

ARTICLE ___
COORDINATOR OF PUBLIC PROGRAMS
SERIES

A. DEFINITION

Titles in the Coordinator of Public Programs series are assigned to those appointees who have overall responsibility for programs that serve the public need in the areas of education (at all levels), health, and labor issues. They represent the University in serving the public of California, and the nation, as professional adult educators, teachers, program leaders, and planners. Their duties may include, but are not limited, to:

1. Designing, leading, planning, implementing, and evaluating University programs of classes, conferences, institutes and seminars, discussion groups, exhibits, lectures and teaching materials;
2. Extending the intellectual resources of the University to address education, health, and labor issues at all levels from pre-school through graduate students and their teachers in both formal and out-of-school settings, through engagement and collaboration.
3. Participating with academic and community partners in developing programs focused explicitly on increasing opportunities and also increasing access to opportunities for underrepresented and under-resourced communities.

The title is used primarily to reflect programs on the Berkeley campus at the Lawrence Hall of Science, the Graduate School of Education, and the School of Public Health and on the Los Angeles campus at the Labor Center. Other University schools, departments, or units may use this title as deemed appropriate by their campus Academic Personnel Office.

B. RANKS AND STEPS

1. General Conditions

- a. The following ranks and steps apply to the Coordinator of Public Programs series:
 - i. Assistant Coordinator of Public Programs, Step I-VI – Appointees to the Assistant rank should possess a master's degree (or equivalent degree) or a

bachelor's degree and equivalent work experience.

- ii. Associate Coordinator of Public Programs, Step I-V – Appointees to the Associate rank should possess a master's degree (or equivalent degree) and five years of experience, or a bachelor's degree and equivalent work experience.
- iii. Coordinator of Public Programs (for purposes of this Article, referred to as "Full"), Step I-IX – Appointees to the Full rank should possess a doctorate degree (or equivalent degree) or a master's degree and five to ten years of work experience.

2. Normative Time at Each Step

- a. The normal time at each step within the Assistant and Associate Coordinator of Public Programs rank is two years. Within the Full Coordinator of Public Programs rank normal time at Steps I-VIII is three years. Time at Full Coordinator of Public Programs, Step IX is four years, but may be for an indefinite time.
- b. For initial appointments that begin mid-cycle, the time for the first review period may be more or less than the normative time above. See Section D.1.b below regarding review schedules.

C. TERM OF APPOINTMENT

1. An appointment in the Coordinator of Public Programs series shall normally have a specified ending date and appointment percentage, and the appointment shall terminate on the specified ending date without any further action.
2. The supervisor shall ensure that the overall effort expected of the Coordinator of Public Programs is commensurate with the appointment percentage.
3. When a Coordinator of Public Programs simultaneously holds a University teaching appointment or other University position, the sum of all University appointments shall not exceed one-hundred percent (100%).
4. Non-Reappointment

a. Appointments of Less Than 50 Percent Time:

The University is not obligated to give written notice of non-reappointment to Coordinators of Public Programs who hold appointments at less than 50 percent time or short-term appointments of less than a year.

b. Appointments of More Than 50 Percent Time With Fewer Than Eight Consecutive Years of Service:

For Coordinators of Public Programs who have served fewer than eight consecutive years in the Coordinator of Public Programs series on a campus, the appointment terminates automatically on its specified ending date unless notice of reappointment is given. It is within the University's sole discretion not to reappoint a Coordinator of Public Programs under this section, so long as the reasons for non-reappointment are not unlawful or in violation of this Agreement.

c. Appointments of More Than 50 Percent With Eight or More Consecutive Years of Service:

The University may decide not to renew a Coordinator of Public Programs who has served at least 50 percent time for eight or more consecutive years in the Coordinator of Public Programs series on the same campus when the programmatic needs of the department or unit, lack of work, the availability of appropriate funding for the position, or the Coordinator of Public Programs' conduct or performance do not justify renewal of the appointment.

