October 28, 2019

SUSAN CARLSON, VICE PROVOST
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Re: Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Manual Section 230, Visiting Appointments

Dear Susan,

As you requested, I distributed for systemwide Senate review the proposed revised APM 230 (Visiting Appointments). Six Academic Senate divisions (UCI, UCM, UCR, UCSC, UCSD, and UCSF) and one systemwide committee (UCAP) submitted comments. These comments were discussed at Academic Council’s October 23, 2019 meeting and are attached for your reference.

We understand that the proposed revisions reflect changes made to comply with a stipulated agreement between the University and the UAW, in recognition of the new Academic Researchers bargaining unit. The agreement changes who qualifies as an academic “visitor” for which the “Visiting” prefix is used. The revisions clarify that 1) the titles of Visiting Professional Researcher and Visiting Project Scientist are reserved only for individuals who hold, or are on leave from, an academic or research position at a non-UC educational institution. They also clarify that 2) individuals employed by UC who are temporarily performing the duties of those series must now be appointed in a non-Visiting title in the Academic Researchers unit. In addition, the revisions permit the “Visiting” prefix to attach to the Specialist series, and clarify that doctoral students visiting from non-UC “educational” institutions can be appointed in a Visiting Specialist title, but for no more than one year.

Academic Council supports the revisions in general. While several Senate reviewers noted that the new one-year appointment limit for visiting graduate student Specialists could negatively affect those students later in the job market, Council understands that this was a stipulation included as part of bargaining that UC cannot change. However, we should like to draw your attention to UCAP’s comment that language stipulating “educational” institution in APM 230-4-b-3 and APM 230-4-b-4 would, if taken literally, rule out a relevant non-educational institution such as a national laboratory or an industrial research laboratory. We ask policy authors to address this unintended consequence by removing the word “educational” from this phrase.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to opine. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair
Academic Council
cc: Academic Council
    Senate Directors
October 4, 2019

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair
Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200


Dear Chair Bhavnani,

At its October 1, 2019 meeting, the Irvine Divisional Senate Cabinet discussed the proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual Section 230, Visiting Appointments. The Cabinet agreed with the concerns raised by the Graduate Council regarding graduate student appointments, noting that the firm one-year appointment limit under Section 230-17 risks needlessly and negatively impacting visiting Ph.D. students. The Cabinet unanimously endorsed the Graduate Council’s recommendation that visiting doctoral students be provided with a mechanism by which extensions or reappointments may be granted, or that visiting graduate students be classified under a title that would provide such flexibility when appropriate.

If you have any questions related to the action of the Irvine Division, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

James Steintrager, Chair
Academic Senate, Irvine Division

Enclosures: Graduate Council memo dated 6/25/19
Council on Research, Computing, and Libraries memo dated 9/18/19

Cc: Jeff Barrett, Chair Elect, Academic Senate
Lee Bardwell, Chair, Council on Research, Computing, and Libraries
Linda Cohen, Vice Chair, Graduate Council
Thao Nguyen, Graduate Council Analyst
Michelle Chen, Council on Research, Computing, and Libraries Analyst
Gina Anzivino, Assistant Director, Academic Senate, Irvine Division
Kate Brigman, Executive Director, Academic Senate, Irvine Division
LINDA COHEN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

RE: APM-230 Visiting Appointments

At its June 13, 2019 meeting, Graduate Council reviewed the proposed revisions to APM-230 Visiting Appointments, made in compliance with the “Stipulation” between UC and the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America in recognition of the Researchers-Academic Unit formation. Specifically, the positions that belong in the bargaining unit are being updated to comply with the agreement (e.g., faculty appointments without salary and Senate faculty are not in the unit).

Graduate Council identified one issue of concern for visiting graduate students, under 230-17 Terms of Service. The revised language reads as follows:

Visitors in the Specialist series who are enrolled in a degree-granting doctoral program or the equivalent at an educational institution other than the University of California are limited to a one (1)-year appointment, with no extensions, reappointments, or exceptions.

