

September 17, 2014

MAUREEN STANTON

Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

RE: SECOND REVIEW: UCD – APM 240 Appointment and Review of Deans

The revised proposal to amend UCD APM 240, regarding the appointment and review of Deans, was forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees and Faculty Executive Committees from the Schools and Colleges. Responses were received from the Academic Personnel-Oversight Subcommittee, Faculty Welfare, and Planning and Budget Committees and Graduate Council, as well as from the Faculty Executive Committees from the Colleges of Letters and Science, Engineering, and Management.

Responses from Academic Senate committees demonstrate support for the proposed changes to UCD APM 240. Academic Senate faculty understand that flexibility is important but also want to be sure procedures and expectations are clear. Based on the responses received, the Academic Senate offers the following considerations:

1. In Section II. A. 2. a., the second bullet point reads, “undergraduate curricular planning and assessment.” This statement is overly narrow, as most, if not all, Deans have responsibility for graduate curricular planning and/or professional curricular planning in addition to, or in lieu of, only undergraduate curricular oversight.
2. In the response to comments on the initial draft of the proposal, it was noted that there was a desire to avoid specificity in order to maintain “flexibility” in Section III. B. 2. While we appreciate the value of a flexible process, we also believe clear guidelines are important. Therefore, the Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Subcommittee recommends revising the wording in Section III. B. 2 to indicate that the Dean’s summary should specifically address accomplishments and failures in carrying out the duties and responsibilities listed in Section II. A. 2.
3. Adding alumni to the list of stakeholders can be useful, but such a list could become excessive or infeasible given that it already involves all staff, all faculty members, and all members of the CODVC.
4. In Section III.C.1, the phrase “after consultation with an appropriate committee of the faculty” should remain, because removing it denies faculty input and gives the power to appoint Deans without consulting the faculty.
5. In the Section III.C.2, Duties and Responsibilities, it states: “An acting dean assumes the duties and responsibilities described in UCD 240-B., above.” This statement should refer to both acting and interim Deans.

Similarly, the policy should include a time limit for an interim Dean appointment. The expected term of an interim appointment is one year and should be no more than three years, with the expectation being that a search should begin as soon as an interim Dean is appointed. Extending interim appointments is harmful to departments and colleges, because academic planning and searches are often put on hold.

6. Graduate education responsibilities should be mentioned for “Lead Deans,” and for any other duties taken outside the school or college regarding graduate education not officially within the “Lead Dean” designation. Additional discourse on the responsibility of Deans to consider future graduate program development could be further clarified. Deans represent the Chief (Federal) Affirmative Action Officers for their colleges and programs, so this fact should be explicitly listed in their expected duties for which they will be evaluated in APM 240.

Finally, assessment of the adequacy of the current or revised procedure for reviewing Deans will ultimately hinge on the implementation of the procedure. Overall, the revised document appears to be sound. With the above changes taken under consideration, the Davis Division of the Academic Senate supports the revised policy amendments. Thank you for the opportunity to review the modifications prior to implementation.

Sincerely,



André Knoesen, Chair-designate
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor: Electrical and Computer Engineering