- i. In the case of non-reappointment, the University shall provide a written Notice of Intent not to reappoint the Coordinator of Public Programs at least sixty (60) days prior to the appointment's specified ending date. Either the appointment shall be extended to provide the required notice, or appropriate pay in lieu of notice shall be given. The University shall provide a simultaneous copy to the Union. The Notice shall state:

1. the intended action is not to reappoint the Coordinator of Public Programs and the proposed effective date;
 2. the basis for non-reappointment, including a copy of any materials supporting the decision not to reappoint;
 3. the Coordinator of Public Programs' right to respond either orally or in writing within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written Notice of Intent; and
 4. the name of the person to whom the Coordinator of Public Programs should respond.
- ii. The Coordinator of Public Programs who receives a written Notice of Intent shall be entitled to respond, either orally or in writing, within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written Notice of Intent. The response, if any, shall be reviewed by the administration.
5. If the University decides not to reappoint the Coordinator of Public Programs who holds a term appointment, following the review of a timely response, if any, from the Coordinator of Public Programs, and within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of issuance of the written Notice of Intent, the University shall issue a written Notice of Action to the Coordinator of Public Programs and the Union of the non-reappointment and its effective date.

D. MERIT AND PROMOTION REVIEW PROCESS

1. General Conditions
 - a. When Coordinators of Public Programs are eligible for merit increases and promotions, such increases and promotions are based on academic attainment, experience, and performance, and are not automatic.
 - b. Coordinators of Public Programs eligible for review shall receive written notification in accordance with local campus

procedures. This notification shall include:

- i. A list of materials the Coordinator of Public Programs is responsible for providing and how they should be submitted;
 - ii. The date by which the Coordinator of Public Programs must submit all required materials;
 - iii. Links to the applicable collective bargaining agreement article(s) and campus guidelines and procedures for merits and promotions; and
 - iv. A statement of the date by which the merit increase or promotion in question shall be effective
- c. A Coordinator of Public Programs may request an extension of the Section D.1.b review deadlines due to a leave of absence taken under Article ___ - Leaves of Absence or Article ___ - Work-Incurred Injury or Illness. Such requests shall not be unreasonably denied.
- c. The effective date of merit increases and promotions as a result of the review process will normally be July 1.
- d. Consistent with this Agreement, decisions to grant or not grant a merit increase or promotion to individual Coordinators of Public Programs are at the sole discretion of the University. In the event a Coordinators of Public Programs is not awarded a merit increase or promotion following a review, the University shall include an explanation for its decision that shall accompany the review determination.
- e. The University is not precluded from granting merit increases of greater than a one-step increase.
- f. A Coordinator of Public Programs may request to review their academic review file in accordance with the provisions of APM-160 that are applicable to them.

2. Review Period

- a. A Coordinator of Public Programs with an initial date of appointment between July 1 and January 1 shall be

reviewed as follows:

- i. Assistant and Associate Coordinators of Public Programs shall be reviewed every two years, however promotion to the next rank is not automatic. Someone at Step VI of the Assistant rank and Step V of the Associate rank may remain at those steps for an indefinite period of time.
 - ii. Full Coordinators of Public Programs shall be reviewed every three years, except for Step IX, which shall be reviewed every four years. Promotion to the Full rank will be reserved for appointees who have responsibilities for the vision, leadership, and executive management of major programs, including, but not limited to (1) identifying and securing necessary funding; and (2) the successful promotion of the program on a regional, national, or international level.
- b. The review schedule for a Coordinator of Public Programs with an initial date of appointment between January 2 and June 30 will not commence until July 1 of that year. On July 1 of that year, the review schedules in Section D.2.a shall apply.
 - c. An off-cycle review is one that takes place earlier than the standard review (as defined above).
 - i. A Coordinator of Public Programs may request an off-cycle review. The reasons for the off-cycle review must be in writing and the proposed accelerated advancement must be submitted for written approval (or denial) to the designated University official, per campus guidelines and procedures.
 - ii. The University's decision concerning whether to conduct the off-cycle review shall not be subject to grievance and arbitration.
 - iii. The review file will be prepared in accordance with campus guidelines and procedures.

- d. Coordinators of Public Programs may request to defer their review, in accordance with local procedures. A deferred review is the omission of an academic review during a year when a review would normally take place. It is a neutral action that can only be initiated with the written request of the candidate.
 - i. A review may be deferred if prolonged absence or other unusual circumstances have resulted in insufficient evidence to evaluate performance. Reasons for review deferral must be in writing and all proposed deferrals must be submitted for written approval (or denial) to the designated University official. The University's decisions concerning review deferrals shall not be subject to grievance and arbitration.
 - ii. When a deferral takes place, the review is deferred for one year whether a person's review cycle is 2 or 3 years. A request for a deferral for an additional year should be regarded as a new request and thus subject to the same approval process described in D.2.d.i above. After the completion of a review which has been deferred, the review cycle will resume anew at the 2- or 3-year interval. Work conducted during the extended review period shall be reviewed as though it were completed in the normal period.
 - iii. If the delay in review has occurred because of lagging performance, evidence of deficient performance must be documented and a remedial plan shall be put in place to address the concerns that contribute to diminished achievement.
 - iv. Every Coordinator of Public Programs must be reviewed at least every five years.

