

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Mary Croughan
Telephone: (510) 987-9303
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: mary.croughan@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

August 6, 2009

LAWRENCE PITTS INTERIM PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT – ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Re: Proposed Revisions to APM 240

Dear Larry:

Three Senate Divisions and one committee (UCR, UCSC, UCSD, and UCAP) responded to the second revision of the proposed changes to APM 240 (the remaining divisions and several committees declined to comment); two respondents approved of the changes, and two requested further revisions and clarifications.

The Santa Cruz Division identified specific concerns that fall into two categories. First, those issues associated with the long-standing difficulties in how the academic side of the house should treat the “professorial” assessment of a Dean. Second, concerns regarding the seeming intent of the policy to define a class of Deans as “academic administrators” and the compatibility of their retention policies and merit advancement procedures with those on the academic side of the house.

The San Diego Division is concerned about the overall performance required for reappointment as Dean. They believe that reappointment at this prestigious level requires continued demonstration of excellence and for this reason, urge the addition of the following sentence as a third bullet to APM 240-80(b): “(3) A Dean’s overall performance should be judged as distinguished or highly meritorious in order to be reappointed.”

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding Council’s comments.

Sincerely,



Mary Croughan
Chair, Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Patricia Price, Interim Executive Director, Academic Personnel

Encl. 4

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

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

ANTHONY W. NORMAN
DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR OF BIOCHEMISTRY
AND BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0217
TEL: (951) 827-5538
E-MAIL: ANTHONY.NORMAN@UCR.EDU
SENATE@UCR.EDU

June 24, 2009

Mary Croughan
Professor, Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences
Chair, UC Systemwide Academic Senate
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Mary:

RE: PROPOSED REVISED ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY 240 - DEANS

The relevant Senate committees reviewed the proposed revisions to APM Policy 240 which applies to Deans and found the revisions reasonable and thus merited no further comments. Committee on Academic Personnel pointed out what they presumed was an apparent clerical oversight – and this is to be found in Section 240-24.d which appears not to have been revised to be consistent with the modifications that appear as Section 240-20.a.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Anthony W. Norman", with a horizontal line underneath.

Anthony W. Norman
Distinguished Professor of Biochemistry and
Biomedical Sciences; and
Chair of the Riverside Division

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



1156 HIGH STREET
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064

Office of the Academic Senate
SANTA CRUZ DIVISION
125 CLARK KERR HALL
(831) 459 - 2086

March 19, 2009

Mary Croughan, Chair
Academic Council

RE: UCSC Response to Revised APM 240 Appointment and Review of Academic Deans

Dear Mary,

The UC Santa Cruz Division reviewed the proposed changes to APM 240. Our committees on Academic Personnel (CAP) and Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the proposed changes. We support many or most of the portions of the proposed policy, including ensuring that consultation with the Senate must occur prior to a decanal appointment and streamlining the Regental role in approving administrators' salaries by removing some deans from the Senior Management Group (SMG) designation and delegating authority to chancellors. However, there were some specific concerns that were raised about parts of the policy. The concerns fall into two categories: first, associated with the long-standing difficulties in how the academic side of the house should treat the "professorial" assessment of a Dean; and second, from the seeming intent of the policy to define a class of Deans as "academic administrators," and the compatibility of their retention policies and merit advancement procedures with those on the academic side of the house.

Scholarly Expectations While the proposed policy revisions pertain primarily to the administrative review of deans, and not to the "professorial" side of the personnel review process, the proposed APM 240-4b explicitly states that Deans "are encouraged to continue to engage in scholarly and professional activities, if possible and to the extent consistent with their decanal responsibilities, and it is therefore appropriate for time to be allotted to them to engage in these activities." We are in agreement with this revised wording.

