

MEETING CALL  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, February 24, 2009

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Memorial Union, MU II

*REVISED 2/20/2009*

Page No.

1. Transcript of the October 16, 2008 Meeting	2
2. Announcements by the President - None	
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents - None	
4. Remarks by Academic Senate Chair	
5. Announcements by the Chancellor	
a. State of the Campus – Chancellor Larry N. Vanderhoef	
6. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers	
a. Presentation by IET –	
i. Online Course Evaluation – Elizabeth Gibson	
7. New Business (Item reordered per Davis Division Bylaw 160 (B))	
a. DDR 522 and 523: Proposed Change in the Effective Date for the Revised Regulations 522 & 523 – General Education Program	5
8. Reports of Standing Committees (Item reordered per Davis Division Bylaw 160 (B))	
a. CERJ Bylaw Changes	
i. DDB 99: Academic Senate Committee on Research	6
ii. DDB 39: Academic Senate Committee on Committees ( <i>Revised</i> )	8
b. Faculty Research Lecture	
i. Confirmation of 2008-09 Faculty Research Lecturer Award Recipient	12
c. Public Service	
i. Confirmation of 2008-09 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award Recipients (To be distributed at the meeting)	
9. Special Orders	
a. CAES Special Review Committee Presentation	14
10. Petitions of Students	
11. Unfinished Business	
a. Chancellor and Provost Response to 3-year Interim Administrative Appointment	20
12. University and Faculty Welfare	
13. New Business	
a. College/School Bylaw and Regulation Updates: 2007-08 L&S Annual Report	23
b. Davis Division Response to Proposed Extension of the CBS Interim Dean Appointment	33

Don C. Price, Secretary  
Representative Assembly of the  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

\*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

MEETING CALL  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

*Thursday, October 16, 2008*

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Memorial Union, MU II

**DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED**

Page No.

1. Transcript of the June 6, 2008 Meeting

3

**Motion: To approve**

**Action: Unanimously approved**

**Item 11a moved to the top of the agenda**

**Action: General consent given**

- a. Resolution: Interim Appointment to Campus Leadership Positions

202

**Motion: “I move that the Resolution on Interim Appointments be recommitted to the Executive Council with instructions for the Executive Council to consult with the Chancellor, to convey to the Chancellor the tenor of the concerns expressed by the Representative Assembly, and to report back at the next meeting of the Representative Assembly.”**

**Action: Discussion ensued, the question was called, seconded and passed.**

**Vote: Calling the question: 40 – 5, 1 Abstention.**

**Vote: On the motion: 32 – 15, 3 Abstentions.**

**Motion passes.**

**It was also brought to the attention of the Assembly that the next meeting of the Representative Assembly will be on February 24, 2009 (at which time the Chancellor is scheduled to present his State of the Campus Address) unless a special meeting is called before that time. (This is specified in Bylaw 20 of the academic senate).**

2. Announcements by the President - None
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents - None
4. Announcements by the Chancellor - None
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None
6. Special Orders
  - a. Remarks by the Divisional Chair – Robert Powell
  - b. Library Task Force Report – Library Committee Representative
  - c. Annual Reports for Discussion:
    - i. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel –
    - i. Oversight Committee

6

\*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

MEETING CALL  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

*Thursday, October 16, 2008*

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Memorial Union, MU II

**DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED**

Page No.

**Bill Casey Presented. Also introduced report by Colin Cameron & Robert Feenstra, “Salaries at the University of California, Davis in Comparison with other UC Campuses.” There was a correction to one of the slides being presented. Slide #4 of the presentation should have “Off-Scale Salary in Dollars” on the left of the graph instead of “Above-Scale Salary in Dollars.”**

ii. Appellate Committee	34
d. Annual Report of the Committee on Courses of Instruction	37
<b>A point was made to the Assembly that the campus is best served when the entire committee reviews all courses.</b>	
e. Annual Report of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction	
f. Annual Report of the Graduate Council	55
g. Annual Report of the Committee on Research	78
h. Annual Report of the Undergraduate Council – General Education	83
<i>Annual Reports on Consent Calendar:</i>	
i. *Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility	100
j. *Annual Report of the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment (not available)	
k. *Annual Report of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity	102
l. *Annual Report of the Committee on Committees	107
m. *Annual Report of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards	111
n. *Annual Report of the Emeriti Committee	113
o. *Annual Report of the Executive Council (hand-out)	
p. *Annual Report of the Faculty Research Lecture Award Committee	116
q. *Annual Report of the Committee on Faculty Welfare	117
r. *Annual Report of the Grade Changes Committee	120
s. *Annual Report of the Committee on International Studies and Exchanges	121
t. *Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel	129
u. *Annual Report of the Library Committee	139
v. *Annual Report of the Committee on Planning and Budget	141
w. *Annual Report of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure	152
x. *Annual Report of the Committee on Public Service	154
y. *Annual Report of the Committee on Student-Faculty Relationships	156

\*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

MEETING CALL  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

*Thursday, October 16, 2008*

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Memorial Union, MU II

**DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED**

Page No.

