



CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
RIVERSIDE DIVISION
UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING, RM 225

MARY GAUVAIN
PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0217
TEL: (951) 827-5538
E-MAIL: MARY.GAUVAIN@UCR.EDU
SENATE@UCR.EDU

November 18, 2011

Robert Anderson
Professor of Economics and Mathematics
UC Systemwide Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Bob:

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF PROPOSED REVISED APM 200 GENERAL, AND PROPOSED POLICY APM 205 – RECALL OF ACADEMIC APPOINTEES

In response to your request, the UCR Senate Committees on Academic Personnel (CAP), Faculty Welfare (FW), and the Division of Biomedical Sciences (BIOMED) reviewed and commented on the proposed policy issues noted in the header above. The individual responses from the committees are attached and a summary of their comments follows.

APM-200: There is strong opposition to the elimination of the mandatory 5-year academic review of Deans and faculty in the Senior Management Group (SMG). This issue is especially problematic regarding Deans in that it conflicts with the definition of Deans as academic employees (APM 240-4). Moreover, many Deans and faculty members in the SMG continue to have research programs and teach. These individuals are eligible for merits, so it is not consistent to exempt them from a 5-year academic review. Such a review is especially important for Deans or faculty in the SMG who receive research funds either from the campus or an ORU.

APM-205: Two concerns were raised.

1. FW objects to a clause in section 20e, finding the language unnecessarily harsh and too legalistic in tone. Although the committee is not proposing modification to the policy, it does feel that all University employees are entitled to know why they are being terminated even though an individual may have no right of appeal.
2. BIOMED wonders why, in Appendix A, there are no specific guidelines regarding recall rates for teaching, as was the case in the previous version of APM-200.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Gauvain
Professor of Psychology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Sellyna Ehlers, Director of UCR Academic Senate office

November 3, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: 
Marylynn V. Yates
Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Comments on proposed revised APM-200, General and proposed new policy, APM 205

CAP discussed the proposed revisions to APM 200 and the proposed new policy APM 205 on October 12, 2011. The background information and rationale provided regarding APM 205 was very clear, and CAP has no concerns about the proposed policy.

With respect to the proposed changes in APM 200-0, CAP has a number of concerns. No background information or rationale was provided to explain the reason for the proposed change to the requirement for the 5-year mandatory review of the academic appointment of Deans and faculty who are members of the Senior Management Group. Indeed, the elimination of the 5-year mandatory review of the academic appointment of Deans is in direct contrast to the definition of academic Deans as described in APM 240-4:

240-4 Definitions

- a. An academic Dean is head of a Division, College, School, or other similar academic unit and has administrative responsibility for that unit. This assignment includes fiscal responsibility for the unit; responsibility for ensuring diversity of the faculty, students and staff, including maintaining an affirmative action recruitment and retention program consistent with University affirmative action policies, Regental policy and applicable law; and responsibility for ensuring that systemwide and local policies, including Academic Senate regulations, are observed.
- b. As academic heads of their units, Deans are persons of scholarly and professional accomplishment. The University encourages their continued engagement as academicians in scholarly, professional, teaching, and University service activities, consistent with, but distinct from, their decanal responsibilities. Therefore, it is appropriate for time to be allotted to them to engage in these activities.

As the academic heads of their units, it is imperative that Deans maintain scholarly and professional accomplishments. Many, if not all, Deans receive support to allow them to continue their scholarly activities. CAP is unanimous in its opposition to the proposed changes to APM 200-0.

November 1, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Senate
Riverside Division

From: Daniel S. Straus, Chair
Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed APM-200, General and Proposed New Policy, APM-205, Recall for Academic Employees

The Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee reviewed the documents. It looks like we are being asked to comment specifically on APM 205-18b, entitled "Rate of Salary for Faculty Retired from a Health Sciences School". This section seems reasonable to us. However, we offer the following comments on other sections of the documents:

APM -200 Draft: page 1: It is stated that Deans are exempt from five year review and that faculty who are in the Senior Management Group may also be exempt. This seems to suppose that Deans and faculty in the Senior Management Group should be exempt from normal review because they do not have research programs or teaching responsibilities. In fact, many Deans and faculty in SMG do teach, and some are given support for their research from the campus or from an ORU. To our knowledge, senior administrators who teach and do research are eligible for merits, so it does not seem logical to exempt them from a five-year review. Furthermore, anyone who receives funds for their research either from the campus or from an ORU like the Agricultural Experiment Station should not be exempted from a five year review under any circumstances.

APM-205 New Policy Draft: The previous version APM-200 Appendix A had specific guidelines regarding recall rates for teaching:

Compensation: In general, the recall rate for academic-year appointees will be 1/9th of the base salary at the time of retirement per quarter course or 1/6th of the base salary per semester course, not to exceed the current salary rate for Professor, Step VII. Fiscal-year salaries should be converted to the academic-year equivalent salary. Campus administrators and faculty may negotiate a higher or lower salary rate, as appropriate to the nature of the course, to reflect specific needs.

Shouldn't APM-205 also have specific guidelines?

 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UCRIVERSIDE | *Academic
Senate*
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

November 4, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Irving Hendrick, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

**Re: Proposed Revisions to APM 200 and 205, Recall of Academic
Appointees**

The Committee understands that the proposed policy revisions have already been considered several times and that there is very little left for us to say.

We would, however, like to make two suggestions:

First, with regard to the proposed APM 205-20e, we object to the clause, “the University may terminate a recall appointee with or without cause, prior to the specified original end date.” That language, while possibly customary in legal circles, seems unnecessarily harsh in the setting of a University of California campus. All University employees, faculty and staff, active or recalled, are entitled to know why they are being terminated. We are not proposing any new limits on the University’s flexibility with regard to recall appointments, only that recall employees receive the courtesy of being told why their services are no longer desired. We imagine that budgetary or space constraints might be the most common reasons, but other issues might also arise. In a word, there is always a reason for a termination, and it is not asking too much for the appointee to be told what that is, even though s/he has no right of appeal.

Second, with regard to the proposed APM 200, we recommend that deans not be exempted from the five year academic review. The principle of a five year academic review is important and is consistent with the career origin of deans. This reality was reinforced by the removal of deans, first from the Executive Program and later from the Senior Management Group. Deans are also faculty.