Re: Academic Council’s Proposed Revisions to APMs 210, 240, 245 – Appointment and Promotion

Dear M.R.C.:

In fall 2002, President Atkinson convened a Strategic Review Panel to, among other things, assess the effectiveness of the University’s outreach programs, recommend desirable changes, and to set reasonable short- and long-term goals for the University in pursuing its outreach agenda. The Panel completed its report in May of last year, and one of its key recommendations was that educational outreach should be incorporated into the teaching and research mission of the University and, as a consequence, involve faculty more directly in outreach efforts. In order to accomplish this goal, the Panel asked the Academic Senate to engage its members in deliberations about the proper role of faculty in this endeavor and to develop the means by which faculty could be properly recognized and rewarded for their participation in educational outreach.

The Academic Council responded to this request in two ways. First, in November 2003, the Academic Council co-sponsored, with the Office of the President, a daylong conference focused on a new vision for faculty in the University’s educational outreach efforts; and, second, the Academic Council asked the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD), in collaboration with the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), to undertake a review of and recommend changes to the APMs governing merit and promotion that would properly credit and reward faculty for their contributions to the these efforts.

UCAAD’s proposed revisions to APMs 210, 240 and 245 were sent out for full Senate review in February of this year, and were discussed by the Academic Council at both its March 31st and June 23rd meetings, when the revisions were approved. Members of the Academic Council were unanimous in their view that these changes were a good first step in furthering the cause of outreach academic preparation at the University of California.

The proposed revisions to APM 240 and APM 245 were accepted without controversy. However, UCAAD’s proposed revisions to APM 210 generated considerable discussion during the course of the review process, with the result that the language was substantially modified from that originally proposed. The chief concern was with the language inserted in the three...
review criteria (1) Teaching, (2) Research and Creative Work, and (3) Professional Competence and Activity, with a particular focus on (2) Research and Creative Work. There was a vocal minority who felt that the new language in criteria (2) might conflict with established standards of quality scholarship by explicitly inviting review committees to judge research by those other than scholarly rigor, objectivity and originality. Moreover, there was a widely held concern that review committees should not misconstrue the changes in the review criteria as being required for merit and promotion. We believe that the language suggested for changing APM 210 has addressed these points. You might keep these concerns in mind as you consider whether to incorporate into the APM the language approved by the Academic Council, or some modified version.

The Academic Council anticipates and welcomes the opportunity to consider these proposed revisions a final time during the formal review process.

Cordially,

Lawrence Pitts, Chair
Academic Council
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