specialists in Cooperative Extension are the individual position descriptions. The position descriptions provide a context for and a characterization of the percent of effort expended in all areas of responsibility. Merit and promotion actions will be awarded based on high quality of accomplishments. The departmental letter and supporting documentation should clearly document the specialist’s accomplishments in the following areas. (Note: In accordance with federal laws, equal opportunity/affirmative action are integral parts of each appointee’s responsibilities in programmatic and personnel areas.)

1. **Extending knowledge and outreach**

A specialist’s ultimate responsibility is education. This activity takes place on and off campus, in organized or informal meetings or field demonstrations, and through all appropriate print and electronic media. Programs often are initiated and organized by Cooperative Extension advisors or other clientele groups to serve county, regional, institutional, or industry needs. A major responsibility of specialists in CE is to educate their clientele about recent advances in knowledge and technology and to encourage the use of new and improved practices. Information extended may originate from a wide variety of sources including research conducted by AES scientists (outreach) or researchers in other states or countries, or from the appointee’s own research. AES responsibilities in this area of performance include such outreach.

Evidence of accomplishments includes organization of and participation in workshops, short courses, symposia, and informational meetings; preparation of publications directed to user groups and decision-makers in the specialist’s area of responsibility; establishment of computer networks; and preparation of films, video, PowerPoints, slide sets, etc. Examples of information that indicates performance, growth, and accomplishment include:

- Effectiveness of training programs, leadership support, and cooperation provided to county Cooperative Extension personnel or clientele.
- Effective leadership of, or teamwork with, county CE personnel to identify and reach a broad range of clientele.
- Range of educational methods used, with new or improved educational methods utilized.
- Use by county CE personnel and/or clientele of information or educational products developed (e.g., publications, audio-visual packages, software).
- Change in clientele or industry practices as a result of educational efforts.
It is important to evaluate the quality of the appointee’s program and its effect on society within the context of the job description.

2. Research and/or creative activity

Research and creative activity carried out by specialists in CE with an agronomist appointment is aimed at resolution of existing or potentially significant issues or problems in California. Such problems and issues are often identified with information from Cooperative Extension county advisors and clientele groups. Collaboration and cooperation with AES faculty, with other specialists in CE, and with CE advisors is usual.

The research is expected to provide important new insights or approaches to the solution of problems. The research should exhibit scientific rigor, originality, innovation, and creativity. To fulfill the research component of the AES appointment, appointees are expected to engage (to a level commensurate with the FTE appointment) in concept-building research, with the results published in peer-reviewed journals. Additionally, because of the problem-solving or mission orientation of research in CE, and the need to reach appropriate clientele, appointees are expected to publish in a variety of semi-technical or popular outlets to communicate effectively with a user audience. Information that indicates performance, growth, and accomplishment includes:

- Publication of research and/or creative activity in appropriate outlets, including peer-reviewed journals and shared authorship papers.
- Leadership in research and/or creative activity.
- Cooperation with others in addressing problems and opportunities.
- New technology, practices, or adaptations developed as a result of research activities.
- Level of difficulty or challenge in the problem addressed.
- Relationship of research and/or creative activity to overall program priorities and goals.

It is important to evaluate the quality of the appointee’s program and its effect on society within the context of the job description.

3. Professional competence

The expectations for professional competence for specialists in CE with Agricultural Experiment Station appointments are similar to other academic members of the University of California, as are expectations of participation in the activities of appropriate professional and scientific societies. Information that indicates performance, growth, and accomplishment includes:

- Contribution to programmatic, administrative, or organizational direction and leadership.
- Commitment and effectiveness in development and maintenance of productive cooperative relationships (e.g., committee service, workgroup participation).
Effectiveness in developing and maintaining liaison and cooperative working partnership among Cooperative Extension personnel, interest groups, research agencies, and others involved in the program.

- Effort and effectiveness in aiding and counseling peers and non-peers.
- Type and degree of participation in disciplinary and professional societies.
- Professional competence or recognition, including awards, honors, fellowships, grants, peer and non-peer respect, collegial testimony.

4. Service

Specialists in CE with AES appointments are expected to serve on the same general types of committees as other campus-based academics. In addition, appointees typically provide liaison between campus-based research and technology users. This role may require that appointees work with agencies, organizations, industry groups, and CE advisors to coordinate cooperative projects and maintain relationships with both external and internal groups.

*A Agronomist appointments are referred to as “organized research” (OR) positions. Hence, split appointments are colloquially referred to as CE/OR appointments.

**In practice, the director of the AES and the director of CE delegate the responsibility for direct contact with agronomists to campus personnel (e.g., the dean) who then may redelegate responsibilities to the department chairs. In most cases the department chair serves as the primary contact for appointees when interpreting the appropriate balance in workload. The AES work should be consistent with the CE job description.
8. Frank Questions and Undocumented Answers for Specialists in Cooperative Extension

How many Category I (Cat I) publications does it take to be promoted to an associate specialist in Cooperative Extension at UC Davis?
This can vary widely among specialists, depending on the program. If the emphasis of an individual’s program is on extension, it would be expected that a lower number of Cat I publications would be compensated for by numerous extension (Cat II) publications. In general, however, a strong research program will generally assure promotion, provided that you have also developed an extension program. A number is not reported in the APM.

Is there an order of significance on how authors are listed on a publication?
While it varies from discipline to discipline, the first and last authorship positions are the most critical. First authorship indicates the person was the primary direct contributor to the manuscript. The last authorship position is typically given to the person in whose laboratory the research was conducted, is the supervisor of the main author, or who got the grant to conduct the research. Secondary authorship positions generally indicate that the author played a collaborative role in the publication and they are usually listed in order of contribution. The order of significance on how the authors are listed should be clarified in the dossier under Contribution to Jointly Authored Papers (See Chapter 11).

How many Cat I publications should I publish every year?
No rules are available in the APM. However, the journal in which you publish is of importance. Journals with higher impact factors are often viewed as more significant than low- or no-impact factor journals. However, because of the role of specialists in Cooperative Extension, it is recognized that publications of research must target the audience most likely to benefit from the work. As a result, the impact factor of journals is not as important for specialists as it is for I&R faculty.

Should I get involved in collaborative research or can collaborative research have a negative impact on promotion?
In principle, there should be an advantage of getting involved in collaborative research projects. Most successful research grant applications list multiple (co)-PIs. This can include collaborations with I&R faculty, other specialists in Cooperative Extension, and in particular, area and county Cooperative Extension advisors. It is critical that you develop a program and not just participate in a number of projects. It should be clear from the Contribution to Jointly Authored Papers that you were able to play a significant role and that the research is part of your own overall independent research program. It is important to discuss how authorship on publications will be handled ahead of time.

Do only Cat I papers really count when you go up for promotion?
Cat I publications are very important and can make the promotion and merit process much easier for specialists in CE. A lack of Cat I publications is very difficult to make up with more service, outreach, and extension. However, Cat II and III extension publications can also be very important and should not be ignored. The success of an extension program can depend on how a
specialist in Cooperative Extension disseminates information. There are many avenues to do this, of which extension publications play a critical role.

**Can I pay myself the 12th month as I have an 11-month appointment?**
No, you cannot pay yourself a 12th month from research grants. I&R faculty are allowed to pay themselves from research grants for research work performed on those days for which they report vacation. By policy, specialists in Cooperative Extension are currently not allowed this practice.

**Can I consult on the side?**
Yes, you can consult provided it is not a conflict of interest with your job. Specialists in Cooperative Extension with 11-month appointments are allowed to provide paid-for consulting services (excluding any grants administered through the UC Davis Office of Research) for up to 48 days per year (without reporting vacation on those days) and for additional days if vacation days are reported for these days. Please see the APM-025 FAQ Factsheet for specialists in Cooperative Extension, which the Dean’s Office published in 2006.

**Can I / should I pay myself from a grant rather than have UC Davis pay me?**
Yes, if the grant permits, you can pay your regular (9-month or 11-month) salary from a grant. The grant will have to also pay any applicable overhead on your salary charges to the grant. The incentive for doing so is that the salary savings will be available to you for research, travel, etc., in your 19900 account; however, this policy resides at the discretion of the department chair. Note that the salary savings returned to you will be less than the charge to the grant due to the difference between your salary and the charge to the grant, which includes overhead.

**When should I consider going for an accelerated merit or promotion?**
Most accelerations are one-year accelerated merits, although accelerations can also be for promotions and can be for more than one year. As a rule, accelerations are often considered for those who accomplish in one year what would be expected in two years (at the assistant and low step associate rank) or in two years what would be expected in three years (as the high step associate or full title rank). However, it is important to recognize that Cat I publications are important, but not the only criteria used to evaluate an acceleration. All areas, including your extension program, professional competence, and university service must be strong, but one or two must be exceptional.
APM-025 Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members
Frequently Asked Questions

Question: What titles does the policy apply to?
Answer: The policy applies to all members of the Academic Senate (Professor, Professor in Residence, Professor of Clinical X, Adjunct Professor, Clinical Professor, Visiting and Acting Professors, Lecturers with Security of Employment), Lecturers (Unit 18), Supervisors of Teacher Education, Supervisors of Physical Education.

Question: Are Specialists in Cooperative Extension required to adhere to this policy?
Answer: According to the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, in the absence of a specific policy in the ANR Handbook, specialists in CE should adhere to campus policy. Even though the APM-025 is limited to Senate and Unit 18 titles, the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences requires that specialists in Cooperative Extension adhere to this policy.

Question: How much time can I spend in consulting activities?
Answer:
- A full-time academic year (9 month) faculty member may engage in compensated outside professional activities for up to 39 days from the start of fall quarter though the end of spring quarter.
- A full-time fiscal year (11 month) faculty member may engage in compensated outside professional activities for up to 48 days during the active months of service. Vacation does not need to be reported for these activities.

Question: What constitutes a “conflict of commitment”?
Answer: Any activity, whether compensated or uncompensated, professional or nonprofessional, that interferes with the successful performance of a faculty member’s university obligations represents a conflict of commitment. Regents Standing Order 103.1(b) states that faculty members shall not allow outside employment to interfere with primary university duties.

Question: What are the different categories and when is prior approval required?
Answer:
- Category I: These are activities likely on their face to raise issues of conflict of commitment. Prior approval is required before engaging in this type of activity. A partial list of these activities include:
  - Assuming an executive or managerial position in a for-profit or not-for-profit business. (This does not include serving on a board of directors of an outside entity, or providing consulting services or engaging in professional practice through the faculty member’s single member professional corporation or sole proprietorship.)
  - Administering a grant outside the university that would ordinarily be conducted under the auspices of the university.
  - Establishing a relationship as a salaried employee outside the university. Compensated teaching and/or research at another institution while employed as a full-time faculty member at the University of California is not permitted without prior approval of the chancellor or executive vice chancellor.
Engaging in other compensated outside professional activities which common sense and good judgment would indicate are likely to raise issues of conflict of commitment.

