January 18, 2007

TO: R. A. (Richard) Luben, Vice Chair, (Department of Biomedical Sciences)
   R. L. (Rusty) Russell, Secretary Parliamentarian, (Department of Sociology)
   N. E. (Nancy) Beckage, Chair, Diversity and Equal Opportunity, (Department of Cell
   Biology and Neuroscience)
   W. P. (Ward) Beyermann, Chair, Committee on Committees, (Department of Physics and
   Astronomy)
   J. B. (Jan) Blacher, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee, (Graduate School of Education)
   J. W. (Joe) Childers, Representative to the Assembly, (Department of English)
   H. L. (Helen) Henry, Chair, Faculty Welfare, (Department of Biochemistry)
   C. (Carol) Lovatt, Junior Representative to the Assembly, (Botany & Plant Sciences)
   R. T. A. (Rene) Lysloff, Chair CHASS Executive Committee, (Department of Music)
   A. W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Planning and Budget (Department of Biochemistry)
   E. A. (Gene) Nothnagel, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy, (Department of
   Botany and Plant Sciences)
   L. P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee, (Department of Biology)
   T. D. (Tim) Paine, Chair, Undergraduate Council (Department of Entomology)
   T (Tom) Payne, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Technology
   (Computer Science)
   T. (Teodor) Przymusinski, Chair, COE Executive Committee
   W. (Waymond) Rodgers, Chair AGSM Executive Committee, (A. Gary Anderson
   Graduate School of Management)
   R. R. (Robert) Russell, Chair, Graduate Council (Department of Economics)
   T. (Theda) Shapiro, Chair, Preparatory Education Committee, (Department of
   Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages)
   I. A. (Ivan) Strenski, Chair, Physical Resources Planning, (Department of Religious
   Studies)
   K. (Kiril) Tomoff, Chair, Committee on Research, (Department of History)
   A. D. (Allen) Zych, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel, (Department of Physics
   and Astronomy)

FR: T. Cogswell, Chair
   Riverside Division

RE: ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA – January 22, 2007

This is to confirm the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Monday, January 22, 2007 at 1:00
p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building.

Please let me know your attendance plans. *A light lunch will be served*

Following is the agenda - please print out a copy and the attachments and bring them to the
meeting.

GUESTS: - EVCP E. Wartella, VC G. Bolar, VP Betty Lord, Associate Vice Chancellor Rowley
1. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**
   
   **Action items:**
   - Approval of the agenda (page 1 – 2)
   - Approval of January 8, 2007 notes (see Attached) (page 3 – 6)

2. **EVCP ELLEN WARTELLA -**
   
   Summer Sessions

3. **PRESENTATION OF EFILE BY CHUCK ROWLEY**
   
   followed by questions

4. **CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS:**
   
   Follow-up on the Special Committee on Health Affairs (page 7)
   - Revised Charge (see Attached)

5. **PETITION CALLING FOR AN INTERDISCIPLINARY RIVERSIDE REVIEW OF THE UC-NUCLEAR WEAPONS LABS INVOLVEMENT** (see Attached) (page 8 – 10)

6. **DEFINITION OF JOINT APPOINTMENTS FOR USE IN ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS:** (Attached) (page 11-26)
PRESENT:

T. (Tom) Cogswell, Chair, (Department of History)
R. A. (Richard) Luben, Vice Chair, (Department of Biomedical Sciences)
R. L. (Rusty) Russell, Secretary Parliamentarian, (Department of Sociology)
W. P. (Ward) Beyermann, Chair, Committee on Committees, (Department of Physics and Astronomy)
J. W. (Joe) Childers, Representative to the Assembly, (Department of English)
H. L. (Helen) Henry, Chair, Faculty Welfare, (Department of Biochemistry)
C. (Carol) Lovatt, Junior Representative to the Assembly, (Botany & Plant Sciences)
R. T. A. (Rene) Lyslof, Chair CHASS Executive Committee, (Department of Music)
A. W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Planning and Budget (Department of Biochemistry)
E. A. (Gene) Nothnagel, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy, (Department of Botany and Plant Sciences)
L. P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee, (Department of Biology)
T. D. (Tim) Paine, Chair, Undergraduate Council (Department of Entomology)
W. (Waymond) Rodgers, Chair AGSM Executive Committee, (A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management)
R. R. (Robert) Russell, Chair, Graduate Council (Department of Economics)
T. (Theda) Shapiro, Chair, Preparatory Education Committee, (Department of Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages)
K. (Kiril) Tomoff, Chair, Committee on Research, (Department of History)
A. D. (Allen) Zych, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel, (Department of Physics and Astronomy)

ABSENT

N. E. (Nancy) Beckage, Chair, Diversity and Equal Opportunity, (Department of Cell Biology and Neuroscience)
J. B. (Jan) Blacher, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee, (Graduate School of Education)
T. (Tom) Payne, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Technology (Computer Science)
T. (Teodor) Przymusinski, Chair, COE Executive Committee
I. A. (Ivan) Strenski, Chair, Physical Resources Planning, (Department of Religious Studies)

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The consent calendar including the informational items was approved unanimously.

CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS:
Chair Cogswell reported to the Committee that George Haggerty had reneged on his agreement to chair the Conversion Committee and that we are now looking for another person to chair this committee.
Chair Cogswell indicated that the EVC/Provost had now invited the Senate to assess its interest in creating other health programs that would complement the medical program in the future School of Medicine. He indicated that the major areas to investigate will include a School of Pharmacy, a Nursing School and a Veterinary School. He indicated he will be setting up exploratory committees to investigate what areas we should pursue further.

He indicated that Toby Miller was working on the revisions for the Media and Cultural Studies and that there was a possibility of launching a committee to look at a possible Media School. He will be setting up an Ad Hoc Committee with Toby Miller.

DEVOLUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALLOCATING GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP FUNDS:
Dr. R. Russell, Chair of Graduate Council informed the committee that early this academic year, the Graduate Council learnt from the Dean of Graduate Council that the EVC/Provost had informed him that responsibility for allocating central graduate fellowship funds would devolve from the Graduate Division to the colleges.

Graduate council was concerned that there was no lack of consultation with the Academic Senate, particularly the Graduate Council and even though the Council acknowledges the authority of the administration to implement this policy change but is disappointed about the lack of consultation not just because it appears to be inconsistent with the principle of shared governance but, more importantly, because the faculty, represented by the Academic Senate, has extensive, hands-on experience with different approaches to graduate student recruitment, experience that would properly inform decision making. He mentioned that this is not the first time that this devolution has been attempted and that the last attempt lasted about two years. Below are some of the concerns that the Council has with the devolution:

- The Graduate Council is charged with the responsibility for assessing qualifications for admissions;
- Devolution will create a duplication of efforts;
- Appropriation of funds to the three colleges limits comparison across program and noted that centralizing the fund allows for diversification of fellowships;
- Decisions about allocation are less objective the further away they are; and
- Devolution threatens the fiscal stability of the cohort system;

Dr. Robert further noted that it is their understanding that the reason for the policy change is the administration’s concern about the slow growth of graduate student enrollment and the hope that the colleges will be able to increase the leverage of the fellowship funds through coordination with teaching and research assistantships to offer better funding packages and although the Council shares the concern about graduate student enrollment it does not believe that the policy change will have a salutary effect.
He indicated that he was asking the Advisory Committee to appeal to the EVC/Provost to reconsider the decision and to deliberate with more shared governance.

The Advisory Committee unanimously endorsed the request and it was agreed that a response would be formulated jointly by Chair Cogswell and Dr. Russell, and that this would be presented to the Administration. It was also agreed that Chair Cogswell would request a meeting between the EVC/Provost, the Chair of Graduate Council and himself.

HEALTH AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:  
Chair Cogswell indicated that the first issue that the Advisory Committee had to decide on was whether the committee should be an ad hoc committee, a standing committee or a special committee. The Secretary Parliamentarian pointed out bylaw 8.1.3 which states that “Special committees are appointed each year not later than June first to serve from the first day of September until the following August thirty-first, unless (1) a definite term of existence is specified in the enabling act or (2) the term of existence is continued by appropriate action of the Division”. The AC agreed that the committee would be a Special Committee to be appointed by Committee on Committee. The AC also discussed the terms of the committee and it was agreed that the committee members would rotate off after every two years with an initial 2 year term.

The Advisory Committee unanimously endorsed a move that the Committee approve the formation of a Health Advisory Committee with the understanding that the draft charge will be revised to incorporate the agreed upon suggestions at this meeting.

REVIEW OF DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN (HSCP) AND GUIDELINES FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN FOR THE UCR DIVISION OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES:  
The Advisory Committee unanimously endorsed the recommendations made by the Committee on Faculty Welfare and CAP and moved to approve them and forward the same to Vice Provost Lord.

PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY:
Chair Cogswell indicated that the proposal had been submitted to the appropriate committees for review and that there were reservations about some issues especially the proposal to raise funds. The committee members indicated that they would like to see a response showing the interaction between the school and departments. They noted that there was very little discussion at the departmental level and there was not indication that any department had had extensive discussions of how they would interact with the School. The committee members felt that there were many meritorious aspects about the proposed school and unanimously agreed that the formation of a School of Public Policy would represent a significant addition to the academic and intellectual environment of the campus and to the overall number of graduate students. After a lengthy discussion, the Advisory Committee moved to preliminarily approve the proposal for the Establishment of a School of Public Policy until all the queries raised by the various
committees receive a response. The proposal will then be brought back to the AC for final approval before being adopted by the Division.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sellyna Ehlers  
Executive Director  
Academic Senate
DRAFT

Charge for the Health Affairs Special Committee

Since the founding of the university, no single development will impact the campus more than the new medical school. Consequently it is imperative that the Academic Senate be closely involved with the planning and the implementation of this new school.

Towards this end, I am requesting the Committee on Committees to appoint a Special Health Affairs Committee with the following charge:

- to develop the curriculum for the medical school; and
- to work with the administration to resolve other matters relating to the new school; and
- to help the founding Dean with initial hires.

The committee will consist of nine members. In order to ensure some institutional memory, the members of the Special Committee will at first be appointed for one, two and three year terms in roughly equal numbers. Subsequently, appointments will be for three years. Former committee members are eligible for reappointment.

On the opening of the new UC Riverside Medical School, the Health Affairs Special Committee will submit a formal report on its activities and a recommendation about its future. In response, the Advisory Committee will decide whether to terminate the Special Committee or to extend its existence.
UCR Academic Senate, Sellyna Ehlers

From: Andrew Culp [aculp@napf.org]
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2007 1:02 PM
To: sellyna.ehlers@ucr.edu; susan.stracener@ucr.edu
Subject: Faculty Senate

Dear Faculty Senate,

A group of UCSB students has been on campus today and yesterday collecting petition signatures. The petition is for the Faculty Academic Senate. We recognize that the petition may be unusual, seeing as there are no official rules for petitioning the Senate. The petition, however, is about a very important issue that we hope to encourage the Senate to consider. We intend on delivering the petition signatures to the Office of the Senate, and our delegation may include UCR students.

We hope to deliver it around 3:30-4:00 today (Friday). If you would have a few remarks, even a couple, we would enjoy hear some feedback.

The petition is short and simple:

"A petition calling for: An interdisciplinary Riverside faculty review of UC-nuclear weapons labs involvement; A Riverside Faculty Academic Senate resolution to sever ties with the nuclear weapons labs."

We recognize that this may only be the start of the conversation that will hopefully create the necessary faculty relationships for a meaningful dialogue on the Riverside campus about the UC and nuclear weapons labs.

If you would like to contact me for any reason, I will be most available this weekend by phone at 816-522-0255. Otherwise, email and my work phone when I return to Santa Barbara on Monday.

Sincerely,

Andrew Culp
Research and Advocacy Associate
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
(805) 965-3443
aculp@napf.org
Dear Faculty Academic Senate Chair T. Cogswell,

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation in conjunction with the Coalition to Demilitarize the University of California visited UC-Riverside on Thursday, January 4th and Friday January 5th. Our visit was part of the “UC Nuclear Free” campaign, which seeks to end University of California management of the nation’s two nuclear weapon design laboratories.

In only two days of petitioning, over 400 students signed our petition. If students from other campuses would have had the opportunity to stay longer, the signature count would have assuredly been in the thousands by the time you receive this letter. We hope this sends a strong signal to the Faculty Academic Senate – students on the Riverside campus want the Faculty Academic Senate to commit the time and resources necessary for an interdisciplinary faculty review of UC-nuclear weapons labs involvement, and they want the Faculty Academic Senate to entertain, debate and pass a resolution that calls for severance.

There is a long rich history of activism at University of California campuses aimed at severance from the labs, dating back to Nobel Laureate Joseph Rotblat’s conscientious resignation from the Manhattan Project. For an in-depth overview of the topic, written from a student perspective, an article called “People’s History of UC Weapons Labs Management” is available at: http://www.ucnuclearfree.org/blog/historymain.htm. Faculty activism has been particularly central since the 80s. We would like to help recreate a sense of interest and urgency regarding this issue at Riverside.

