



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

June 19, 2012

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

Dear Bob,

RE: PROPOSED TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO APM 010, 015 AND 016

Four standing Senate committees on our campus, Charges, Faculty Welfare, Privilege and Tenure and Academic Freedom reviewed the proposed technical revisions to APM 010 and 015 which are being revised to include within the protections of academic freedom, the freedom to speak on matters of institutional policy and 016 which remedies the omission of a single, clear statement. The following comments were received:

Academic Freedom:

The Committee on Academic Freedom questions the use of the word "as" in the sentence which reads "...when acting as a member of the faculty whether or not **as** a member of an agency of institutional governance.." The committee opines that it would be clearer to say "whether or not the faculty member is also a member"

Faculty Welfare:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare did not support the proposed changes to Sections 010, 015, and 016 because they find that puzzling language has been introduced with negligible or insufficient explanation as to why it is needed. The Academic Freedom section, APM 010, includes new language affirming rights of academic freedom for faculty "when acting as a member of the faculty." This language begs the question of when a faculty member's freedom begins and ends. Does it begin and end with classroom speech and scholarly expression in publications? Does it extend to political speech outside of class? Does it extend to comments about administrative action and student issues? Section 015 appears to make clear that faculty do enjoy freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action "when acting as a member of the faculty whether or not as a member as an agency of institutional governance." If this language is intended only to enforce internal discipline among administrators who also hold faculty titles, it may be easier to appreciate, but absent a clear explanation of intention, they do not find it acceptable.

Section 016 is troubling in that it introduces a new category of "policies" to the current categories of "rules and regulations" for which faculty members may be subject to "appropriate administrative [disciplinary] actions." The

problem here is one of definition and differentiation between rules, regulations, and policies. Why is it necessary to add a new term without an explanation of why it is needed or how it differs from a rule or a regulation? May a policy exist only in the mind of an administrator? What is most worrisome is that it could be applied impulsively. Are policies subject to prior review by the Academic Senate before they are implemented? Must they be written and conveyed prior to implementation?

Parenthetically, Faculty Welfare Committee is aware from correspondence and conversations with faculty outside the committee that the concerns expressed above are not unique to the committee.

The other two committees; Charges and the Privilege and Tenure had no additional comments to make.

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