- **Category II**: These activities are unlikely to raise issues of conflict of commitment and are ordinarily accepted as a regularly performed compensated outside professional activities. Most Category II activities do not require prior approval. When in doubt, seek approval.
  - Expert testimony
  - Providing consulting services or engaging in professional practice where such activities are provided by the faculty member acting as an individual or are provided by the faculty member through his or her single member professional corporation.
  - Serving on the board of directors of an outside entity.
  - Providing a workshop for industry.
  - University teaching activities, such as University Extension courses/programs or continuing education programs run by the university are reportable and counted toward the 39/48 day limit.

- **Category III**: These are activities that are generally accepted as part of a faculty member’s scholarly and creative work. Whether compensated or not, these activities are not counted within the 39/48 day limit. Approval is not required, and these activities do not need to be reported annually, although should be reported for merits and promotions.
  - Serving on a federal, state, or local government agency, committee, panel, or commission.
  - Serving in an editorial capacity for a professional journal.
  - Reviewing journal manuscripts, book manuscripts, and grant or contract proposals.
  - Attending and presenting talks at scholarly colloquia and conferences.
  - Development scholarly communications in the form of books or journal articles, movies, television productions, etc., even when such activities result in financial gain.
  - Serving as a committee member or as an officer of a professional or scholarly society.
  - Accepting a commission for an artistic work or performance.
  - Accepting honoraria and prizes (except as those described in Category II)

**Question: Whose approval is required for Category I and some Category II activities?**
Answer: Signatures are required from the faculty member, department chair, and dean/associate dean.

**Question: What are the annual reporting requirements?**
Answer: All Category I and II activities must be reported annually using APM-025, Appendix C. Beginning 2005–06, Appendix C will be required regardless of whether or not you engaged in outside professional activities. The Provost’s Office is revising the form to include a box a faculty member can check if they did not engage in outside professional activities.
Question: Can I use university equipment to engage in outside professional activities?
Answer: UCD-015, Faculty Code of Conduct, states that “unauthorized use of university resources or facilities on a significant scale for personal, commercial, political, or religious purposes” is a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct. Exceptions may be granted if the faculty member can prove that there are no other facilities available to conduct this type of activity and the exception requires prior approval.

Question: Can I consult within California?
Answer: Yes, however, one must be careful about what agreements one enters. It needs to be abundantly clear that the consulting work is not part of your regular university duties and that it does not violate any university policy. If in doubt, request prior approval.
9. Agricultural Experiment Station: Hatch Proposals

Individual Mission-Oriented Research and Outreach Plans (Hatch Proposals)

All faculty who have an AES appointment have to submit a Hatch (AES) project. New faculty members with an AES appointment must submit a Hatch project within the first year of arrival. An individual’s AES mission-oriented research is described in his or her AES project, which is subject to review and renewal every five years. The review process for AES projects is initiated within a faculty member’s home department/section. After proposals are approved by department/section chairs, they are forwarded to the Office of the Associate Director of the AES where they undergo centralized review. As proposals are approved, they are forwarded to the AES Director’s Office in Oakland (UC Agriculture and Natural Resources) for co-signing and transmittal to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for final approval. A faculty member’s AES project serves as a basis for evaluating progress and accomplishments with regard to the AES.

Every year, a progress report must be submitted for approval. The Dean’s Office will send a reminder for the annual progress report.

While not a federal requirement, UC Davis faculty members with an AES appointment are required to include an outreach plan in the AES project proposal, in addition to the standard research plan. These two plans serve as the approved, documented standard against which research and outreach accomplishments can be evaluated.

Hatch projects are related to the land-grant status of the UC system. Although UC has land-grant status, the resources associated with the land-grant status of UC are divided between UC Berkeley, UC Riverside, and UC Davis. The large majority of the funding for UC Davis is allocated to the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CA&ES). Approved Hatch projects are directly linked to the amount of funds allocated to CA&ES, and subsequently the department.

Many faculty in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) hold fiscal-year appointments split between the Instruction and Research (I&R) and Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) components of the university. Since 1995, faculty have been hired into fiscal-year term (FYT) appointments in which the base appointment is an academic year (9-month) which is extended to a fiscal year (11-month) appointment for a fixed term; hence the designation “fiscal-year term appointment.” Upon hiring, each candidate signs a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which details the terms of the FYT appointment and the AES expectations. These appointments are subject to periodic review to determine whether the fiscal year term appointment will be renewed. If not, the position reverts to the standard academic year appointment and the AES appointment will be subject to removal.

If at all possible, the renewal of the fiscal-year term appointment will coincide with a regular merit or promotion action.
In November 2002, the chancellor designated the Agricultural Experiment Station associate
director as “responsible for conducting reviews of the AES component of faculty holding FYT
appointments.” In the first three rounds of review, concerns were raised by the Term
Appointment Review Committee (TARC) about the AES mission-oriented outreach activities for
a number of faculty members. The FYT appointment for each of these faculty members was
renewed, but they also were required to submit a “brief mid-term update and progress report on
[their] successes at identifying and connecting with appropriate outreach clientele . . .” Therefore
FYT appointees are advised that documenting satisfactory outreach activity will be important for
future renewal of the FYT appointment.

Faculty outreach in general is attracting increased interest. For example, the National Science
Foundation requires that grantees address the “broader impacts” of their proposed research,
including evidence for broad dissemination of results and benefits to society. Likewise, the
UC Davis Strategic Plan lists faculty “engagement” (extension) as one of three goals, along with
“learning” (teaching) and “discovery” (research). Future evaluation of academic units will
include reviews of progress toward these goals. Thus, faculty documentation of AES mission-
oriented outreach activities can help to satisfy expectations in arenas beyond the AES per se.

Faculty performance in the AES is evaluated in accordance with the Academic Personnel
UCD-320 includes Exhibit A, Evaluating split appointments: Agronomist (_____ in the
Agricultural Experiment Station) with a professorial title.

The AES outreach plan presented here outlines some of the ways in which faculty can fulfill and
document their AES mission-oriented outreach obligations. It is anticipated that individual
faculty members will participate in a wide variety of mission-oriented outreach activities that are
not specifically mentioned in this document. (NOTE: Several phrases below have been excerpted
or paraphrased from UCD-320.)

Identifying Clientele and Stakeholders

Land-grant universities are accountable to clientele, many of whom also serve as stakeholders.
The Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension provide major conduits by
which universities fulfill this mission. Clientele comprises “the clients of a professional person
taken collectively,” or “a body of customers or patrons,” and a stakeholder has “a share or
interest in an enterprise, especially a financial share.”

Stakeholders include governmental agencies, organizations representing California agricultural
and business interests, environmental groups, citizen groups, non-governmental organizations,
and biotechnology and pharmaceutical firms. These often contract for research programs directed
toward specific issues. For example, the program to study Pierce’s disease of grapevine has been
funded by a broad mix of governmental and nongovernmental agencies.

Therefore, mission-oriented research should meet the needs of identifiable clients. What people
and processes will benefit from the mission-oriented research? The resulting outreach program
will identify appropriate conduits to provide communication for the professional researcher to
learn about clients’ needs, and to report back the results of mission-oriented research guided by these needs.

Mission-oriented Outreach

Outreach activities may be conducted on or off campus, but will vary by person and/or discipline. Some CA&ES and CBS faculty conduct research that is directly relevant to off-campus clientele. However, some of the mission-oriented research conducted by faculty is very basic and therefore unlikely to immediately impact practices in the field. In these cases, outreach may involve consultation or collaboration with other AES and non-AES scientists who can move fundamental research closer to a practical application.

The primary determinant of outreach is activity that directly or indirectly delivers information to California’s citizens operating outside the confines of academia. Thus, normal teaching activities involving undergraduate or graduate students, publications in peer-reviewed journals that are targeted for an academic audience, and presentations made to one’s academic colleagues at professional society meetings do not constitute outreach that is consistent with the AES mission. A number of outreach possibilities are described in UCD-320, and additional examples are listed below.

Regardless of the exact outreach activities, it is expected that all researchers holding AES appointments will conduct research that is relevant to the mission of the UC Davis Agricultural Experiment Station. Many faculty may benefit from participation in ANR Workgroups, where important research issues are identified, research collaborations can develop, and outreach activities are planned.

Examples of Mission-oriented Outreach

The examples below are excerpted from FYT renewal requests evaluated by the Term Appointment Review Committee (TARC). Each example has been edited to remove specific details that might identify a particular faculty member, and each is included here with permission from the faculty member. Most examples of faculty outreach statements are from FYT requests that were approved by TARC, and help illustrate the range of outreach activities that are deemed appropriate to the AES mission. The final two examples illustrate activities that were judged as not appropriate.

- I collaborate with a California biotechnology company that is a major player in products for genotyping and gene expression analysis. Biotechnology for agricultural research is one of several important parts of their product portfolio. For example, this company produces gene chips for barley, soybean, and wheat. Improvements to performance of these agriculture-related biotechnology products represent a direct benefit to the stakeholder, the research community, and ultimately, the farmer.

- Membership in an ANR Biotechnology Workgroup, participation in the Explorit Science Center’s Corporate Science Challenge, phone consultations with members of the biotech
industry on possible avenues for improving the accuracy of genetic engineering, presenting a seminar at a California biotech company, and discussions with reporters on a variety of science-related topics.

- I have worked closely with the California Department of Fish and Game staff scientists on defining the historical and present day extent of a major California fishery. We documented the consumption of a specific food and educated food-stamp clients on concerns related to associated toxins. I am also involved in a number of K-12 outreach activities that include education in public schools. This involved running day-long science classes within the local school district.

- During this review period, I gave 35 professional presentations and lectures at several agricultural and occupational conferences, symposia, and short courses. There were several summaries written in industry magazines about some of the research that I conducted. I was co-organizer of a national conference attended by many agricultural health and safety professionals. Lastly, I am a member of two ANR workgroups whose foci coincide with my research program.

- In a collaborative effort with a California biotechnology company, funded through a BioStar grant, we proposed to generate new reagents to assay for a particular class of bioactive compounds.

- Our work on a specific aspect of microbial physiology garnered the attention of microbiologists at a large California winery. They were very interested in our novel application of genetic analysis to investigate the growth of laboratory strains under different nutritional conditions. I presented our work at the winery’s research laboratory, and we plan to extend our methods to the analysis of their industrial strains.

- My primary outreach activity is the writing, testing, distribution, and support of computer programs for analysis of scientific data. Based on communication I have had with users, the clientele for these programs includes researchers at a variety of institutions in California and around the world. To extend this outreach to the broadest possible clientele, all my software is available on my web site, free of charge, and “open source,” meaning that the original computer source code is provided, making it easy for users to modify or adapt the programs for their own purposes. In addition, I spend a considerable amount of time answering queries from users regarding the software and addressing their needs in subsequent versions of the code.

- I have given interviews to local newspapers in locations where the invasive species we study pose particular threats to environmental or economic concerns. I have also given interviews on species invasions for a number of mainstream press outlets (regional newspapers, radio, and magazines). I work as a science advisor for a major national news show. I teamed with a UC Cooperative Extension specialist to educate boat owners about the risks that watercraft may contribute to the spread of invasive species. I am working collaboratively to develop an educational program for coastal California residents to
teach them about their local marine communities and to guide them to create and execute projects and policies aimed at protecting and restoring the area in which they live.

