



# **Davis Division Academic Senate**

## **Request for Consultation Responses**

**Systemwide APM 200 (General) and 205 Review (Recall for Academic Appointees)**

**November 11, 2011**

Enclosed for systemwide review are proposed revision to APM 200 (General) and proposal of a new policy APM 205 (Recall for Academic Appointees). The proposals are responsive to campus requests for revision and clarification of existing policy for recalling academic appointees to active service in academic titles.

# **Administrative Partners (DANN TRASK)**

**November 3, 2011 12:52 PM**

Dear Professor Bisson,

The L&S Executive Committee has reviewed the draft revisions to UC APM Section 200 (Appointment and Promotion: General) and new policy UC APM Section 205 (Appointment and Promotion: Recall for Academic Appointees). The committee observed that it would be helpful if the policies would clarify who belongs to the "SMG", as the relation of the academic Deans to this group seems to have changed in the past few years.

Sincerely,

Abigail Thompson, Chair  
Executive Committee  
College of Letters and Science

# **Affirmative Action & Diversity**

**October 24, 2011 1:58 PM**

*No response at this time.*

# CAP Oversight Committee

November 3, 2011 11:27 AM

## APM 200 and 205 Review (Recall Academic Appointees)

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) discussed the proposed changes to APM 200 and APM 205, entitled, "Recall of Academic Appointees." CAP views 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.

However, CAP strongly opposes the alteration and addition of the wording in the proposed APM 200-0 stating (*italics added to highlight the section that CAP opposes*), "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.*" CAP's 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. CAP also notes 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.

The CAP discussion did include recognition that Deans undergo periodic administrative review, but this was considered 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.

In addition, CAP is 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.

# **Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction**

**November 3, 2011 9:45 AM**

*No response at this time.*

# **Emeriti**

**November 11, 2011 4:51 PM**

The following is a preliminary response. The Emeriti Committee will meet on November 17<sup>th</sup> to discuss the Proposed New Policy, APM – 205, Recall of Academic Appointees.

Strict implementation of the proposed policy will limit the ability of emeriti to serve the campus. In a number of cases emeriti have been recalled to serve in administrative positions such as chairing a department with a period of service of two years or more.

The alternative could be that in exceptional cases, when an emeritus/a was approaching 43% time, and it was in the interest of the campus for the individual to continue in the position, the individual could switch to the University's group insurance plan. The cost of having an emeritus/s serving the campus would still be less than a regular employee because there would be no payments into the UC Retirement System. In this way the individual would not exceed the Medicare 43.75 % threshold.

Charles Hess, Chair  
Emeriti Committee

# **Faculty Welfare**

**November 10, 2011 11:43 AM**

Submitted on behalf of the Academic Senate 2011-12 Faculty Welfare Committee Chair Stuart Hill.

RE: Systemwide APM 200 (General) and 205 Review (Recall for Academic Appointees)

The Faculty Welfare Committee has no comment on the proposed policy for the recall of academic appointees found in APM 200 and 205.

# **Planning & Budget**

**November 3, 2011 9:46 AM**

*No response at this time.*

# Research

**November 3, 2011 9:46 AM**

*No response at this time.*