We note, however, that this is the sole mention within the policy of the professorial side of the Dean's responsibilities, and provides no guidance on how to consider research productivity or teaching performance in professorial reviews of Deans. Such professorial reviews of administrators are always quite difficult, because it is not clear how to evaluate the research and teaching components of these files given that Deans occupy essentially full-time service positions—indeed, if Deans do rotate in-and-out of the faculty, then an inability to determine what the appropriate assessment of scholarly activity for a Dean could handicap (or conversely, benefit) individuals during the faculty personnel process—and no guidance is available for how to make an assessment of what the scholarly expectations for a Dean are. Hence, some

additional guidance on how to assess such cases, and in particular in how to determine what “the extent [of scholarly activity] consistent with their decanal responsibilities” might be would be very helpful.

Retention and Advancement Policies Section 240-14 c creates two subgroups of deans, dividing academic deans from all others. The principle that divisional deans are “academic heads” (240-4b) is one that we support, but as implemented in these changes to APM 240, several problems could arise in relation to compensation. The basic issue here is that the compensation processes differ markedly from those on the academic side of the house.

Compensation is based on a completely separate review process from the process by which faculty are reviewed. Unlike general faculty, deans are to be reviewed annually and considered for annual raises: there seems to be no role for peer or Senate review of the deans, except at five-year intervals—and this is at marked odds with practice on the academic side of campuses. Moreover, Section 240-18 a appears to conflate merit and market forces, and it is not obvious why a dean’s salary is not set as his/her academic base salary, combined with stipends or off-scale to recognize administrative service on the one hand, and market conditions on the other. We support the principle of competitive salaries, but it is not clear that UC has had more trouble retaining deans than (for example) faculty. Similarly, 240-18 a (3) is problematic because it compares deans’ salaries to those at different (and seemingly intentionally ambiguous) comparison institutions. Yet, the faculty is typically compared only to the Comparison 8. UC does not systematically use salaries from institutions outside that group for different disciplines in adjusting salary scales, and hence this seems like a policy that could be fraught with inconsistencies and anomalies.

To conclude, while UCSC support the general intentions of the policy, we would like to see the policy revised.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Quentin Williams". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Quentin" and last name "Williams" clearly distinguishable.

Quentin Williams, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0002
TELEPHONE: (858) 534-3640
FAX: (858) 534-4528

July 9, 2009

Professor Mary Croughan
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200SUBJECT: Revised Proposed Changes to Academic Personnel Policy (APM) 240: Appointment
and Promotion – Deans

Dear Chair Croughan:

The San Diego Division cannot support the revised proposed changes to APM 240 in their current form (dated May 29, 2009). In our letter of March 3, 2009, we raised two concerns. The first concern, addressing the pay scale for transition leave, has been appropriately dealt with and we are satisfied. However, our second and more substantive concern had to do with the overall performance required for reappointment as dean. We suggested in our earlier letter that the following sentence should be added as a third bullet under 240-80(b): “(3) A Dean’s overall performance should be judged as distinguished or highly meritorious in order to be reappointed.” We believe that reappointment at this prestigious level requires continued demonstration of excellence. For this reason, we urge the addition of this sentence to APM 240-80(b).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Daniel J. Donoghue".

Daniel J. Donoghue, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Divisioncc: W. Hodgkiss
F. Powell



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)
Steven Plaxe, Chair
splaxe@ucsd.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

June 30, 2009

MARY CROUGHAN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: FINAL REVIEW OF PROPOSED REVISIONS TO APM 240

Dear Mary,

The University Committee on Academic Personnel finds this revision of APM-240 to be acceptable.

The Committee would like to be certain that, as stated in the APM, a Dean may hold an appointment in an Academic Senate faculty title or an equivalent title, that section 240-16 a.:

“This section of policy formalizes review procedures for the administrative portion of a Dean’s duties. The administrative review procedures are separate and distinct from the formal academic review procedures governing the underlying faculty appointment as described in APM - 210, Review and Appraisal Committees, and APM - 220, Professor Series.”

This provides suitable guidance regardless of the appointee’s academic series.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Steven Plaxe".

Steven Plaxe, Chair
UCAP