- I presented six talks from 2000–2004 at forums that include mixed audiences of nutritionists, health professionals, and the general public. I also participated in an informal homework policy study and update group in a California school district. I performed research and prepared a document that argued homework in elementary school should be limited in order to increase time available for exercise (play) as this may promote health and reduce childhood obesity. The results of my research and the prepared document were widely circulated. Although my role was minor, the school district has adopted some limits on elementary school homework.

- I recently began working with a local water agency and a local watershed coordinating committee on the problem posed by an introduced invertebrate. The water agency is charged with caring for this source of water, and the results of our work on this problem will be of direct application in solving the problem of this invasive invertebrate. A second way of accomplishing outreach follows from my recently joining the Conservation Biology ANR workgroup. My intention here is to use the workgroup to establish stronger ties with state wildlife personnel and other groups that are concerned with the demise of native species in the face of the introduced species. My hope is that the workgroup will provide greater exposure to target groups.

Examples of outreach activities that do not satisfy AES expectations:

- I have given research presentations to a lay audience of donors to a fundraising organization with focus on a specific set of human diseases.

- My lab has been active in undergraduate and high school education, in the form of providing a research environment where the students actively perform research at similar levels to that of graduate students. The lab supports typically three to five undergraduate researchers at any given time. Additionally, the lab usually hosts one high school student per year.

**Excerpts from the Academic Personnel Manual**

*Excerpt from UCD-320-4 (Series Description)*
AES projects are supported by federal and state funds earmarked for mission-oriented research, both basic and applied, consistent with the mission of the California Agricultural Experiment Station. The AES appointee is expected to disseminate the results of that research, sometimes but not always mediated by Cooperative Extension, to other scientists and to those who can use and benefit directly from the results. In addition, the AES appointee is expected to provide services to the university and public and private sectors and complement university educational programs both on and off campus. It is expected that research will be the dominant activity, providing direction to the other activities of the appointee.
Excerpt from UCD-320-10 (Criteria)
Outreach activities apply research-based expertise to identify issues and communicate solutions to people within the state or society. As such, these activities are derivative of research productivity. Outreach activities could include any of the following at the appointee’s discretion: interacting with officials in local, state and/or federal governmental agencies, with private sector companies that have goals in common with the AES, and/or with Cooperative Extension (specialists, advisors, workgroups, and programs); participating in meetings with the public; publishing articles in popular and trade/industry magazines; providing information for articles for newspapers, radio, or visual media; developing computer software; working with public or private schools; teaching University Extension courses or short courses; participating in workshops, field tours, or symposia; or other activities.

Guidelines for Developing a Hatch (AES) Project Proposal and AD-421 Reports

All specialists with a partial AES appointment or those who desire to be part of a Regional Hatch project must develop and submit a Hatch project proposal and maintain an active Hatch project by annually submitting AD-421 reports. An annual AD-421 report must also be submitted by the principal investigator (even without AES appointment, e.g., specialist in Cooperative Extension) of a USDA research grant (for example, USDA NRI grants). The guidelines for preparation of a Hatch project proposal follows.

Examples of Hatch projects and AD-421 reports can be found at http://cris.nifa.usda.gov/search.html.

In this website select the Assisted Search category and click on “Any” in the middle box. You can enter the name of any of your colleagues who have a Hatch project and review the type of information that they have included in their project and reports. Examples of full project proposals of colleagues in your department can be obtained the administrative staff in your department or the AES project staff person in the Dean’s Office.

Guidelines for faculty: Preparation of Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) Project Proposals
September 2005

Overview: The goals of this document are (1) to describe the review process that AES project proposals will undergo on the UC Davis campus prior to being forwarded to the USDA and (2) to provide guidelines for the formatting and content of the proposals.

AES project proposal review process. All AES project proposals are subject to two stages of review on the UC Davis campus before being forwarded to USDA for final review. The first stage of review is conducted within the principal investigator’s home department, and is focused on the scientific rigor of the proposed work. This review will generally be conducted by an
ad hoc committee consisting of two faculty members who have expertise in the field of inquiry addressed by the proposal. In cases where the AES project proposal is a revision of a former proposal rather than a new project, the departmental review will also include an assessment of progress made towards completion of the original proposal’s objectives.

The second stage of review is conducted by the associate director of the UC Davis Agricultural Experiment Station in conjunction with the AES Project Proposal Review Committee, made up of the associate deans from CA&ES and CBS. This second stage of review will assess whether or not the proposal is consistent with the mission of the California Agricultural Experiment Station, including aspects of both the proposed research and the plan for outreach to stakeholders.

Guidelines for proposal content and format. The AES project proposal should be prepared as a bi-partite document. The first part of the document will contain the standard AES project proposal, employing the format that is requested by the USDA. Only this part of the proposal will be forwarded to the USDA for final approval. The second part of the document will include additional information that is relevant specifically to California’s Agricultural Experiment Station, and is for campus use only.

Part 1: The federal Agricultural Experiment Station project description

Overview
Individuals with appointments in the UC Davis Agricultural Experiment Station account for their research efforts with AES projects. AES projects (including Hatch, Multistate, McIntire-Stennis, or Animal Health) provide necessary research documentation for the university, in its role as a public land-grant institution, to answer questions about current and past research, planning, goals, and direction. The proposal should be scientifically rigorous while remaining easily understood by other interested parties (such as legislative analysts and so-called “watchdog” groups) with little or no scientific background.

Proposals should be three to five pages in length, single-spaced, and exclusive of references. The complete project number, i.e., CA-D*-ABC-1234-H, must be at the top of each page of the project narrative for new and revised projects.

Title
The title (maximum length 100 characters) should provide a clear and concise statement of the subject of the research. Multistate projects must have the same title as the regional project outline.

Justification
Research proposed must conform to the policy specified in the Hatch Act. This policy is very broad with respect to subjects that can be studied, however relevance to agriculture is required.
This section should state, as appropriate:
1. the importance of the problem to agriculture and/or rural life of the state or region
2. the reasons for doing the work (e.g., the needs the project will address), and the project’s timeliness
3. the ways in which scientific knowledge will be advanced
4. the ways in which public welfare will be advanced

Previous Work and Present Outlook
This section should provide the conceptual framework for the project. It should include a summary of relevant previous and current work in the research topic area conducted by the principal investigator and others, and a description of the additional understanding that is to be achieved by the proposed work. For proposals that are revisions of previous projects, it is important to cite the publications that emerged from the original AES project.

Objectives
The objectives should be numbered, single-sentence statements of specific goals of the research project. Avoid using sub-objectives, and avoid listing more than six objectives.

Procedure
The procedures section should describe the methodology to be used to attain each of the project’s objectives. Procedures should, to the extent possible, follow the order of the objectives.

Duration
Estimate the amount of time necessary to complete the research and publish the results. The maximum period for a project is five years; projects requiring more than five years will require a revised AES project proposal prior to or at the time of their estimated termination date.

Support and Personnel
Estimate the FTE that will be devoted to the project for all personnel involved over the life of the project. State the names of the principal investigator, co-investigators, and any technical staff involved with the research (when known).

Institutional Units Involved
Identify all units within the University of California, including research facilities, that will contribute to the research effort.

Cooperation
Identify other experiment stations, institutions or agencies expected to cooperate formally or informally on the project. If the project is a contributing project to a multistate project, list the multistate project number.

Literature Cited
Provide full citations to all literature cited in the body of the proposal.
Part 2: UC Davis Agricultural Experiment Station

The second part of the AES project proposal is to include text that specifically addresses how the project addresses the mission of the UC Davis Agricultural Experiment Station. This part of the proposal text will not be forwarded to USDA.

Relevance to the Mission of the UC Davis Agricultural Experiment Station (one paragraph)
All proposals, regardless of whether the proposed research is to be conducted within or outside of California, must provide a concise explanation of how the proposed work will ultimately address problems of importance to the people of California.

Outreach (one paragraph)
There has been some confusion regarding what constitutes outreach that is appropriate to the mission of the AES. Such outreach is described in APM Section UCD-320-10-a-2, “Mission-Oriented Research”

Outreach activities apply research-based expertise to identify issues and communicate solutions to people within the state or society. As such, these activities are derivative of research productivity. Outreach activities could include any of the following at the appointee’s discretion: interacting with officials in local, state, and/or federal governmental agencies, with private sector companies that have goals in common with the AES, and/or with Cooperative Extension (specialists, advisors, workgroups, and programs); participating in meetings with the public; publishing articles in popular and trade/industry magazines; providing information for articles for newspapers, radio, or visual media; developing computer software; working with public or private schools; teaching University Extension courses or short courses; participating in workshops, field tours, or symposia; or other activities.

Thus, the primary determinant of outreach is activities that directly or indirectly deliver information to California’s citizens operating outside of the confines of academia. (Normal teaching activities involving undergraduate or graduate students, publications in peer-reviewed journals that are targeted for an academic audience, and presentations made to one’s academic colleagues at professional society meetings do not constitute outreach that is consistent with the AES mission.)

Principal investigators should explain the relevance of their outreach activities to the mission of the AES. For some faculty, it may be possible and desirable to communicate directly with an identified stakeholder group. For other faculty, it may be more appropriate to reach their stakeholders indirectly, by establishing effective collaborations with Cooperative Extension personnel or with other faculty whose research programs are more closely tied to stakeholder groups.

Progress Report (not to exceed one page)
AES project proposals that are revisions of previously approved projects should include a short progress report that summarizes the extent to which previous objectives were met. Alternatively,
principal investigators may simply submit a compilation of all Annual Progress Reports (form 421) prepared for the project.
10. Cooperative Extension: DANRIS-X Progress Reports

Individual Research and Extending Knowledge Plans (DANRIS-X Reporting)

All faculty who have a Cooperative Extension appointment have to submit a CE project through the DANRIS-X system. **New faculty members with a CE appointment must submit a DANRIS-X Annual Plan within the first year of arrival.** The main purpose of the DANRIS-X system is to capture CE productivity within the UC system for reporting to USDA.

DANRIS-X for specialists in CE has two modules: **Annual Plan** and **Annual Report.** The format for the plan and report data entry parallels the reporting done by AES faculty in the national CRIS reporting system. The new DANRIS-X enables ANR academics to more fully document their activities and impacts and to record, in one place, information needed for individual and administrative purposes. All records that you enter will be stored indefinitely.

**Annual Plan:** The Annual Plan module collects information for the projects/programs on which you anticipate working. You code your FTE to ANR Issues and Knowledge Areas and identify your projects/programs, including the objectives, methods, commodities, and multi state extension activities.

**Annual Report:** The Annual Report module collects information for the program/projects you identified in your Annual Plan, including the outputs, outcomes/impacts, publications, and multi state extension activities.

The DANRIS-X system can be accessed through the faculty’s personal UC ANR portal (similar to the personal UC Davis portal) at “my.ucanr.org”.