As you may know, Riverside voted strongly in favor of severing ties with the labs as part of a1990 state-wide University of California faculty resolution. In today’s post-Cold War environment, during which time nuclear weapons have been rendered largely useless in meeting US national security challenges, we are confident that there will be an even stronger sentiment in favor of severance. That is why students from the Coalition to Demilitarize the UC decided to petition students at Riverside to bring the nuclear weapons labs issue back to the Faculty Academic Senate’s attention.

This is particular timely given the National Nuclear Security Administration’s proposal to build a whole new arsenal of nuclear weapons misleadingly named the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program.

HEADQUARTERS: PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 1 • Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794 USA Tel: (805) 965-3443 • Fax: (805) 568-0466 • E-mail: wagingpeace@nafp.org

WASHINGTON, DC OFFICE: 322 Fourth Street NE • Washington, DC 20002 USA Tel: (202) 543-4100 ext. 105 • Fax: (202) 546-5142 • E-mail: DCOFFICE@nafp.org

www.wagingpeace.org • www.nuclearfiles.org

PLANETHOOD - THE FINAL LEAP TO WORLD PEACE
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory have both submitted their designs to the US Nuclear Weapons Council, and the Bush Administration is expected to announce a decision regarding the designs as soon as this week. Furthermore, RRW production would not only put the current US nuclear test-ban in jeopardy, but would require UC-managed Los Alamos National Laboratory to begin large-scale weapons component manufacturing for the first time since 1949. If that is not enough for reason for alarm, the proposal calls for special “small builds” of weapons to be designed at UC labs for use against specific targets like North Korea and Iran.

Your leadership and guidance can help reclaim the University of California’s commitment to research. The UC Regents do not even pretend that lab management is an intellectual endeavor; they usually tout it as a contribution to national security, which it is decidedly not. As we are all painfully aware, student turnover is a large problem when trying to build long-term, institutional change. We are therefore asking the faculty of Riverside to act as a strong foundation to work in tandem with students and alumni to bring an end the UC’s unethical support for nuclear weapons production.

Lastly, the petition was not meant to be our only contact with faculty. Instead we mean for the petition to spark a connection between students and faculty which will hopefully result in positive steps toward a nuclear weapons-free university. The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and the Coalition to Demilitarize the UC would like to work with you regarding this issue in the future. If there is information or support you would like us to provide, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Andrew Culp
Research and Advocacy Associate

cc: Vice Chair R. A. Luben
Secretary Parliamentarian R. L. Russell
Representative J. W. Childers
Representative C. J. Lovatt
Executive Directory Sellyna Ehlers
January 10, 2007

TO:    THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM:    JOHN CIOFFI, CHAIR
       RULES AND JURISDICTION

RE:    DEFINITION OF JOINT APPOINTMENTS FOR USE IN ACADEMIC
       PERSONNEL REVIEWS

The Rules & Jurisdiction committee has reviewed your request for an interpretive ruling on the definition of a joint appointment and voting rights with respect to personnel in various research units. We agree with the position embraced by VPAP Lord that personnel of ORUs, MRUs, institutes, or centers cannot formally vote on promotions, but see no reason why they cannot submit advisory materials such as a poll of the unit personnel.

We would frame the issues a bit differently, however. Voting by the IGPP, or any other ORUs, MRUs, institutes, or centers, is not covered by Bylaw 55 and therefore does not violate it. Bylaw 55 confers voting rights to members of departments, and Legislative ruling 5.67 restricts departmental membership to members of the Senate. As the noted by the VPAP, appointments are made within departments, defined as by the APM as "administrative units...with combined instruction and research functions." We are unable to find anything more explicit or precise about what a "department" is and how one is established. Under this definition, the kind of units referred to by the VPAP are not departments or their equivalent. One open question is whether an exception has been made by the UCOP allowing appointments to be made within IGPP or (other units that might raise these issues). We have no information regarding any exceptions made the UCOP regarding the status of these units and therefore express no opinion on such cases.

With regard to voting rights, Bylaw 55 doesn't say who can vote on an appointment. APM 220-80 sets out the procedure for recommendations and reviews, and states that appointments, promotions, etc. are "normally initiated by the department chair, after appropriate consultation with members of the departmental faculty." This is consistent with other provisions and general scheme of the UCR and UC Bylaws, which consistently refer to voting on promotions within departments. Accordingly, we find that voting by members of ORUs, MRUs, institutes, or centers on promotion matters would violate the APM if regarded as a formal vote.