Graduate Council expressed concerns with this firm one-year limit for appointment, “with no extensions, reappointments, or exceptions.” This time limit risks needlessly and negatively impacting visiting PhD students and the research programs that need them. The Council strongly recommends that visiting doctoral students be provided a mechanism by which extensions or reappointments can be granted, or that they be reclassified under a title that would allow for such a process.

Graduate Council notes that visiting appointments to titles in Professor, Astronomer, Agronomist in the Agricultural Experiment Station, Specialist in Cooperative Extension, and Librarian series remain unchanged.

On behalf of the Graduate Council,

Glen Mimura, Chair

C: Kate Brigman, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Thao Nguyen, Graduate Council Analyst
October 4, 2019

LINDA COHEN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

RE: Review of Proposed Adoption of APM-230, Visiting Appointments

In lieu of a meeting, the review of the proposed policy APM-230: Visiting Appointments was conducted electronically.

The Working Group on Privileges and Responsibilities of Non-Faculty Academic Appointees recommends that APM-230 (Visiting Appointments) be adopted as University policy. CORCL has a particular interest in this policy because the proposed APM-230 would apply to Professional Researchers and Project Scientists and also to Out-of-Unit Visiting Professional Researchers and Visiting Project Scientists and therefore establishes a clear policy for these Non-Faculty cases.

The Council found that the working group seems to have done due diligence in consulting with key stakeholders. The policy changes recommended seem to be completely appropriate.

The Council appreciates the opportunity to comment.

On behalf of the Council,

Jeffrey A. Barrett, Chair

c: Kate Brigman, Executive Director
   Michelle Chen, CORCL Analyst
OCTOBER 14, 2019

KUM-KUM BHAVNANI, CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: PROPOSED REVISED APM - 230, VISITING APPOINTMENTS

Dear Kum-Kum:

The proposed revisions to APM-230 Visiting Appointments were distributed for comment to the standing committees and school executive committees of the Merced Division. At its October 2, 2019 meeting, Divisional Council endorsed forwarding for Academic Council’s consideration the enclosed comments from the Committee on Research (CoR).

In sum, the CoR noted that the proposed, revised policy is at odds with long-established traditions, in certain academic fields, in which a "stand-alone" visiting position (without appointment elsewhere) is part of regular professional development. Two possible negative impacts were identified. The use of a non-traditional title may affect the caliber of applicants, as applicants may not recognize the position for what it is or applicants may elect to accept a position with a more recognizable title. Reciprocally, when appointees under the new title apply for faculty positions, their experience may not be fully understood by other institutions that maintain the visiting title.

CoR members also wondered why individuals at one UC campus are unable to hold a visiting title at another UC campus. In other words, why use of the visiting title is restricted to individuals in the Professional Research, Project Scientist, and Specialist series who hold academic or research positions at institutions other than the University of California.

The Merced Division thanks you for the opportunity to opine.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tom Hansford
Chair, Divisional Council

CC: Divisional Council
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Laura Martin, Executive Director, Merced Senate Office

Encl (2)
September 25, 2019

To: Tom Hansford, Chair, Division Council

From: Michael Scheibner, Chair, Committee on Research (COR)

Re: Proposed Revisions to APM 230 (Visiting Appointments)

CoR reviewed the proposed revisions to APM 230 pertaining to Visiting Appointments. We offer the below comments and request for clarification.

Section 230-4 Definition and Policy states that the Visiting prefix applies to those individuals in the Professional Research, Project Scientist, and Specialist series who hold academic or research positions from institutions other than the University of California. CoR requests clarification on why individuals from UC campuses cannot hold a Visiting title at another UC campus than their UC home campus.

The proposed, revised policy is at odds with long established traditions in certain academic fields in which a "stand-alone" visiting position (without appointment elsewhere) is part of the regular professional development. Requiring the UC to name such positions as anything other than the customary visiting positions in certain fields elsewhere may have a negative consequence: advertisement of these positions under the new title may not attract the same caliber of applicants, as applicants may not recognize the position for what it is. Likewise, when appointees under the new title apply for faculty positions, their title may not be fully understood by other institutions that maintain the visiting title.