**Annual Plan:** The DANRIS-X reporting system is not the easiest to follow and takes some getting used to. To simplify the reporting, it is strongly recommended to define a **single “project/program”** in the “annual plan” which encompasses the entire CE mission-oriented research of a CE faculty individual. This will greatly simplify the reporting, which is done by “project/program.” Defining multiple “project/programs” means that each project will need to be reported separately. The hassles are not worth the exercise and it is okay to have just one “project/program” (although by funding source, most faculty have many projects). Also note that, for tracking purposes, DANRIS-X will associate each “project/program” with one to multiple “ANR Issues” and with one to multiple “Knowledge Areas.” Again, it is easiest to associate an individual’s “project/program” with the one “ANR issue” and the one “Knowledge Area” that best fits the individual’s “project/program.” Multiple ANR issues and Knowledge Areas need not be identified and only lead to complicating the reporting process.

The “project/program” does NOT have a five-year review and renewal process like the AES project. The annual plan may span ten or more years. For faculty with split CE/AES appointments, the AES report can be duplicated into the DANRIS-X report.
Annual Report: Sometime after the first of the calendar year, individuals with CE appointments will have to make their report for each of their “project/programs” and within each of those for each identified “ANR issue” and “Knowledge Area.” The report includes a list of relevant extension activities, publications, etc.

Example of a DANRIS-X Progress Report

FY 2006–2007
DANRIS-X
Data Recap For: Thomas Harter
03/01/2007

ANR Issues:
1) Water Quality

Knowledge Areas:
1) Watershed Protection and Management Knowledge Area
FTE: 1.00
(ANR Issue: Water Quality)

Projects/Programs:
1) Nonpoint Source Pollution of Groundwater Resources (FY 2002–2011)
(ANR Issue: Water Quality)

Commodities:
1) Water (ANR Issue: Water Quality) (Project/Program: Nonpoint Source Pollution of Groundwater Resources)

Objectives / Approach:
1) (ANR Issue: Water Quality)
(Project/Program: Nonpoint Source Pollution of Groundwater Resources)

Objective:
The main objectives of the UCCE Groundwater Hydrology Program are to develop scientific and technical information on the sources, fate, and transport of nonpoint source pollutants in groundwater and to provide educational, scientific and technical support on current and emerging groundwater resources and groundwater quality issues in rural and agricultural areas of California.

Approach:
The program primarily works with the water resources industry (public water supply utilities, irrigation districts, water districts, etc.), research, planning, and regulatory agencies on the local, county, state and federal level, farm advisors in county cooperative extension, and the agricultural industry. The components of the program are:
1. an integrated basic and applied research program that emphasizes hydrogeologic processes, contaminant fate and transport in both vadose zone and groundwater, and techniques for sampling, monitoring, and mitigation of contamination and groundwater quality problems;

2. an extension program that provides educational and technical support to local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, to natural resources conservation districts, irrigation and water districts, county farm advisors and policy makers in both the agricultural and urban sectors in the state;

3. coordination of groundwater related programs and events among faculty in hydrology related areas at UC Davis, with other extension specialists and farm advisors, with federal, state and local agencies, water districts, irrigation districts, and natural resource conservation districts and other groups that are concerned with groundwater hydrology.

The program is statewide, with emphasis on rural areas in Central California. The groundwater hydrology outreach and extension program is a novelty among existing cooperative extension programs. It distinguishes itself from traditional Cooperative Extension programs in that it is not primarily occupied with an area of agricultural production or agricultural economics.
11. Academic Personnel Review Process

Dean’s Office, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

Neal Van Alfen
Dean
phone: (530) 752-0108
e-mail: nkvanalfen@ucdavis.edu

Jim MacDonald
Executive Associate Dean
phone: (530) 752-6730
e-mail: jdmcdonald@ucdavis.edu

Mary Delany
Programmatic Associate Dean
phone: (530) 752-0233
e-mail: medelany@ucdavis.edu

Jan Hopmans
Programmatic Associate Dean
phone: (530) 752-8473
e-mail: jwhopmans@ucdavis.edu

Julie Fritz
Assistant Dean for College Personnel
phone: (530) 752-8651
e-mail: jxfritz@ucdavis.edu

Sequence of events of a regular merit increase or a promotion event

1. Every spring the CA&ES Dean’s Office compiles a list of faculty members in the department who are eligible for a merit increase or promotion.

2. Faculty members are informed that they are eligible for a merit increase or promotion by their department chair. Faculty members who wish to go for an accelerated merit increase or promotion should inform their chair in the spring.

3. All promotion actions (assistant to associate specialist in CE, associate specialist in CE to specialist in CE, the advancement of specialist in CE, Step V to Step VI, and IX to Above Scale (above specialist in CE, Step IX) require outside letters of support. Five to eight letters are required. The candidate provides the department with a list of five to eight names from which a selection is made to ask for an extramural evaluation. In addition, the department solicits extramural letters from three to four experts not provided by the candidate. It is important that the names provided by the candidate are of people who are considered to be an authority in his/her field, are somewhat arm-length removed from the candidate’s activities, and are able to provide an unbiased evaluation. In general, former graduate students, postdocs, and faculty members at the UC Davis campus should not be asked to provide an extramural letter. Exceptions can be made to have a faculty member at the UC Davis campus comment on teaching performance.

4. Following the department vote, the dossier including the departmental letter reporting the vote is forwarded to the Dean’s Office. Before the dossier is forwarded, the candidate is asked to sign the Candidate’s Disclosure Certificate.
5. For a regular merit increase of CE/AES faculty members, the dossier is forwarded by the Dean’s Office to the Joint Personnel Committee (JPC) who provides the Dean’s Office with a recommendation, including the vote on the requested merit increase. The Dean’s Office can accept or reject the advice of the JPC and makes the final decision on the merit increase. The Dean’s Office will send a notification of the decision to the chair of the department who informs the candidate.

Promotion actions, skip-a-step accelerated merit increases, advancement to specialist in CE, Step VI, and Above Scale (>Step IX) are non-redelegated merits. The decisions on these actions are taken in the Office of the Vice Provost–Academic Personnel. Once the dossier is forwarded by the department to the Dean’s Office, the associate dean writes a recommendation which is then forwarded along with the dossier to the Office of the Vice Provost. The vice provost will forward the dossier to JPC who may decide to establish an ad hoc committee, and provided JPC with a recommendation regarding the requested action. Whether an ad hoc committee is formed depends on the content of the candidate’s dossier and the JPCs expertise in evaluating that dossier. If an ad hoc committee is formed, a recommendation is made to JPC which makes a recommendation to the vice provost. When a promotion decision is considered, the chancellor, in consultation with the provost makes the final decision. The outcome of the decision process will be sent to the Dean’s Office which will inform the chair of the department, and subsequently the candidate.

6. If a regular merit increase or promotion is denied, appeal is possible within 30 days. The appeal has to be submitted by the candidate with a supporting letter from the chair and the appeal will be handled by the JPC.

7. Most decisions on merit and promotion actions are forwarded to the department during the spring quarter.

8. A summary of the review and approval process of appointments, merits, and promotions is provided in Appendix 1 below.

**Dossier**

The following items comprise the dossier and should be submitted in the order presented below. Follow the checklists provided for each action.

Content of the dossier:

1.) Candidate’s Disclosure Certificate: this must be dated on or after the date of the department chair’s letter. If the candidate disagreed with the content of the departmental letter, the candidate can attach a rebuttal to the departmental letter.

2.) List of names and addresses of referees solicited for extramural letters (required for appointments, upper level merit increases to specialist in CE, Step VI and above-scale merits, and promotions).
3.) Sample copy of solicitation letter MARKED SAMPLE. Extramural letters are stamped “CONFIDENTIAL” and are redacted to the candidate.

4.) The primary instrument for evaluation the professional accomplishments of specialists in Cooperative Extension is the individual position description. The key areas described in the position description are: Extending knowledge and outreach, Research and/or creative activity, Professional competence, and Service. The material in the dossier and the departmental letter is also concentrated on these four main areas.

5.) Candidate’s Statement
Candidates for promotion or advancement have the option of providing a one- to five-page personal statement about the unique aspects and special significance of their work for the review file. It may include any information concerning teaching and graduate student mentoring, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, university and public service, outreach and extension activities, participating in ANR workgroups, presentations to stakeholders activities, activities related to fulfilling the AES mission, and any other matter that the candidate believes is important for reviewers to consider.

The candidate’s statement may list accomplishments or it may focus on areas of achievement including honors and awards. It doesn’t need to address each area of review. It may include a statement of the candidate’s philosophy on his or her extension and research program and how the two relate to each other. Chairs need not repeat information included in the candidate’s statement. Chairs must evaluate the information presented in the statement as part of the department evaluation.

6.) Extending Knowledge
A description of the individual’s extension program should be covered in the Candidate’s Statement. This includes his or her philosophy, clientele, and activities. In addition, a description of how his or her research and extension programs are tied together is important. Workshops, seminars, field days and other events that were organized by the candidate should be emphasized and any evaluation scores of extension events should also be included. An additional file of extension presentations is required. This should include the presentation title, date, location and event or organization to whom presentation was made, and the number of participants in attendance. Talks at professional scientific meetings are not considered part of an extension program.

7.) Teaching, Advising, and Curriculum Development
If a specialist in CE or a CE/I&R participates in formal classroom instruction, summaries of all student evaluations of courses taught during the review period are included. In the departmental letter quotes from the student evaluations can also be included, but are not required. In addition, they need to include their activities on their course load, fraction of the course they taught, and the number of students enrolled. All specialists in CE who have graduate students need to include the names of students for whom they have served as chair or thesis and dissertation committee member. Serving as chair of a thesis and dissertation committee implies that the faculty member served as the student major advisor. In some cases, specialists in CE also act as undergraduate or graduate student advisors during the
review period. These are activities conducted through the specific graduate groups. Similar special advising activities (i.e., master advisor, chair advising committee), and activities in curriculum development should be listed.

8.) List of Service and Outreach Activities
This list, which can be presented in the form of a table, should include the title of the department/college/university service activity, and outreach activities and the dates of activities — but should not include any discussion of these activities. A brief discussion or summary should be included in the departmental letter, with possible augmentation in the optional binder.

Contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisors to student organizations should also be recognized.

9.) Contribution to Jointly Authorized Papers.
The contribution of all authors listed on a refereed publication (Category I, including articles “in press”) is described. Activities can be related to who was the driving force behind the concept, who obtained the financial support, who collected the data and did the analysis, who wrote the first draft, and who carried out the final revisions and editing.

10.) Publications List
Category I. A list of all publications appearing in peer reviewed journals and books. For specialists in Cooperative Extension, publications of research targeted toward specific clientele and stakeholder outlets such as ANR publications or production manuals are classified as Category I publications. Only anonymous peer-reviewed papers, book chapters, or other publications should be included. Do not include non-refereed proceedings, letters to the editor, case reports, limited distribution items, abstracts, etc. on this list. All papers should be numbered with the oldest publication listed as publication no. 1.

Category II. List of non-refereed publications, books and book chapters, regular distribution reports, proceedings, popular articles (if not included in regular publications list above). Reviews that were not anonymous should also be included in this category.

Category III. Report presentations items of limited distribution. Generally these include commodity board reports, handouts prepared for extension meetings and workshops, or other reports that cannot be found in a library.

Category IV. Abstracts, book reviews, and editorials.

List of publications Category I “in press” — attach acceptance letter or copy of galley to “in press” manuscripts submitted and the “in press” publications list.