On the second issue of defining joint appointments, we have not found any definition or procedure established by the Regents, UC bylaws, UCR bylaws, or APM for joint
appointments. Notwithstanding this absence of clear authority, we find that the applicable definition is the appointment of an academic senate member to more than one department or equivalent administrative unit in accordance with the procedure set out in the EVC's memorandum on Joint Appointment Procedures of November 7, 1995. Under these procedures, all voting on appointments is conducted within the established departments to which the faculty member will be formally attached. This precludes votes on appointments and promotions within ORUs, MRUs, institutes, or centers, and by personnel who are not departmental (and Senate) members.

We hope that this helps to resolve these issues.

Very truly yours,

R & J

John W. Cioffi
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521
951-827-7269 (tel.)
951-827-3933 (fax)
To: Thomas Cogswell  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Allen Zych  
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Joint Appointments

The following view has been expressed by the CAP members (2) who also are IGPP members: faculty that hold FTE (I&R and OR) appointments in both a teaching unit and a research unit should not be excluded from formal (as opposed to advisory) voting in the research unit for appointments, merit advances and promotions of faculty members within the unit. Research units share the support, training and mentorship of graduate students and postdoctoral researchers with teaching units. Faculty members with FTE appointments in more than one teaching unit have formal voting privileges in all the units. This negates the argument that each faculty member should have only one vote. This privilege should extend to research units with OR FTE. Their vote within the research unit should have the same value as their vote within the teaching unit. Their vote within the research unit brings a different and unique prospective to the candidate’s research and service within the unit that would not be heard by other means. Faculty members with OR FTE in research units have activities and obligations to that unit that may be unknown to the teaching unit. These require a full review as part of the merit and promotion process. In the case of the IGPP, the OR faculty members have been registering formal votes on all merits, promotions and appointments for 40 years. The votes of the professional researchers have been advisory.

The remaining CAP members appear to be neutral on this matter.
November 27, 2006

TO: JOHN CIOFFI, CHAIR
RULES AND JURISDICTION

ALLEN ZYCH, CHAIR
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

FM: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: DEFINITION OF JOINT APPOINTMENTS FOR USE IN ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS

Please have your committees review the attached document regarding the definition of joint appointments from VP Lord’s office and let me have your committee’s comments by December 18, 2006.

Attachment (1)
November 21, 2006

TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Elizabeth Lord
      Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

RE: Definition of Joint Appointments for Use in Academic Personnel Reviews

Our (Academic Personnel's) interpretation of joint appointment refers to the situation in which a faculty member is a member of more than one academic department. Such appointments carry a percentage of FTE in each academic department, and in rare cases this may be a zero percentage in one department. Joint appointments are voted on by the academic departments, recommended by the dean(s) and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and approved by the Chancellor. Faculty having joint appointment status have voting rights in each department (see attached current UCR policy on joint appointments dated November 7, 1995 by former EVC David Warren). Other UC campuses (e.g., UC Davis, UC Santa Barbara and UC San Diego) written policy appear to interpret the appointment and use of joint appointments in a similar manner. However, what is unclear, but is important to know, is if other units (i.e., Institutes and Centers) can be considered the equivalent of academic departments with respect to voting rights in the realm of academic personnel reviews. For example, the Institute of Geophysics & Planetary Physics (IGPP) on our campus is currently handling personnel actions (appointments, merits, promotions, etc.) within their units in the same manner that a department would function. To clarify the dynamics of the unit, I would like to explain that IGPP has senate faculty members with split appointments, partial professorial (I&R) appointments in a department (i.e., Physics or Earth Sciences) and partial professional researcher appointments funded as organized researchers in IGPP from (OR) 19900 funds. These funds come from systemwide since the IGPP is a systemwide multi-research unit (MRU). The appointments are on 5-year terms in IGPP, being renewable upon review.

When the personnel review file for a senate member arrives in Academic Personnel, the "recommendation letter" from IGPP contains a record for both eligible (faculty) votes and advisory votes (i.e., non-senate researchers in the unit). However, the membership in the unit is composed of faculty from several departments as well as some in the department of the candidate. This results in some Physics IGPP faculty having two votes on a Physics IGPP file—one in IGPP and one in the Physics Department. In addition, it results in faculty outside a members department having eligible votes on their file.

The practice of functioning as a department has been in place since the inception of the unit; however, since they are not a department, I believe this is not in compliance with Bylaw 55. While I have no problem with the procedures they are using to provide input into the personnel
review process for their senate members, I see their votes on merits and promotions as advisory only to the senate vote from the department the IGPP faculty members resides in.