Under section 230-17 Terms of Service, CoR was encouraged to note that Visiting Assistant Professor Programs in Mathematics remains unchanged. UC Merced’s Applied Math department has greatly benefited from the addition of these scholars and hopes that this program will be allowed to continue in its current form.

We appreciate the opportunity to opine.

cc: Senate Office
October 8, 2019

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: [Systemwide Review] APM Revision: APM - 230, Visiting Appointments

Dear Kum-Kum,

I write with the result of the Riverside Division’s review of the proposed revision to APM 230. The Senate’s Executive Council discussed the revision and decided not to offer any additional comments in its general concurrence with the attached consultative review from the Committee on Faculty Welfare. CFW supports the revision, and interprets it as a logical outcome of a new union agreement. We appreciate the opportunity to examine this policy.

Sincerely yours,

Dylan Rodríguez
Professor of Media & Cultural Studies and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office
To: Dylan Rodriguez  
Riverside Division Academic Senate  

From: Daniel Jeske, Chair  
Committee on Faculty Welfare  

Re: [Systemwide Review] APM Revision: APM - 230, Visiting Appointments  

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) carried out an email discussion concerning the proposed changes to APM-230. CFW understand the changes are due to a new union agreement entered into by the University of California. The proposed changes do not raise any concerns from CFW.
October 11, 2019

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair
Academic Council


Dear Kum-Kum,

The Santa Cruz Division has reviewed and discussed the proposed revisions to Section 230 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) regarding Visiting Appointments. Our Committees on Academic Freedom (CAF), Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), and Research (COR) have responded. We understand that the proposed revisions are pursuant to a stipulation reached in March 2019 between the University and the United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), which recognizes the Academic Researchers United/“RA-Unit” as the exclusive representative of a unit of employees defined in the stipulation. Overall, the Division is supportive of the proposed revisions and welcomes modifications to the existing Visiting Appointment guidelines. However, the Committee on Research was perplexed by the proposed reduction of the Visiting Appointment duration from a maximum of two years to a maximum of one year, while mathematics scholars were granted a maximum appointment period of 3 years (page 2 of AMP-230, redline copy). We would very much appreciate an explanation of this discrepancy.

As always, thank you for the opportunity to opine.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Lau, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

cc: Jessica Taft, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
Elizabeth Abrams, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
Paul Roth, Chair, Committee on Research
October 8, 2019

Professor Kum-Kum Bhavnani
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: Proposed Revisions to APM 230, Visiting Appointments

Dear Professor Bhavnani:

The proposed revisions to APM 230, Visiting Appointments, was circulated to standing Senate committees for review and responses were received from the Divisional Committees on Academic Personnel (CAP) and Academic Freedom (CAF), and discussed at the Divisional Senate Council meeting on September 30, 2019. Senate Council endorsed the revisions to APM 230.

Sincerely,

Maripat Corr, Chair
San Diego Divisional Academic Senate

Cc: Steven Constable, Vice Chair, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate
    Ray Rodriguez, Director, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate Office
    Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
October 16, 2019

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, PhD
Chair, Academic Council
Systemwide Academic Senate
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200


Dear Kum-Kum:

Our Committee on Research and Graduate Council submitted the enclosed comments.

Our Graduate Council requested a justification for the proposed changes to APM section 230-17.

“Visitors in the Specialist series who are enrolled in a degree-granting doctoral program or the equivalent at an educational institution other than the University of California are limited to a one (1)-year appointment, with no extensions, reappointments, or exceptions.”

Under APM 430, a Visiting Scholar can also receive an appointment as a Visiting Specialist. APM 430 allows for the extension of a Visiting Scholar appointment beyond one year. However, the proposed change would limit the Visiting Specialist appointment to one year. We support the request for additional information about this proposed revision.

Thank you for this opportunity to review proposed changes to APM - 230.

Sincerely,

Sharmila Majumdar, PhD, 2019-20 Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Cc: Lea Grinberg, MD, PhD
Dyche Mullins, PhD
October 16, 2019

Professor Sharmila Majumdar, PhD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

RE: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to APM Section 230, Visiting Appointments

Dear Chair Majumdar,

The proposed revisions to APM - 230 (Visiting Appointments) section 230-17 includes language pertinent to the Graduate Division. The changes add the following text: “Visitors in the Specialist series who are enrolled in a degree-granting doctoral program or the equivalent at an educational institution other than the University of California are limited to a one (1)-year appointment, with no extensions, reappointments, or exceptions.”