11.) List of Grants

12.) Research funding may be an indication of research or creative activity. In disciplines in which funding, especially substantial extramural funding, such as a list of grants, funding
agencies and project titles, is properly include in the review file. It is important to indicate your role in the grants, i.e., PI, co-PI, subcontract, etc.

**Drawing the line**

Nothing published or “in press” and considered in the last review should be counted in the current review. A line should be drawn on the publication list to designate where the new publications begin. Refer to the publication list that was submitted at the last successful action (for merits this would be the last successful merit, for promotions this would be the appointment or promotion to the current rank). Asterisk (*) all items that will be submitted (below the line) for this review period. Please refer to the annual call if you have questions on determining the appropriate review period. Do not discuss papers in the Candidate’s Statement that were not part of the current action.

**Supporting Documentation**

1. Reprints of items published or “in press” of Category I publications for the review period. Reprints must be labeled to correspond to the number on the various publication lists. Append an acceptance letter or galley to the “in press” manuscripts.

2. Student evaluations. Student evaluations for the entire review period should be included. It is required that at least one complete set of original evaluations from two courses be included. Statistical summaries of student evaluations, if available, should be included with student evaluations.
### Appendix 1. Delegation of Authority for Appointments, Merits, and Promotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Research (APM-310), Agronomist (in the AES) (APM-320), Project Scientist (APM-311), Specialist in Cooperative Extension (APM-334) ¹</th>
<th>Dean’s Review</th>
<th>Ad Hoc/Stand</th>
<th>Final Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Rank I–III</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Rank IV–VI</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Rank, Step I through Full Rank, Steps I–IX and Above Scale</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reappointment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ranks and steps</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First normal merit after appointment and first normal merit after promotion</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Rank, II–VI; Assoc Rank, II–III; Full Rank, Step II–V</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Rank, IV–V</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Full Rank, Step VI ²</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Full Rank, Steps VII, VIII, and IX ²</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Full Rank, Above Scale ²</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accelerated Merit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Rank, II–VI; Assoc Rank, II–III; Full Rank, II–V that does not skip a step</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Rank, IV–V that does not skip a step</td>
<td>I/R</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>R/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Disregard all ranks and steps that do not apply.

² For ranks and steps that do not skip a step.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professional Researcher or Project Scientist to Associate Professional Researcher or Project Scientist</td>
<td>I/R RP R/R RP R/R R/R RP A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant ___ AES or Specialist in CE to Associate ___ AES or Specialist in CE</td>
<td>I/R RP R/R RP R/R R/R RP A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professional Researcher or Project Scientist to Full Professional Researcher or Project Scientist</td>
<td>I/R RP R/R RP R/R R/R RP A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate ___ AES or Specialist in CE to full ___ AES or Specialist in CE</td>
<td>I/R RP R/R RP R/R R/R RP A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deferral</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First and second year deferrals for ___ in AES and Specialists in CE only</td>
<td>I/R RP A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year deferrals for ___ in AES and Specialists in CE only</td>
<td>I/R RP R/R RP R/R R/R RP A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Year Review</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Research Series and ___ in the AES only</td>
<td>I/R RP R/R RP R/R R/R RP A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Appointment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All actions are processed in accordance with procedures outlined above except all departments and Dean’s Offices must review the action (see UCD-220 for procedure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redelegated actions</td>
<td>I/R RP R/R A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 When faculty hold a professor (or professor in residence) and professional researcher (or agronomist) title the entire review is conducted in accordance with the Senate title.
Approval of salary rate above 47 percent of the maximum of the appropriate salary scale requires president/regents approval.
12. Tips for Preparing the Dossier for Merits and Promotion

1. Consult with your respective department office for an example of a good merit or promotion dossier. This will save a considerable amount of time and grief on your part, as well as your departmental staff and the committee that evaluates your dossier.

2. Show evidence of having met the criteria for advancement in each category: extension, research, service, and outreach. In your candidates statement consider the following:
   - Quantity, quality, significance, and impact of your program
   - Highlight accomplishments rather than promises.
   - Highlight leadership role in research, (i.e., first author or senior author on publication), extension, professional competence, and service. Elaborate on it in the Self Evaluation.

3. Extramural letters for promotions, advancement to specialist in Cooperative Extension, Step VI, or Above Scale. When asking for letters, do not list the following:
   - Mentors, former postdocs, or graduate students, frequent co-authors, best friend, mother, etc. List experts in your field, including well respected individuals in the U.S. and other countries (if possible).
   Look for objective reviewers who can place your accomplishments within the context of your field.

4. Preparing your dossier is ultimately your responsibility. Many faculty do not adequately stay organized and keep track of their accomplishments between merit or promotion cycles. This can lead to frustration and incomplete dossiers submitted to departments or review committees. It is strongly suggested that you maintain an up-to-date file system, whether electronic or in hard copy. Although lack of research productivity may be the reason of most of the denials, standards for extension, professional competence/activity, and university and public service have to be met. This includes the following:
   a. Publications. Maintain separate files on published Cat I, Cat I in press, Cat II, and Cat III publications. Do not submit lists of manuscripts that are submitted or in preparation unless you at the early stages of your appointment and have not had a chance to fully develop your research program.
   b. Abstracts (Cat IV). Although this does not carry much weight, it does show that you are engaged in professional societal activities.
   c. Keep an updated list of grants you have obtained during the review period. This should include the proposal title, funding agency, award amount, time period of funding, and the principal investigator (PI) of the proposal. If you are a co-PI of a proposal, indicate after you note the PI. If you know the amount of funding you received on grants for which you were a co-PI, this should also be included. Do not list pending or unfunded proposals unless you are in the early stages of your appointment. List each proposal only once for the total time period of the grant, do not list a grant several time under each year. A summary of this should be included in the research section.
   d. Graduate student mentoring, including serving as major advisor (Ph.D. and M.S.), serving on other dissertation or thesis committees, qualifying exam committees, and graduate advising generally fall under teaching. For those with a split appointment
consisting of an I&R appointment, this is where it would be listed. For specialists in CE, this could be listed under service or research.

e. Teaching, either as a class you organized or as a guest lecture should be included as service, not extension, and should be included in your Candidate’s Statement under that category. Teaching materials you developed should also be included here. In you have a split appointment with an I&R component, this should be in the teaching section.

f. Student advising assignments should also be used to demonstrate university service.

g. Extension activities such as organizing symposia, meetings, and organizing field tours, giving talks, meeting with board of directors, etc. should all be listed to demonstrate the breadth of your extension program.

h. Invited lectures at scientific meetings should also be listed and highlighted as a sign of professional competence. Invited talks at extension meetings should not be in this category.

i. Service on ANR workgroups, commodities boards, as the liaison officer for commodity groups, professional society memberships, committees and boards service, federal, state, and regional panels, etc. should be listed under professional competence.

j. Number of manuscripts/research proposals reviewed, including the journal names, should be provided in the professional competence section.

k. Awards and honors should be listed in the professional competence section.

l. Serving on departmental, college, university, ANR, and other non-professional society committees should be listed as service.
13. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) Concerning the Academic Personnel Review Process at UC Davis

The personnel review process described herein applies to all specialists in Cooperative Extension, but the main purpose of this FAQ document is to clarify the review process for new specialists in CE. The answers to these FAQs reflect not only APM information about the review process, but also best practices, traditions, and culture regarding the process at UC Davis.

What are the guiding principles for advancement in the UC system?
Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in extension and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable criterion for appointment or promotion in an academic position. Merit increases will be awarded only on the basis of continuing excellence in extension, research, and university and public service in the rank at which the candidate is presently serving.

I. Terms/Definitions

In the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), as well as this document, the faculty member being reviewed is referred to as the “candidate.” “Reviewer” refers to all who participate in the review process: department members, chair, dean, ad hoc committee, Joint Personnel Committee (JPC), extramural referees, and the Vice Provost–Academic Personnel.

What is the APM?
The APM is the University of California Academic Personnel Manual, which encodes all university policies regarding academic employment. There are two components of the APM, one containing UC systemwide policies, and the other containing the UC Davis guidelines implementing those policies. There are hard copies of both manuals in all departments. The web address for both components of the APM is http://manuals.ucdavis.edu/apm/apm-toc.htm. Under Appointment and Promotion, the following APM sections may be helpful as references:

- 200: General Information
- 210: Review and Appraisal Committees
- 220AF: Academic Federation Review and Advancement
- 320: Agronomist Series
- 334: Specialist in Cooperative Extension Series
- 334-10: Specialist in Cooperative Extension Appointment, Merit and Promotion
- 334-80: Review Procedures for Personnel Actions

Who are the members of the Academic Federation?
The Academic Federation faculty members are those who hold a position in one of the following title series:

- Academic Administrator (APM-370, UCD-370)
- Academic Coordinator (APM-375)
- Agronomist (___ in the Agricultural Experiment Station) (APM-320, UCD-320)
• Assistant, Associate University Librarian (APM-365)
• Continuing Education Specialist (APM-340, UCD-340)
• Librarians (non-represented) (APM-360)
• Professional Research (APM-310)
• Project (e.g., Scientist) (APM-311)
• Specialist, Specialist in the Agricultural Experiment Station, Education Extension Specialist (APM-330)
• Specialist in Cooperative Extension (APM-334, UCD-334)
• Supervisor of Physical Education (APM-300)
• University Extension Teacher (UCD-340B)

What is an FTE?
FTE = Full Time Equivalent. A 1.0 FTE is a 100-percent appointment in a position (such as Professorial and Specialist in CE series), funded by the state of California. A certain number of FTEs are allotted to each dean to fulfill the teaching and research obligations of his or her unit.

What are the roles of department chair, deans, and Vice Provost–Academic Personnel in the personnel process?
The chair is responsible for overseeing the departmental review of the candidate’s record and for writing the recommendation letter, which presents the department’s evaluation (including the vote) of the candidate’s teaching, research and creative activity, and service for all personnel actions (APM-245 and UC Davis APM-245).

The dean (in some colleges an associate dean has responsibility for academic personnel matters) is the administrator responsible for reviewing the following actions within the school, college, or division:

• Appointments
• Merits
• Promotions
• Accelerations
• Deferrals
• Appraisals

Personnel actions that are re-delegated to the dean go to the JPC for review. Currently these include all normal merits (excluding full title, step VI and Above Scale), and appointments at or below the assistant specialist in CE, III level.

The chancellor shall make the final determination concerning the outcome of an appraisal listed below, taking into account all the available evidence and the recommendations made in the course of the appraisal. The chancellor shall inform the chair, through the dean or vice provost, of any decision and of any information or advice resulting from the appraisal.
• Appointments at or above the assistant specialist in CE, IV level
• Promotions
• Accelerations involving the skipping of two years or more at the assistant and associate specialist in CE levels, or three years or more at the full specialist level
• Deferrals of more than two years
• The two high-level merit reviews at full specialist, steps VI and Above Scale

**What personnel committees have responsibility for reviewing Academic Federation faculty? How are they appointed?**

For an individual whose appointment is entirely within the Specialist in CE series, or is split between this and the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES), all personnel actions are reviewed by the Joint Academic Senate/Academic Federation Personnel Committee (JPC). For individuals whose appointment is split between the Specialist in CE series and any series within the Academic Senate (e.g., I&R), all personnel actions are reviewed first by JPC and then by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). JPC is responsible for reviewing that portion of the appointment that falls under the specialist in CE title.