According to APM, Section 220, Appendix A, Item 2, "Appointments in the Professor Series are for duty in departments of Instruction and Research, or in equivalent administrative units (e.g. colleges and divisions) with combined instruction and research functions." An ORU, MRU, Institute or Center does not have jurisdiction over courses or curricula and cannot offer formal courses for credit; therefore they do not qualify as a department.

There are several Institutes that are under development on campus and they are interested in using the IGPP model, so we need senate guidance on these matters. I am seeking your advice and asking the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction to offer a ruling on this issue. Are the current voting practices in IGPP in agreement with Bylaw 55? Can you give us a definition of a joint appointment with respect to academic personnel review of senate faculty?

Your assistance in this matter is greatly valued.

EL/sm

Attachments (2)
  Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 220, Appendix A
  UCR Joint Appointment Procedures Dated November 7, 1995

cc:  Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost Ellen Wartella
     Research Analyst Bryce Mason
     Senior Analyst Cindy Palmer
     Analyst Mary Thompson
Regents’ Policy on Funding of Regular Ranks Faculty Appointments

Approved November 19, 1971
Amended September 22, 2005

1. It is the policy of the University of California that no appointment shall be made to a title in the Professor Series (i.e., to any of the titles Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) unless there is an appropriately budgeted provision for the appointment. Any exception to this rule must be approved by the President.

2. Appointments in the Professor Series are for duty in departments of Instruction and Research, or in equivalent administrative units (e.g., colleges and divisions) with combined instruction and research functions. Any exception to this rule must be approved by the President.

3. Except as noted in 4., following, an appointment to the Professor Series shall not be made unless the full amount of the regular salary for the position (on the academic-year or fiscal-year academic salary scale, whichever is appropriate) is available and assigned to the position from General Funds, Educational Fees, and/or Professional School Fees.

4. The following exceptions to the provision stated in 3. may be permitted upon recommendation of the Chancellor and approval by the President.

   • Appointments supported in part or in full from permanent endowment income.

   • Appointments supported in part or in full from continuing Federal appropriations, such as Hatch Act or Sea Grant funds.

   • Appointments in certain of the faculties of the health sciences, in conformity with Regentally approved salary scales or compensation plans in which a part of the total compensation of the appointee may be derived from fees collected for patient care services and from extramural contract and grant funds.

   • Appointments, very limited in number, supported in part or in full from foundation or other extramural sources, when warranted by exceptional circumstances.

5. If, in connection with an extramurally-funded contract or grant project, an appointee in the Professor Series undertakes duties which substantially detract from his or her ability to perform the regular duties of instruction and research for which he or she was appointed, an appropriate portion of his or her total salary shall be charged to the project and paid from extramural funds. The General Funds thus temporarily released

Rev. 1/1/06
may be used to pay for the temporary services of an individual to perform the duties from which the aforementioned appointee was diverted. But, for every appointment in the Professor Series, with the exceptions noted in 4., and with exceptions for those professors who have concurrent appointments at the University-operated Department of Energy Laboratories, there is a continuing lien on General Funds for the full amount of the salary provided for in the terms of the original appointment.
TO: DEANS, DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRS

FROM: David H. Warren
Executive Vice Chancellor

RE: Joint Appointment Procedures

Joint appointment refers to the situation in which a faculty member is a member of more than one department. Such appointments carry a percentage of FTE in each department; in rare cases this may be a zero percentage in one department. Zero percentage appointments must be reviewed for continuation every three years. In general, the less formal Cooperating Faculty Member title is preferable to a zero percentage appointment.

Joint appointments are voted on by the departments, recommended by the Dean(s) and the Committee on Academic Personnel, and approved by the Chancellor. Both departments are listed on the Personnel Action Form (PAF), even though the percentage of FTE in one department may be zero.

Faculty having joint appointment status have voting rights in the departments listed on the PAF. Likewise, those departments are obligated to review and vote on all matters pertaining to the merit and promotion advancement of such individuals.

The purpose of having official status in more than one department may be to reflect the individual’s research interests and achievements, and/or to reflect the individual’s teaching interests, capabilities and expertise.

The procedure by which joint departmental status is established is as follows:

1. A written statement is prepared by the faculty member who is seeking a joint appointment indicating the percentage of appointment FTE and the proposed duties and activities, outlining the reasons for the appointment, and identifying the qualifications for membership in the proposed host department. The larger percentage of FTE dictates the faculty member’s home department. If the joint appointment is 50/50, the faculty member must designate in writing which of the two departments will be considered the home department.

