March 23, 2016

Dan Hare, Chair
Universitywide Academic Senate

RE: Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California

Dear Dan:

The “Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California” proposal was forwarded to all standing committees of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate, including school and college Faculty Executive Committees. Responses were received from the Committees on Planning & Budget (CPB), Academic Personnel Oversight (CAP), and Affirmative Action & Diversity (AA&D).

All committees support the proposed guiding principles and UC system-wide minimum standards for search waivers. AA&D appreciates that the proposed minimum standards establish explicit categories for the use of search waivers; while campuses can restrict the categories further, they will not be able to expand outside the categories, and therefore open recruitments will not be arbitrarily bypassed or undermined. Similarly, AA&D strongly supports the inclusion of the President’s and Chancellors’ Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) as one of the Senate categories, noting that search waivers have been valuable tools for recruiting competitive PPFP candidates. CAP also commented on the PPPF category; they suggest including a sentence stating that “[PPFP] Candidates are expected to satisfy the qualifications and standards of excellence for the appointment.”

The Davis Division supports the proposed guidelines.

Sincerely,

André Knoesen
Chair, Academic Senate
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering

Attachments: Committee Response Report
UCD Academic Federation Input

c. Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Universitywide Academic Senate
   Michael LaBriola, Principal Policy Analyst, Universitywide Academic Senate
   Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
CPB discussed the proposed guiding principles for search waivers for academic appointees at the University of California. Overall CPB did not have any major concerns with the proposed guiding principles.
The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the document "Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of California". Overall, CAP found the principles outlined in this document to be reasonable and in line with existing practice at UC Davis. CAP has one suggestion for modification to the proposed guidelines:

(1) In the category "President's and Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellowship Recipients" on page 2, CAP suggests the insertion of a sentence stating that "Candidates are expected to satisfy the qualifications and standards of excellence for the appointment".
Affirmative Action & Diversity

March 9, 2016 1:46 PM

AA&D Committee Response to Proposed Guiding Principles for Search Waivers

In the interests of transparency and of a commitment to open searches as the primary recruitment method of the university, the AA&D committee supports having clearly stated minimum standards for search waivers. Furthermore, we strongly support the explicit inclusion of President's and Chancellors' Postdoctoral Fellows as a possible basis for a search waiver. Due to the frequently intense competition in recruiting diversity candidates, the use of search waivers for hiring PPFs has been a valuable tool for a number of departments in recruiting highly desirable candidates.
Dear Vice Provost Carlson,

The primary concern of the Academic Federation is that interruptions in soft money funding for Academic Federation members might result in the situation whereby a Federation member will be forced to compete against a national pool for applicants for his or her previous job. The memo doesn’t precisely address this situation, but the accompanying chart does seem to allow search waivers for many “Non-Faculty” situations. One case seems to be slightly odd: the possible change in job title from Professional Researcher to ladder rank faculty would, as judged by APM merit and Review Criteria, seem to be a lateral job transfer worthy of a search waiver.

Of course, the Academic Federation would like to see other terms used for its’ members in place of “Non-Faculty” or to have the job titles simply spelled out in the chart without the terms “Non-Faculty” or “Non-Senate Faculty”. The continued use of these terms fosters a non-inclusive environment and intentionally or unintentionally creates a hierarchy.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

John Hess

Chair, Academic Federation