A report from JPC documenting its assessment of the candidate will be included in the dossier, which is then forwarded to the CAP for its review. CAP is responsible for reviewing that portion of the appointment that falls under the Academic Senate title, primarily teaching. After making its separate assessment of performance relative to the appropriate criteria for the Senate title portion of the appointment, the CAP makes an overall recommendation with regard to the proposed action. In reaching its overall recommendation on the personnel action, the CAP uses the information and recommendations contained in the report from JPC.

Appointment to JPC is made by the Academic Federation Committee on Committees.

**What are overlapping steps?**

Within the assistant and associate specialist in CE ranks there are steps above the ones where most faculty apply for promotion, and they are considered to overlap with the first steps of the next rank. Within the assistant specialist in CE rank, Steps V and VI overlap with associate specialist in CE, Steps I and II, respectively. Within the associate specialist in CE rank, Steps IV and V overlap with specialist in CE, Steps I and II, respectively.

**When are overlapping steps used?**

Overlapping steps at the assistant specialist in CE level (V and VI) are most commonly used when the individual is hired at Step III or above and although making good progress toward promotion, he or she has not achieved a record commensurate with promotion. Overlapping steps at the associate specialist in CE level (IV and V) are most commonly used when the individual is initially promoted to associate specialist in CE at Step II or higher and again reflects the need for more time to achieve promotion. Only individuals who are making good progress toward promotion are eligible for overlapping steps.

**What is the ad hoc committee?**

Each ad hoc committee has three members nominated by JPC and appointed by the vice provost to review the extension, research and creative activity, and service performance of a particular
candidate. One member is from the candidate’s department and the other two have expertise in the candidate’s field of research. Although the candidate does not know the composition of the ad hoc committee, he or she has the right to request that certain individuals not be appointed to the committee; this is accomplished by way of a letter to the vice provost. Ad hoc committees may be appointed for all promotions, as well as for high-level merits at professor, Steps VI and Above Scale. Streamlined processes however, allow JPC the discretion to waive an ad hoc review when it deems appropriate.

What is a merit review?
A merit review is an evaluation by the department, JPC, and the dean of a faculty member’s record of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. A positive review will result in advancement in step within rank.

What is the period of review for a merit increase?
Merit reviews normally occur at two-year intervals at the assistant I–IV levels, and associate specialist in CE, I–III levels, every three years at the associate specialist in CE, IV and V, and full specialist in CE, levels I–IX, and every four years at the Above Scale level. Merit increases from specialist in CE, V to VI, and from specialist in CE, IX to Above Scale, are treated procedurally like promotions, i.e., they require extramural letters and may include evaluation by an ad hoc committee (see below).

For specialist in CE, VI, the merit review covers the period since promotion or appointment to full title (i.e., Steps I–V).

For specialist in CE, Above Scale, the review period is the period since promotion or appointment to full title, i.e., Steps I–IX. Subsequent Above Scale merits do not normally occur more frequently than once every four years.

What is a promotion review?
A promotion review is an evaluation for advancement in rank; i.e., from assistant to associate specialist in CE, associate to full specialist in CE.

What is the period of review for promotion?
The length of the review period may vary slightly among faculty. For promotion from assistant to associate specialist in CE, the review includes all extension, research, and service or outreach/extension accomplished during the period since the date of the terminal degree. The period of appointment in the UC system in the rank of assistant specialist in CE cannot exceed eight years. Since an assistant specialist in CE must be given one year of notice if there is to be a termination, the candidate must be reviewed no later than the seventh year (APM-220-20c).

For promotion from associate specialist to full specialist in CE the review covers the whole period since promotion to associate specialist in CE.

What is the Eight-Year Limit (“Seven-Year Rule”) regarding indefinite appointment?
For specialists in CE, promotion to associate rank is considered tenure-like. This is a guarantee of an indefinite appointment. A permanent faculty member’s appointment can be terminated for
such reasons as violation of UC ethical principles, unacceptable conduct, or incompetence. The department, the dean, the ad hoc committee, JPC, the vice provost, the provost, and the chancellor conduct the promotion review. A final decision on whether an indefinite appointment is to be granted must be made by the end of the seventh year of service. Those who do not receive tenure are given a final-year notice, during which they may pursue an appeal of the decision.

Under what circumstances can the normative time for indefinite status be extended to more than seven years?
The clock for a seven-year review may be extended for major illness and parental responsibilities associated with the birth or adoption of a child. The chancellor also has the authority to extend the tenure clock in other extraordinary circumstances, but maximum extension for all circumstances is two years.

What is an appeal?
A faculty member has the right to appeal his or her denied personnel action within 30 days of notification of denial, by submitting an appeal letter via the chair and the dean or to the vice provost, addressing each of the specific criticisms of the reviewers. Before deciding whether to appeal a decision, a candidate can consult with a Faculty Privilege/Academic Personnel Advisor (see Senate website for a list). The vice provost will refer the appeal letter and the file to JPC for its review. The JPC recommendation is sent back to the vice provost who will forward it to the dean for final decision if it is a re-delegated action.

What is an appraisal?
At the assistant specialist in CE level, an appraisal of extension, research and creative activity, and service is performed in the faculty member’s fourth year to determine if he or she is “on track” for promotion. The dossier is submitted in the fall and the JPC (acting as the ad hoc committee doing the appraisal) forwards the committee’s report and the dossier to the Vice Provost’s Office. After review of the file by JPC and the vice provost, an appraisal letter is sent to the candidate with reviewer’s comments on performance in extension, research and creative activity, and service. The intent of the appraisal is to provide feedback on the areas of satisfactory performance, as well as collegial advice as to how the candidate can improve those areas where there are problems.

What is acceleration?
Acceleration is a merit or promotion review, which occurs prior to eligibility for normal advancement. Thus, it is a more rapid movement through the ranks and steps than the norm due to the extraordinary record of the candidate. One-year accelerations for assistant and associate specialists in CE and one or two year accelerations for full specialists in CE are normally reviewed by JPC and submitted to the dean for final decision. Requests of one step or more are reviewed by JPC, with final decision by the vice provost. Accelerations are usually sought when there has been unusually high academic achievement in at least one category (extension, research, or service) since the last advancement, and at least normal progress in the other categories, i.e., accelerations are not granted if any component of the record is below par.
What is a deferral?
A deferral occurs when an academic employee who is eligible for normal advancement is not considered for this advancement.

II. Dossier

What is the dossier?
The dossier, or ”packet,” is the file compiled to describe a faculty member’s extension, research and creative activity, and service activities for a specific review period. It is prepared by the department and forwarded to the appropriate administrators and faculty personnel committees for review.

What is the Annual Call?
The Annual Call is a document issued in the spring by the Vice Provost’s Office that describes current changes in the APM, the UC Davis APM, and personnel procedures along with dates of submission of dossiers http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/.

When are faculty members notified that they are up for a merit or promotion action and are expected to submit a dossier?
In the spring or early summer the Dean’s Office prepares an eligibility list of individuals in each department who should be reviewed for merit and promotion during the next academic year and the chair notifies each individual. Dossiers are usually due in the fall quarter, and the specific due dates for submission of the file for various types of merit and promotion actions are listed in the Annual Call.

Specifically, what is in the dossier and who puts it together?
The department usually has a designated staff member who works with the chair and the candidate in assembling his/her dossier. The following documentation for the review period must be assembled for each dossier:

- The extension record (summarizes activities related to outreach, including presentations, publications, websites, and other activities), summaries of student and peer evaluations of teaching; descriptions of any teaching or training grants; numbers of undergraduate and graduate students; and number of postdoctoral fellows being trained in research.
- The research record includes a list of publications in a standardized format; letters of acceptance of articles, which have been accepted but not yet published (i.e., items in press); description of research or creative activity presentations; reviews of the publications or presentations; list or description of any grants supporting the research.
- The service record includes a list of committees and other forms of service to the campus, the candidate’s discipline, and to the public.

In addition, the Candidate’s Statement and the Departmental Letter are included in the dossier. In the case of promotions and high level merits at specialist in CE, VI and Above Scale, a list of extramural reviewers who have been contacted (with notation as to whether they were suggested by the candidate or the department) and their confidential letters in response are added to the file by the chair. There is a Candidate’s Disclosure Certificate for the candidate to review and sign,
verifying that he or she has seen the nonconfidential content of the file and that it is complete and error-free, and also that a summary or redacted copy of confidential materials has been provided.

Supporting documents are submitted in a separate envelope or box with the dossier and include copies of all publications in the review period, art work, or descriptions of it.

**What is the Candidate’s Statement?**
Each candidate has the right to include a personal statement in the file (up to five pages), describing the extension, research and creative activity, service accomplishments, and professional competence in his or her own words. Although it is optional, this is the opportunity for the candidate to describe: how his or her research fits together; what his or her extension approach is; as well as to explain unusual circumstances, both good and bad, which have affected performance in the various areas. For example:

- Description of the significance of the research, any unusual problems which had to be overcome, or any breakthroughs which pushed the research forward
- Discussion of reviews of research and extension activities
- Explanation of the significance of any awards or honors received during the review period
- Description of any difficult, time-consuming, or particularly noteworthy committee assignments or any other activities

**What is included in the Departmental Letter?**
The Departmental Letter is an evaluation of the faculty member’s record as presented in the dossier. It reflects the views of the departmental faculty, not just those of the chair. It usually discusses if the candidate meets departmental standards and goals with regard to extension, research and creative activity, service, and professional competence. The letter also states the vote, i.e., yes, no, or abstention, as well as any reasons for the no or abstention votes.

**What can the candidate do if he or she doesn’t agree with the Departmental Letter?**
The candidate must be provided an opportunity to review the Departmental Letter before the file goes forward for review. Although the content of the letter is not negotiable, the candidate should alert the chair to factual errors. After errors are corrected, if the candidate still disagrees with the department’s recommendation or wants to clarify statements made in the letter, he or she can write a rebuttal. Any rebuttal letter must be submitted within 10 calendar days from the candidate’s receipt of the departmental letter and contain his or her signature on the disclosure form (indicating that he or she has read the file and certifies that it is complete and factually correct). A rebuttal may be sent directly to the dean or Vice Provost–Academic Personnel if the candidate does not want to submit it to the department chair.

**When a candidate has an appointment split between two different departments, which one prepares the dossier? Do they both vote?**
When there is a split appointment, the home department of the candidate prepares the dossier; the chair of the secondary department must also supply a letter including the vote. Federation and Senate faculty in both departments vote on the action according to their individual departmental voting procedures. Voting procedures may vary somewhat among departments.
What is the Dean’s Letter?
After the dossier leaves the department, it goes to the Dean’s Office. For actions that are not re-delegated, the dean or associate dean reviews the entire file and writes a letter of support or nonsupport of the action. This letter becomes part of the file, which then goes forward for further review by the ad hoc committee, JPC, and the vice provost.

