The Office of the Vice Provost Academic Affairs revised the proposal (changes noted) to amend UCD APM 240 after receiving feedback. The Vice Provost welcomes additional feedback on the revised proposal. The initial response from the Davis Division of the Academic Senate is included for reference.
CAP Oversight Committee

May 23, 2014 8:21 AM

Response continued on next page.
The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the revised version of the proposed changes to UCD APM 240 - Appointment and Review of Deans, and has two comments regarding the proposed document.

In Section II. A. 2. a., the second bullet point reads, "undergraduate curricular planning and assessment." CAP considers this statement to be 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.

In Section III. B. 2., the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs noted in her response to comments on the initial draft of the proposal a desire to avoid specificity in order to maintain "flexibility." While CAP appreciates the value of a flexible process, CAP also notes that in many reviews that it conducts, a lack of specific guidance to candidates, chairs or deans results in issues in the record not being addressed that CAP considers significant omissions compromising its ability to ideally evaluate a case. Therefore, CAP recommends that the wording in Section III. B. 2. be revised to indicate that the Dean's summary should specifically address accomplishments and failures in carrying out the duties and responsibilities listed in gory detail in Section II. A. 2.
The College of Engineering Executive Committee supports the revised APM.
The L&S Executive Committee discussed this matter and had one comment: In the section titled "Acting or Interim Deans," under Point #1 ("Appointment"), in the first paragraph, we objected to the striking out of "after consultation with an appropriate committee of the faculty," because it removes the faculty input and gives the Chancellor power to appoint someone without consulting with the faculty.
The GSM FEC sought inputs from two senior faculty members familiar with the workings of the Dean’s office. Both of them felt that the revision is fine and on target. Based on the experience of chairing such a review, one of them noted that flexibility is important. Deans can have very different jobs and their portfolios differ substantially. The addition of academic leadership is important and a good idea. 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, all members of the CODVC, and so on. Also, the Deans at other UC campuses is not always the best comparison set. Finally, assessment of the adequacy of the current or revised procedure for reviewing Deans ultimately hinges on the implementation of the procedure, which is not transparent. Overall, the revised document appears to be sound.
The FWC has no comment, except for a possible small omission:

C2 Duties and Responsibilities

An acting dean assumes the duties and responsibilities described in UCD 240-B., above.
This statement should presumably refer to both acting and interim deans.
Response continued on next page.
RFC: 2\textsuperscript{nd} Review – UCD APM 240 – Appointment & Review of Deans

The Graduate Council accepted the recommendations of the Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee in consideration of the above-mentioned Academic Senate Request for Consultation (AS RFC).

The Graduate Council accepted the recommendations, as follows, from the APD Committee.

The Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee met on May 9, 2014 and May 22, 2014 and discussed the proposed 2\textsuperscript{nd} review changes to APM 240.

APD felt that graduate education responsibilities should be mentioned for ‘Lead Deans,” and for any other duties taken outside the school/college regarding graduate education not officially within the ‘Lead Dean’ designation, notwithstanding the reported Graduate Studies view that such issues fall outside of APM-UCD 240. Additional discourse on the responsibility of Deans to consider future graduate program development could be further elucidated.

Discussion also arose that Deans represent the Chief (Federal) Affirmative Action Officers for their Colleges/programs, so this fact should be explicitly listed in their expected duties for which they will be evaluated, in APM240. The effect of this on graduate education is to further the diversity of faculty mentors for graduate students, consistent with Federal regulations.

The Graduate Council submits the APD committee’s comments, as accepted by consensus, at our June 2, 2014 meeting, as the Council’s assessment of the “2\textsuperscript{nd} Review UCD APM 240 – Appointment & Review of Deans” RFC.

Sincerely,

Rachael E. Goodhue, Chair
Graduate Council

/vm

C: Gina Anderson, Academic Senate Executive Director
CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to UCD APM 240, Appointment and Review of Deans. CPB agrees that the policy should include a time limit for interim dean appointments. The committee agrees that the expected term of an interim appointment is one year and should be no more than three years. The expectation should be that a search should be initiated as soon as an interim dean is appointed. Extending interim appointments are harmful to departments and colleges. From CPB’s perspective, academic planning is put on hold while interim deans are in place and searches are stalled.
Undergraduate Council

May 29, 2014 2:39 PM

No response at this time.