



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502
TELEPHONE: (530) 752-2231

November 17, 2011

ROBERT ANDERSON, CHAIR

University of California
Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

**Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised APM 200, General and Proposed New Policy and APM 205,
Recall for Academic Appointees**

The proposal was forwarded to all Academic Senate standing committees and Faculty Executive Committees within the schools and colleges for comment. Detailed responses were received from the Committees on Academic Personnel-Oversight and Emeriti as well as Letter and Science Faculty Executive Committee.

Given its authority, the Committee on Academic Personnel-Oversight's response forms the basis for the Division's position on the proposals. The relevant changes to appointee recall procedures as necessary in light of federal regulations combined with benefit constraints. It supports the wording specifically relevant to this issue.

We are strongly opposed the alteration and addition of the wording in the proposed APM 200-0 stating (*italics added to highlight the section opposed*), "Every faculty member shall be reviewed at least every five years, *except for those serving as Deans, who are exempt from the five year mandatory review of their academic appointment.*" A basic tenet is that all academic appointees should be subject to the review procedures appropriate to their academic appointments, even if they also hold an appointment as an academic dean. Further, it is noted that APM 200 references APM 240, which in turn refers to the review of the academic portion of a Dean's appointment in APM 210 and APM 220, neither of which refers to any differences between the review of Deans and the review of other academic appointees.

We recognize that Deans undergo periodic administrative review, but this is separate in nature and form from peer-driven Senate review of academic performance. There was also discussion on whether Deans were considered part of the 'Senior Management Group,' (SMG) who may be exempt from academic review under the policies stated for SMG; if so, the membership of Deans in the SMG should be clearly stated in the APM, and this would necessitate changes to some of the aforementioned APMs by deleting any special references to Deans and replacing them with references as SMG members.

Additionally we are very disappointed that this proposed change was not clearly identified in the title of the proposal, which indicated that the changes would be only pertinent to the recall of academic appointees.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda F. Bisson".

Linda F. Bisson, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor: Viticulture and Enology