What are extramural letters? How many are needed? What is meant by “arm’s length” reviewers?
Extramural letters reviewing the candidate’s qualifications for promotion or advancement to specialist in CE, Step VI and Above Scale, are requested by the chair (faculty should not request them directly from reviewers). The candidate submits a list of outstanding researchers in his or her field who could write such letters and the chair, in consultation with the departmental faculty, makes up a second list of potential extramural reviewers (not revealing the names to the candidate). The chair then solicits letters from reviewers on each list, asking for an evaluation of extension, research, service, and professional competence, and an opinion as to whether the candidate would likely be considered for promotion at the reviewer’s institution. Some reviewers do not feel that they can knowledgeably comment on all areas of the research record, and they restrict their remarks to that activity. These letters are confidential.

“Extramural” means outside the UC Davis campus. Thus, letters can be requested from faculty on other UC campuses. These are particularly useful when faculty are being evaluated for specialist in CE, VI and Above Scale, because many universities outside the UC system do not have comparable steps in the specialist in CE rank and are thus unfamiliar with them.

“Arm’s length” means reviewers who are qualified to evaluate the work, but have no connection with the candidate, e.g., they are not a recent mentor, collaborator, or advisor. This assures that reviewers do not have a conflict of interest.

Five to eight letters are usually expected in the review dossier. Regardless of number, reviewers find that detailed, informative, evaluative, arm’s length letters are the most valuable. Reviewers will look to see if the extramural referees:

- Are well known and/or respected in their field
- Are at least of rank comparable to the position being sought
- Discuss the impact of the candidate’s research
- Consider the candidate’s career to be on an upward trajectory

What is the process by which dossiers are reviewed, how long does it take, and who does it?

Redelegated Merits: The file is sent by the department to the Dean’s Office, where the JPC reviews it; the committee writes a report and the dean makes a final decision.

Non-redelegated Merits: High level merits at specialist in CE, VI and Above Scale, two or more year accelerations in the assistant or associate ranks, and three or more year accelerations at
the specialist in CE rank, are all reviewed by the dean or associate dean, who writes a letter, and sends the file on to be reviewed by JPC and the vice provost, who makes the final decision.

**Promotions:** The department sends the file to the dean for comment (i.e., Dean’s Letter); from there it goes to the vice provost and then to JPC where it is reviewed. The JPC makes a recommendation to the vice provost, who then makes the final recommendation to the chancellor, who makes the final decision.

The length of time the process takes varies with the complexity of the review. At each step, knowledgeable staff reviews the dossier to ensure adherence to policy and process. While merit actions may take only a few months, promotion actions take longer. Dossiers are due at some specific date in the fall quarter, and the first announcements of the promotion actions are made in the spring, starting in the winter quarter, with the bulk of the decisions being announced in the spring. Most merits and promotions are effective as of July 1.

**Appraisals:** The file goes from the department to the Dean’s Office, where it is reviewed by FPC, acting as the ad hoc committee. Detailed collegial advice is given to the candidate via a written report, which goes to the dean for signature.

**Are awards, prizes, and commendations considered in the merit and promotion review?** Yes. They should be fully described in the Departmental Letter and the Candidate’s Statement. Letters of thanks/appreciation for service to the university, the government, a research society, etc., while not included in the dossier, can be discussed in the Departmental Letter as reflecting the impact of the candidate’s service. Prizes, commendations, honors for research, as well as awards given to students and fellows working with the candidate, should be described under the Research category.

**III. Evaluation Criteria for Merit and Promotion**

Specialists in Cooperative Extension who are candidates for merit or promotion are to be judged by the following criteria (APM-334-10):

- Performance in extending knowledge and information
- Research and creative work
- Professional competence and activity
- University and public service

**IV. Extension**

**How is extension evaluated in the personnel review process?** The goal of specialists in CE is to develop and conduct a research-based education program aimed at appropriate clientele groups off campus, as noted in Section UCD-334-10. Clientele are defined broadly as any constituency that makes use of disciplinary information from the appointee’s expertise. Although research is an important part of a specialist’s responsibility, it needs to be closely linked to a strong educational program. A specialist’s ultimate responsibility is education. This activity
takes place on and off campus, in organized or informal meetings or field demonstrations, and through all appropriate print and electronic media. Programs involving direct contact with clientele often are initiated and organized by Cooperative Extension advisors or other clientele groups to serve county, regional, state, institutional, or industry needs. (Clientele is defined broadly as any constituency that makes use of disciplinary information from the appointee’s expertise.) A major responsibility of specialists in CE is to educate their clientele about recent advances in knowledge and technology and to encourage the use of new and improved practices. Information extended may originate from a wide variety of sources including research conducted by AES scientists, researchers in other states or countries, or governmental researchers, or from the appointee’s own research.

Educational activities might include, but are not limited to, interacting with other specialists in CE, Cooperative Extension advisors, workgroups, Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) personnel, teaching faculty, or outside clientele groups; developing and presenting educational materials to user groups including decision-makers; communicating to clientele through broadcast, print, or electronic media; preparing and distributing publications or newsletters to clientele groups; participating in meetings with clientele; working with public or private schools; teaching University Extension courses or short courses; developing and presenting in-service training courses; organizing or participating in workshops, field tours, or symposia; and taking action to ensure appropriate external input into the planning of research and educational programs by AES and CE.

What are reviewers’ particular concerns when evaluating the extension record?

One of the primary requirements for a successful extension program is to establish statewide leadership in the individual’s area of expertise. Reviewers will primarily evaluate the quality of the appointee’s program and its impact on the associated clientele and its effect on society within the context of the job description. The program should extend knowledge and information of use to the appropriate clientele by improving their abilities to understand and address problems and opportunities facing them. The educational program should serve the university’s outreach mission, which is defined as extending knowledge from the university’s research base.

Merits and promotions are based on quality and balance of performance. The list of activities in this section provides examples and is not inclusive. Appointees’ choice of activities should be based on what is appropriate for their programs. Evidence of an extending knowledge program’s effect (e.g., such as letters from clientele, reports of behavioral change) may be used to document program quality.

Evidence that indicates quality of performance, growth, and accomplishment includes:

- Effectiveness of training programs, leadership support, and cooperation provided to county CE personnel or clientele.
- Effective leadership of, or teamwork with, county CE personnel to identify and reach a broad range of clientele.
- Range of educational methods used, with new or improved educational methods utilized.
• Use by county CE personnel and/or clientele of information or educational products developed (e.g., publications, audio-visual packages, software).
• Change in clientele or industry practices as a result of educational efforts.

V. Research/Creative Activity

What is meant by “research or creative activity”? In the APM, “research” usually refers to scholarly investigative endeavors, while creative activity usually describes activities in areas of the humanities and the arts, such as music composition/performance, theater and dance, creative writing, etc. Evidence submitted to document achievements in this category includes published articles, books, recordings, works of art, videos, etc.

Does the publication list have to be arranged in any particular format? Yes. The categories of the bibliography are prescribed in the APM, and it generally separates items into published, in-press, submitted, and in preparation. Most candidates do not list submitted or in preparation papers. This is more important for faculty at the assistant rank where activity may need to be demonstrated prior to actual publication. Abstracts, reviews, and reports having limited distribution are listed separately. It also prescribes the format of the bibliographic entries. Faculty who co-author publications are required to describe their role in each publication (idea, development, benchwork, data analysis, writing, etc.) as well as give a description of co-authors, i.e., are they undergraduate, or graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, staff, faculty colleagues. Although work that is submitted and in preparation may be listed, only work that is published or in press is generally considered.

How do reviewers evaluate your contribution to a project when there are many authors on the papers? The Departmental Letter should explain the details of the research, who participated in it, and the candidate’s specific role. As stated above, the candidate should include a statement with the publication list, explaining his/her role in each study, who the co-authors are, and who the primary (or corresponding) author is on each paper, if it is not the first author.

How does a reviewer evaluate the research/creativity category? Are both quality and quantity evaluated? All reviewers consider both quality and quantity important. Quantity during the review period, i.e., productivity, is evaluated, but the specific minimum level of productivity expected will vary by department and discipline, and the Departmental Letter should discuss whether productivity meets the departmental norm. Quality is judged by the importance and the impact of the work. Some of the factors used to judge impact are:

• Venue where work is published; i.e., high quality, peer-reviewed journals, and highly respected presses for books.
• Citations; i.e., where and how many. Whereas citations in journal articles are important indicators of the timeliness and impact of a work, citations in reviews, monographs and textbooks are important indicators of a candidate’s national or international reputation.
and often put the research into perspective with regard to a whole field. National and/or international impact is an important factor in the review for full title.

**How do reviewers evaluate independence?**

Independence in research and creative activity is an important criterion for merit and promotion. A candidate must show that he or she has established a productive research program at UC Davis, as opposed to simply a continuation of research associations with previous training programs or colleagues. The candidate must also show that he or she has a cohesive program of research, rather than a mere collection of unrelated papers. Collaboration with colleagues is strongly encouraged, but reviewers will look to see if:

- The candidate’s contribution to the body of work is distinct and can be clearly associated with his or her name
- The candidate is sole, first, or corresponding author on a significant number of the papers
- The candidate is the Principal Investigator (PI) on funding of a significant number of the projects in his or her program.

**How does a reviewer evaluate the quality of the journals in which you publish? Are online publications acceptable?**

Journal quality is important, and it is definitely considered by reviewers. In some departments, the Departmental Letter lists the most important journals in their field ("top tier") or discusses the relative qualities of the most common journals in their field. There are also rating services which assign "impact factors" to journals, which some reviewers use (however, impact factors refer to the journals, not the individual papers and thus have limited value); others refer to publications like Citation Index to determine the frequency of reference to the candidate’s work.

In a number of fields, online publication is becoming as important as print journal publication and research societies are rapidly establishing competitive online journals. Whether or not it is peer-reviewed however, is the important factor for both print and online publication.

**Does it matter if you have national funding (e.g., NIH, DOD, NASA, NSF, NEA, AHA, etc.) as opposed to campus or local funding? Can you be promoted if you have no grant funding? Do you have to be principal investigator (PI) on a grant to get promoted?**

The first priority is to have the funding you need to support the studies you propose to carry out, regardless of whether it comes from campus, local, or national sources. All money, whatever its source, buys the goods and services you need to do the experiments, gather the data, or create the artwork. With regard to national vs. local funding, reviewers look on national funding as not only providing the money to do the studies, but also providing some assurance that a national standard of review has been met; i.e., when a federal grant application undergoes review it is usually by a national panel of experts. This issue is viewed as an extended assessment of research quality.

The same can be said about being PI. Although you may have more than enough money as a co-investigator on grants, being PI implies that you have the stature and ability to oversee the whole project and its quality (i.e., you have leadership skills). Reviewers look on that as a definite plus, but it is not necessarily essential for promotion in all fields.
If you need grant money to carry out the studies and you have none, you are not likely to be promoted. If you don’t need money to carry out your program of research and creative activity (i.e., you can be productive without grants), then grantsmanship should not be an issue in the promotion review. Many departments, however, view grant/fellowship money not only as support for the research and validation that the candidate has a national audience, but also as support for graduate students. Some departments look on the lack of grants as a serious failing — i.e., a lack of concern for the department and its ability to attract and support graduate students. Since this opinion about grant funding varies across the campus, new faculty should be sure they understand the expectations of their own department, college, or school with regard to grant funds by discussing this with the department chair or a senior faculty member.