2. The statement is presented to the chair of the home department who convenes the eligible voting members. The faculty reviews the written statement and discusses and votes on the proposal, in accord with its established procedures. The chair of the home department prepares a statement of how the proposed joint appointment will affect the home department.
Joint Appointment Procedures
November 7, 1995
Page 2

3. The statement and departmental vote are presented by the chair to the chair of the host department, who convenes the eligible voting members. The faculty reviews the written statement and discusses and votes on the proposal, in accord with its established procedures. The chair of the host department prepares a statement of how the proposed joint appointment would benefit the department.

4. The above statements, with a written record of the votes and discussions of the two departments, are sent to the Dean (or Deans), who makes an assessment and recommendation to the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor.

5. The Executive Vice Chancellor presents the material to the Committee on Academic Personnel for its recommendation and reviews the issue of FTE shift with the Committee on Planning and Budget as appropriate. The Executive Vice Chancellor notifies the two departments of the Chancellor’s decision.

Joint departmental status may be discontinued at any time; such action should be conducted independently of regular academic personnel actions. The process of discontinuation is initiated by the host department, which forwards its recommendation through the same process used for appointments.
November 21, 2006

TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
Academic Senate

FROM: Elizabeth Lord
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

RE: Definition of Joint Appointments for Use in Academic Personnel Reviews

Our (Academic Personnel's) interpretation of joint appointment refers to the situation in which a faculty member is a member of more than one academic department. Such appointments carry a percentage of FTE in each academic department, and in rare cases this may be a zero percentage in one department. Joint appointments are voted on by the academic departments, recommended by the dean(s) and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and approved by the Chancellor. Faculty having joint appointment status have voting rights in each department (see attached current UCR policy on joint appointments dated November 7, 1995 by former EVC David Warren). Other UC campuses' (e.g., UC Davis, UC Santa Barbara and UC San Diego) written policy appear to interpret the appointment and use of joint appointments in a similar manner. However, what is unclear, but is important to know, is if other units (i.e., Institutes and Centers) can be considered the equivalent of academic departments with respect to voting rights in the realm of academic personnel reviews. For example, the Institute of Geophysics & Planetary Physics (IGPP) on our campus is currently handling personnel actions (appointments, merits, promotions, etc.) within their units in the same manner that a department would function. To clarify the dynamics of the unit, I would like to explain that IGPP has senate faculty members with split appointments, partial professorial (I&R) appointments in a department (i.e., Physics or Earth Sciences) and partial professional researcher appointments funded as organized researchers in IGPP from (OR) 19900 funds. These funds come from systemwide since the IGPP is a systemwide multi-research unit (MRU). The appointments are on 5-year terms in IGPP, being renewable upon review.

When the personnel review file for a senate member arrives in Academic Personnel, the "recommendation letter" from IGPP contains a record for both eligible (faculty) votes and advisory votes (i.e., non-senate researchers in the unit). However, the membership in the unit is composed of faculty from several departments as well as some in the department of the candidate. This results in some Physics IGPP faculty having two votes on a Physics IGPP file—one in IGPP and one in the Physics Department. In addition, it results in faculty outside a members department having eligible votes on their file.

The practice of functioning as a department has been in place since the inception of the unit; however, since they are not a department, I believe this is not in compliance with Bylaw 55. While I have no problem with the procedures they are using to provide input into the personnel
review process for their senate members, I see their votes on merits and promotions as advisory only to the senate vote from the department the IGPP faculty members resides in.

According to APM, Section 220, Appendix A, Item 2, "Appointments in the Professor Series are for duty in departments of Instruction and Research, or in equivalent administrative units (e.g. colleges and divisions) with combined instruction and research functions." An ORU, MRU, Institute or Center does not have jurisdiction over courses or curricula and cannot offer formal courses for credit; therefore they do not qualify as a department.

There are several Institutes that are under development on campus and they are interested in using the IGPP model, so we need senate guidance on these matters. I am seeking your advice and asking the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction to offer a ruling on this issue. Are the current voting practices in IGPP in agreement with Bylaw 55? Can you give us a definition of a joint appointment with respect to academic personnel review of senate faculty?

Your assistance in this matter is greatly valued.

EL/sm

Attachments (2)
  Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 220, Appendix A
  UCR Joint Appointment Procedures Dated November 7, 1995

cc: Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost Ellen Wartella
    Research Analyst Bryce Mason
    Senior Analyst Cindy Palmer
    Analyst Mary Thompson
Regents’ Policy on Funding of Regular Ranks Faculty Appointments

Approved November 19, 1971
Amended September 22, 2005

1. It is the policy of the University of California that no appointment shall be made to a title in the Professor Series (i.e., to any of the titles Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) unless there is an appropriately budgeted provision for the appointment. Any exception to this rule must be approved by the President.