This provision relates to APM - 430 (Visiting Scholars and Other Visitors) which governs short-term academic visits of a Scholar, Graduate Student, or Undergraduate Student in neither an employment nor an enrollment status. Section 430-4 (permits the University to grant a concurrent appointment in another series: “Persons visiting a campus may be eligible for appointment in other series and must be so appointed to receive salary or wages from the University of California. See, for example, APM - 230, Visiting Appointments; see also the Research titles available in APM - 310, Professional Research Series, APM - 330, Specialist Series, and APM - 355, Non-Salary Research Positions.”

We note that a Visiting Scholar can also receive an appointment as a Visiting Specialist, but only for a year, and with no extensions, reappointments, or exceptions. This is an apparent change in the existing policy. Our principle concern is that a Visiting Graduate Student can be reappointed beyond a year, whether or not they have a concurrent appointment as a Specialist.

UCSF currently has 112 Visiting Graduate Students none of which hold a concurrent appointment under APM – 230. However, it is feasible that there may exist a future need to make a concurrent appointment in the Visiting Graduate Student series and Visiting Specialist series, and that circumstances may exist that could justify renewing such an appointment beyond one year. We respectfully request a justification for the proposed change to APM section 230-17.

Sincerely,

Dyche Mullins, PhD
Chair, Graduate Council
UCSF Academic Senate
2019-2020
October 9, 2019

Professor Sharmila Majumdar, PhD
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate

Section 230, Visiting Appointments (APM - 230)

Dear Chair Majumdar,

The proposed revisions reflect changes made to comply with a stipulation agreement between UC and the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (“UAW”). Pursuant to the stipulation agreement, the UAW is the exclusive labor representative of individuals in the Professional Researchers series and the Project Scientist series.

The revised APM - 230 does not materially change the definition of visiting appointments with respect to the Professor (i.e., Ladder Rank) series. Thus, the changes will not have a direct impact on individuals in the Academic Senate. As of October 1, 2019, UCSF has 20 Visiting Professors.

In contrast, for individuals in the Professional Research series, Project Scientist series, and the Specialist series the proposed changes would limit the application of the “Visiting” prefix to only “those who hold or are on leave from an academic or research position at another educational institution other than the University of California” (emphasis added).

The proposed changes to APM - 230 will have a nominal if not nonexistent impact on the appointment titles made at UCSF. As of October 1, 2019, UCSF has three Visiting Professional Researchers and 176 Professional Researchers. We also have 699 Specialists. UCSF does not make appointments to the Project Scientist series.

We have inquired with the Office of the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs about the three individuals with appointments in the Visiting Professional Researcher series. UCSF is conducting a review of those three individuals to determine whether or not the “Visiting” title will be appropriate under the proposed revisions to APM – 230.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lea Grinberg, MD, PhD
Chair, Committee on Research
UCSF Academic Senate
2019-2020
June 13, 2019

ROBERT MAY, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: SYSTEMWIDE SENATE REVIEW PROPOSED REVISIONS TO APM - 230, VISITING APPOINTMENTS

Dear Robert,

UCAP has reviewed the proposed revisions to APM - 230, Visiting Appointments, and we agree that the changes are reasonable.

However, the committee suggests one change to the new language in sections APM 230-4-b-3 & -4, concerning visiting appointments in the Professional Researcher, Project Scientist, and Specialist series. The requirement for "...an academic or research position at another educational institution other than UC" would seem to exclude a research scientist visiting from a non-educational research institution (e.g. a national lab, an industrial research lab, NIH, NIST, etc), and therefore require that such a visitor be appointed in the new Unit without a Visiting title.

UCAP suggests removing the word "educational" from the phrasing in both APM 230-4-b-3 and APM 230-4-b-4. We note that the language in Section 2 of the Stipulation does not use the word "educational"; it just specifies "individuals who have an appointment or are employed by another institution."

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Dan Farber, Chair
UCAP