VI. Professional Competence and Activities

An assessment of professional competence is important for which faculty?
In certain positions in the professional schools and colleges, a demonstrated distinction in the special competencies appropriate to the field and its characteristic activities should be recognized as a criterion for appointment and promotion.

What kinds of professional activities are usually engaged in by faculty?
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. Examples of the types of professional activities which are common include: reviewing of articles, books; membership on editorial boards and on research society committees; organizing of symposia; other such activities which give faculty opportunities to use their leadership skills. Invitations to work with professional groups may also indicate that one’s research or creative work is recognized and valued nationally and/or internationally.

What are the expectations with regard to professional service for faculty in the assistant specialist in CE rank?
At the assistant specialist in CE level, ad hoc reviewing for journals, book publishers, or granting agencies, or participation in a professional society committee or a public service organization (e.g., American Heart Association) are generally considered sufficient. Greater involvement is expected as the candidate advances in rank and step.

VII. Service: University and Public

Service is assessed in two categories: that performed for the university, and that for the public sector.

A. University Service:

What is “shared governance” and how does it relate to the individual faculty member?
“Shared governance” is the University of California’s policy of having the Senate and Federation faculty share with the administration in running the university and formulating campus policies.
Faculty usually participate in this endeavor by serving on department, college, campus, or systemwide committees, and/or participating in leadership roles.

**In addition to student advising and committee work, what other activities constitute university service?**
Committees are generally organized in departments, schools/colleges, graduate groups, campus, or systemwide. There are also standing and ad hoc administrative committees. In addition to committees, other service activities include advising students, mentoring students or junior faculty, managing a departmental website, overseeing/sponsoring student activities, overseeing departmental equipment or facilities, using one’s expertise to solve a problem for the department or college, serving as chair of a department, etc.

**How much service is enough? How much is too much?**
It is important to develop a workable balance between research and service activities. Too much is when service encroaches upon time that should be used for teaching or research. At the early stages of one’s career, faculty are expected to have a relatively lighter service load, perhaps assignment to a few committees at the department, college, or graduate group level. After achieving promotion to the associate rank, faculty are expected to take on a heavier service load at both campus and systemwide levels. At the rank of full title, including the upper levels, in addition to serving on committees, faculty are expected to serve in leadership roles on committees.

**B. Public Service:**

**What kinds of public service are usually included?**
Faculty are expected to use their expertise to participate in local community, state, and federal government review panels and committees, to respond to solicitations for advice in developing public policy, to help government agencies organize research meetings, brief legislative staff on current issues, testify at hearings regarding proposed bills, serve on government delegations to foreign countries, and other such activities.

**Are some activities more important than others; i.e., does the reviewer “give more credit” for some activities?**
Yes. Reviewers recognize that there are hierarchies of activities and that the most important assignments are those requiring lots of time, effort, and/or expertise. Specific credit is given for extraordinary activities like chairing committees, panels, societies, and public service organizations, acting as an expert witness, editing a journal, representing the university, organizing a scientific congress, giving invited lectures or keynote speeches, advising federal, state, or foreign governments, and advising other colleges, universities, or foundations, etc.

**IX. Suggestions for New Faculty**

Keep a current copy of your CV on your computer so that new information can be readily added to keep it up to date in the following categories:
1. Publications (published, in press, and submitted)
2. Abstracts
3. Professional activities
4. Seminars/invited lectures given
5. Interactions with stakeholders like commodity groups, conservations organizations, state organizations, etc.

In another computer file organize information for the review period by keeping a current list (with dates) of:

- Departmental and campus committees you have served on
- Courses or guest lectures you have given
- Extension materials you have developed
- Grants acquired and submitted
- Student advising assignments

**A mentor:** Discuss departmental culture and expectations with respect to extension, research, and service with your chair and the senior faculty of your department. In addition, you might find it helpful as a new faculty member to have a mentor during the early stages of your career, i.e., someone who can advise you on questions regarding your teaching, research, and departmental expectations. In selecting a mentor look for:

- A senior faculty member who has successfully moved through the ranks and is willing to mentor
- Someone whom the faculty consider to be outstanding in extension and research
- Someone in your research field, a related field, or knowledgeable about your field
- Someone with whom you would feel comfortable discussing problems which may arise with extension or research
14. UC Davis Work-Life Balance for Faculty

The birth, adoption, or placement of a child may entitle UC faculty to a leave, reduced teaching load, and/or an extension to the eight-year limit at the assistant professor rank. Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 760 outlines these policies in detail [http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-760.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-760.pdf). Since January 2003, ladder rank faculty are entitled to the following, in relation to work-life balance:

**Central funding to cover teaching release for birth or adoption for one quarter of leave** – One quarter of leave is provided for the affected faculty member in the event of a single or multiple birth, adoption, or placement, for up to two separate events, maximum. (NOTE: Leave must be taken in the quarter in which the child is born, adopted, or placed, or in the following quarter.)

**Central funding to cover teaching release for faculty who are on modified duties for care of children** – One quarter of modified duties (teaching release equivalent to 50 percent of the average teaching load per quarter) in the event of a single birth, adoption, or placement, up to two separate events. Two quarters of modified duties for the birth of twins or triplets or the adoption or placement of two or three infants four years old or younger, up to two separate events. (NOTE: Modified duties must be taken within 12 months following the birth, adoption or placement of a child.)

**Extending the “tenure clock”** – An assistant professor, who has substantial responsibility for the care of a newborn child or newly-placed or adopted child under age five, may request an extension of the tenure clock, of up to one year for each event of birth or adoption during the probationary period provided that all time off the tenure clock totals no more than two years in the probationary period. The tenure clock may be stopped no more than two times during the probationary period.

**Deferral of post-tenure merits and promotions** – Faculty members may apply for deferral or postponement of post-tenure merits and promotions to accommodate childbearing and adoption or placement of a child. The length of a deferral may not exceed one year per event for a total of two years.

The above information is accessible on the vice provost’s web page at [http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/worklife.cfm](http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/worklife.cfm).

**UC Davis Work-Life Balance Resources**

Through a variety of programs and services, UC Davis supports its faculty in their attempt to balance their lives while honoring their commitments to work, home, and community. Here are some resources and websites:

**Work-life balance policies at UC Davis** – [http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/worklife.cfm](http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/worklife.cfm)
Employee resources – http://www.hr.ucdavis.edu/employee
Worklife and wellness resources – http://www.hr.ucdavis.edu/worklife-wellness
Partner Opportunities Program – http://popprogram.ucdavis.edu
Benefits – http://atyourservice.ucop.edu
Links to child care, elder care, and other caregiving resources –
  http://www.hr.ucdavis.edu/worklife-wellness/Life
Work-life programs – http://www.ucop.edu/worklife
Short-term and long-term disability plans –
  http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/employees/life_changes/disability/index.html
Faculty-friendly policies and programs – http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/family/welcome.html

For questions regarding this program, call (530) 752-0963.
15. Mentorship Agreement

1) Which topics do you want to address in mentoring sessions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>AES</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self development</td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Additional mentors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) What frequency of meetings would you like to have?

The administrative assistant responsible for scheduling meetings is ________________

3) What information should be provided by mentee prior to each meeting?

- [ ] None
- [ ] Updated CV (with highlight of new additions)
- [ ] Narrative of each topic to be discussed
- [ ] Other

4) What are your expectations of the mentoring relationship?

**Responsibilities of mentor:**
- [ ] Provide assessment and feedback regarding accomplishments in each topic area and help plan “next steps”
- [ ] Emotional support
- [ ] Advocacy
- [ ] Actively address any problems with mentorship relationship

**Responsibilities of mentee:**
- [ ] Understand the academic appointment; review career with department chair annually
- [ ] Provide goals and updates
- [ ] Actively address any problems with mentorship relationship

5) If mentorship relationship is not working, we will discuss it with the chair of the department

Mentor signature _____________________________ Date ________________

Mentee signature _____________________________ Date ________________
16. Individual Development Plan

FOR THE MENTEE

1. Date__________

2. Long-range goals
   It is recommended that faculty complete a self-appraisal to assist in determining personal and long-range career goals prior to completing an Individual Development Plan.

   • Identify mentor(s)_____________________________________________

   • Identify long-range goals

   Having difficulties thinking about long-term goals — consider:
   • Why did you decide to work in the Department of ____________?
   • You are about to go up for tenure or promotion: what are the accomplishments and/or activities that you want your department to be able to write about?

3. Distribution of areas of effort (definitions)
   There are six central areas of effort to which I&R/AES/CE faculty mainly direct their activities:

   • Teaching – undergraduate and graduate teaching, student advising, curriculum teaching/involvement, new course development
   • Research – conducting basic research, presentations and publications, funding and grant support and application
   • University service – participation or leadership in governance of the department, college, and university
   • Self development – training activities, participation in professional academic associations or societies,
   • Public service and professional activity – committee membership, community outreach and service, editing, and peer review
   • Cooperative Extension – interacting with clientele groups, distribution of regular reports, workshops
   • List your current time distribution by area estimating percent of duties and approximation of hours
Outline the estimated time spent in areas of effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of total duties</th>
<th># hours/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graduate student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach/Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Specific goals in areas of effort

**Teaching**
Year in review: List last year’s goal(s) and significant accomplishments (teaching appointments, invitations, course or program improvements, etc). If goal not met, explain and identify barriers.

Upcoming year’s teaching goal(s):

Identify resources, collaborators, and time commitment needed to achieve goal:

Identify barriers to achieve new goals:

**Research and related activities, including fulfilling AES mission**
Year in review: List last year’s goal(s) and significant accomplishments (major publications, grants, presentations, invitations, etc). If goal not met, explain and identify barriers.

Upcoming year’s research goal(s):

If you have identified needed resources and/or barriers:
- What specific action-oriented steps can you take to put you back “on track” to achieve your long-term goals?
- Who can help you if you’re stuck?
- What resources are available to guide you? See faculty affairs website.
Identify resources, collaborators, and time commitment needed to achieve goal:

Identify barriers to achieve new goals:

**University service**
Year in review: List last year’s goal(s) and significant accomplishments. If goal not met, explain and identify barriers.

Upcoming year’s service goal(s):

Identify resources, collaborators, and time commitment needed to achieve goal:

Identify barriers to achieve new goals:

**Cooperative Extension**
Year in review: List last year’s goal(s) and significant accomplishments (workshops, newsletter, research deliveries, etc). If goal not met, explain and identify barriers.

Upcoming year’s Cooperative Extension goal(s):

Identify resources, collaborators, and time commitment needed to achieve goal:

Identify barriers to achieve new goals:

**Professional Service**
Year in review: Please list last year’s goal(s) and significant accomplishments (committee membership, community outreach, other university and/or community service).
5. Optimal time/effort needed to achieve career goals

Revisit the outline in step 4. Create new time outline taking into account your desired focus and specific goals listed in step 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of total duties</th>
<th># hours/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graduate student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach/Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>