3. Evaluation Criteria

- a. A candidate for advancement in the Coordinators of Public Programs series is evaluated on their demonstrated abilities to: (1) assess the needs of clientele groups, and have the

creativity and imagination to plan programs to meet these needs; (2) effectively design, organize, implement, evaluate, and revise programs; and (3) lead and administer programs, including the development of funding sources and budget management.

- b. A candidate for a merit increase or promotion in this series shall be evaluated on the basis of the following criteria:
 - i. Meritorious performance, defined as the individual's specific accomplishments. Evidence may include one or more of the following:
 - a. Letters from collaborators or principal investigators documenting that work performed by the Coordinators of Public Programs contributed to success of a program;
 - b. Recognized expertise, including formal documentation of intellectual effort, presentation of research at regional/national meetings, and/or invitations to participate in projects;
 - c. Documentation of effective planning and execution of programs;
 - d. Active dissemination of information through presentations or other means stemming from the Coordinator of Public Programs' work.
 - iii. Professional Competence and Activity, defined as contributions to the profession and a set of knowledge, skills, and abilities developed over time that enable the individual to do excellent work. Evidence of professional competence and activity may include:
 - a. Serving in a leadership position that promotes the field;
 - b. Serving as an officer or committee member in a professional association;
 - c. Serving as an adviser to other projects; and
 - d. Contributing expertise to a local/state/national group or activity.
 - iv. Public Service to such entities as local schools or pre-schools, school districts, community organizations, government agencies, etc.

- c. Promotions are based on advanced levels of leadership and increased or advanced levels of administrative responsibility.
- d. In evaluating an individual's qualifications within the areas mentioned above, reasonable flexibility should be used to balance, where the case requires it, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. Expectations increase as Coordinators of Public Programs advance through the higher ranks and steps.
- d. Advancement to Above-Scale
 - i. Advancement to Above-Scale status involves an overall career review and is reserved for only the most highly distinguished Coordinators of Public Programs whose:
 - a. work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact;
 - b. professional achievement is outstanding; and
 - c. service is highly meritorious.
 - ii. Advancement requires demonstration of additional merit and distinction beyond the performance on which advancement to Full, Step IX was based. Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur in less than four years at Step IX; mere length of service and continued performance at Step IX is not justification for further advancement.
 - iii. A further merit increase for an individual already serving at Above-Scale salary level must be justified by new evidence of distinguished achievement; continued performance is not an adequate justification. Only in the most superior cases with strong and compelling evidence will a further increase be approved at an interval shorter than four years.

4. Merit and Promotion Guidelines and Procedures
 - a. The UAW shall be provided copies of applicable campus merit and promotion guidelines and departmental review procedures as they exist or as they are developed. Links to the current campus guidelines and procedures may be found in Appendix ___ of this agreement.
 - b. The University may change campus merit and promotion guidelines and departmental review procedures according to the normal campus processes for revising such guidelines and procedures.
 - i. The University shall provide to the UAW proposed changes to campus merit and promotion guidelines at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to finalization. The University will begin to apply changed guidelines to individual Coordinator of Public Program only with the beginning of the Coordinator of Public Programs' merit review cycle.

E. GRIEVABILITY AND ARBITRABILITY

1. Non-reappointment decisions are not grievable unless the grievance alleges a procedural violation. An arbitrator reviewing a grievance under this Article shall have no authority to order the University to appoint or reappoint a Coordinator of Public Programs. An arbitrator reviewing a non-reappointment decision shall not have the authority to substitute the arbitrator's judgment for the University's judgment with respect to the University's academic needs or an individual Coordinator of Public Programs' performance or qualifications.
2. Academic judgment is not subject to grievance or arbitral review. As such, an arbitrator shall not have the authority to substitute their judgment for the University's judgment regarding the Coordinator of Public Programs' performance or qualification, nor shall the arbitrator have the authority to order the University to provide a merit increase or promotion. If the arbitrator finds a procedural violation, the arbitrator's authority shall be limited solely to ordering the University to repeat the review from the point at which the violation occurred.