2. Appointments in the Professor Series are for duty in departments of Instruction and Research, or in equivalent administrative units (e.g., colleges and divisions) with combined instruction and research functions. Any exception to this rule must be approved by the President.

3. Except as noted in 4., following, an appointment to the Professor Series shall not be made unless the full amount of the regular salary for the position (on the academic-year or fiscal-year academic salary scale, whichever is appropriate) is available and assigned to the position from General Funds, Educational Fees, and/or Professional School Fees.

4. The following exceptions to the provision stated in 3. may be permitted upon recommendation of the Chancellor and approval by the President.

   • Appointments supported in part or in full from permanent endowment income.

   • Appointments supported in part or in full from continuing Federal appropriations, such as Hatch Act or Sea Grant funds.

   • Appointments in certain of the faculties of the health sciences, in conformity with Regentally approved salary scales or compensation plans in which a part of the total compensation of the appointee may be derived from fees collected for patient care services and from extramural contract and grant funds.

   • Appointments, very limited in number, supported in part or in full from foundation or other extramural sources, when warranted by exceptional circumstances.

5. If, in connection with an extramurally-funded contract or grant project, an appointee in the Professor Series undertakes duties which substantially detract from his or her ability to perform the regular duties of instruction and research for which he or she was appointed, an appropriate portion of his or her total salary shall be charged to the project and paid from extramural funds. The General Funds thus temporarily released
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may be used to pay for the temporary services of an individual to perform the duties from which the aforementioned appointee was diverted. But, for every appointment in the Professor Series, with the exceptions noted in 4., and with exceptions for those professors who have concurrent appointments at the University-operated Department of Energy Laboratories, there is a continuing lien on General Funds for the full amount of the salary provided for in the terms of the original appointment.
November 7, 1995

TO: DEANS, DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRS

FROM: David H. Warren  
Executive, Vice Chancellor

RE: Joint Appointment Procedures

Joint appointment refers to the situation in which a faculty member is a member of more than one department. Such appointments carry a percentage of FTE in each department; in rare cases this may be a zero percentage in one department. Zero percentage appointments must be reviewed for continuation every three years. In general, the less formal Cooperating Faculty Member title is preferable to a zero percentage appointment.

Joint appointments are voted on by the departments, recommended by the Dean(s) and the Committee on Academic Personnel, and approved by the Chancellor. Both departments are listed on the Personnel Action Form (PAF), even though the percentage of FTE in one department may be zero.

Faculty having joint appointment status have voting rights in the departments listed on the PAF. Likewise, those departments are obligated to review and vote on all matters pertaining to the merit and promotion advancement of such individuals.

The purpose of having official status in more than one department may be to reflect the individual’s research interests and achievements, and/or to reflect the individual’s teaching interests, capabilities and expertise.

The procedure by which joint departmental status is established is as follows:

1. A written statement is prepared by the faculty member who is seeking a joint appointment indicating the percentage of appointment FTE and the proposed duties and activities, outlining the reasons for the appointment, and identifying the qualifications for membership in the proposed host department. The larger percentage of FTE dictates the faculty member’s home department. If the joint appointment is 50/50, the faculty member must designate in writing which of the two departments will be considered the home department.

2. The statement is presented to the chair of the home department who convenes the eligible voting members. The faculty reviews the written statement and discusses and votes on the proposal, in accord with its established procedures. The chair of the home department prepares a statement of how the proposed joint appointment will affect the home department.
3. The statement and departmental vote are presented by the chair to the chair of the host department, who convenes the eligible voting members. The faculty reviews the written statement and discusses and votes on the proposal, in accord with its established procedures. The chair of the host department prepares a statement of how the proposed joint appointment would benefit the department.

4. The above statements, with a written record of the votes and discussions of the two departments, are sent to the Dean (or Deans), who makes an assessment and recommendation to the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor.

5. The Executive Vice Chancellor presents the material to the Committee on Academic Personnel for its recommendation and reviews the issue of FTE shift with the Committee on Planning and Budget as appropriate. The Executive Vice Chancellor notifies the two departments of the Chancellor’s decision.

Joint departmental status may be discontinued at any time; such action should be conducted independently of regular academic personnel actions. The process of discontinuation is initiated by the host department, which forwards its recommendation through the same process used for appointments.