ELLEN SWITKES
ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC ADVANCEMENT

Re: Formal Review of APM 220-18.b (4) – Criteria for Advancement to Step VI and Above Scale

Dear Ellen,

At its March 22, 2006 meeting, the Academic Council voted to discontinue its review of the proposed amendments to APM 220-18b (4) and to withdraw its recommended changes of July 27, 2005, on which the current formal review is based. Council has referred the matter back to the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), asking them to review the Council’s July 2005 recommendations, as well as all comments submitted by Senate bodies in the course of this year’s formal review of APM 220-18.b (4), and advise the Academic Council on the need for any change to the current language of APM 220-18.b (4).

Our decision was made because the responses received in the course of the current formal review – including UCAP’s circulation of a new version incompatible with the version approved by the Council in July 2005 and then circulated for review – demonstrate a significant lack of consensus among faculty across both Senate Committees and Divisions. While we are withdrawing a previous Council position, we do so out of a sense of prudence when dealing with standards for academic advancement – one of the most fundamental issues that shared governance must confront. We prefer to act with a fuller understanding of the differences among Senate constituencies on these important provisions. UCAP will report back to the Academic Council with their recommendations as soon as is feasible, and I will inform you of any further related Council actions.

We greatly appreciate the support of the Office of Academic Advancement in connection with the Senate’s proposed amendments to APM 220-18.b (4), and regret any inconvenience our redirection may cause you or the campuses. Please do not hesitate to contact me for more information.

Sincerely,

John Oakley, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council

María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director