- |                                                                                      |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| z. *Annual Report of the Committee on Transportation and Parking (not available)     | 165 |
| aa. *Annual Report of the Undergraduate Council                                      | 184 |
| i. Annual Report of the Committee on Preparatory Education                           | 186 |
| ii. Annual Report of the Committee on Special Academic Programs                      | 188 |
| iii. Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review  | 188 |
| bb. *Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes |     |

**Motion: To approve all the Annual Reports**

**Action: Unanimously approved**

190

- 7. Reports of standing committees
- 8. Petitions of Students
- 9. Unfinished Business
- 10. University and Faculty Welfare

- |                                          |     |
|------------------------------------------|-----|
| a. UCOP proposal for outsourcing of UCRP | 192 |
|------------------------------------------|-----|

11. New Business

- |                                                                   |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| a. Resolution: Interim Appointment to Campus Leadership Positions | 202 |
| b.                                                                |     |

**\*Handouts (added to the transcript of the meeting)**

**1. CIT Annual report & added to consent calendar**

**2. AS Exec. Council Annual Report**

**3. CAPOC PowerPoint slide copies**

**4. “Salaries at the University of California, Davis in Comparison with other UC Campuses.” Report by A. Colin Cameron & Robert C. Feenstra.**

**Motion: To adjourn**

**Action: Unanimously approved**

Don C. Price, Secretary  
Representative Assembly of the  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

\*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

## **PROPOSED CHANGE IN EFFECTIVE DATE REGULATIONS 522 AND 523 — GENERAL EDUCATION**

Submitted by the Executive Council.

Endorsed by Committee on General Education.

At the June 6, 2008 regular meeting of the Representative Assembly, Davis Division Regulations 522 (Baccalaureate Degree Requirement in General Education) and 523 (Criteria for General Education Certification) were adopted by the Assembly. Concurrent with the adoption of these Regulations, the Assembly approved an effective date of September 1, 2010. It is proposed that the effective date be delayed by one year, with a new effective date of September 1, 2011. This proposal has been endorsed by the General Education Committee.

Rationale: In order to meet the September, 2010 implementation, all current courses (estimated at 1200-1600) would have to be updated to designate the appropriate “Literacy” by November, 2009, or at the latest by the end of Fall Quarter, 2009). This is not advisable, for the following reasons.

- The colleges, departments, Academic Senate office and administrative offices would need additional time to assure appropriate classification of courses and entry into the course database and the *General Catalog*.
- The current electronic Course Approval Form (CAF) system is sorely inadequate for the purposes of managing the workload associated with the revision of existing courses and any new course proposals. The system’s failings cause unacceptable delays, and heavy traffic causes sub-par performance, which slows review and approval of courses. Therefore, approval of more than 1000 courses using the current CAF would demand a tremendous staff commitment due to the slowness of the system alone, which would be exacerbated by the quantity of courses being reviewed at each level.
- Campus departments and advisers need additional time to become knowledgeable about the new requirements in order to advise students under the old GE requirements and the revised GE requirements during the period in which the revised requirements are being phased in.

Resolution: The existing effective date of September 1, 2010 for the implementation of Davis Division Regulations 522 (Baccalaureate Degree Requirement in General Education) and 523 (Criteria for General Education Certification) shall be rescinded and a new effective date of September 1, 2011 established.

## **PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAWS REPRESENTATION ON COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH**

Submitted by the Committee on Research.

Endorsed by Executive Council.

Current Davis Division Bylaw 99(B) defines the makeup of the Subcommittee on Research Policy (CoRP), which is a subcommittee of the Committee on Research. The Academic Federation has proposed that a representative of the Federation be added to the Subcommittee on Research Policy. This proposal was unanimously endorsed by the Committee on Research.

**Rationale:** Although a member of the Academic Federation is invited by the Chair of CoRP to attend meetings on a year-to-year basis, the Bylaw governing service on CoRP does not include representation by the Academic Federation. The members of CoRP believe that many of the research policy issues discussed by CoRP are critical to members of the Academic Federation as well as to members of the Academic Senate, and that input from the Academic Federation was extremely valuable and beneficial to both the Academic Senate and the Federation.

The Committee on Research therefore proposes that Davis Division Bylaw 99 be amended to add to Section B a provision for a representative of the Academic Federation to the Subcommittee on Research Policy.

**Proposed Revision:** Davis Division Bylaw 99 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout~~; additions are in **bold type**.

Bylaw 99. Research.

This committee shall be composed of two subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Research Policy and the Subcommittee for the Faculty Grants Program. (Am. 10/31/90; 6/10/03)

### Committee on Research Policy

The Subcommittee on Research Policy shall consist of a chairperson who will chair both subcommittees, 10 members, the Vice Chancellor for Research ex officio, ~~and one~~ member of the Subcommittee for the Faculty Grants Program ex officio **and one representative of the Academic Federation**. The ex officio member of the subcommittee for the Faculty Grants Program shall be appointed by the committee chairperson. Members of the Subcommittee of Research Policy shall be appointed for a three year term, with the possibility of appointment to a second term that is not to exceed two years. Members shall be selected in consideration of the diversity of research activities on the Davis campus. The Subcommittees on Research Policy shall have the following duties:

1. Consult regularly with the Vice Chancellor--for Research. Advising the Chief Campus officer and the Division concerning: faculty perspectives on the research mission of the Division and the University; budgetary needs to support research infrastructure; policy and strategy regarding the pursuit and acceptance of

research support; and promotion and coordination of multidisciplinary research among faculty members.

2. Formulate policy governing acceptance of extramural funding.
3. Provide periodic evaluation of administrative units that support faculty research.
4. Provide review of Organized Research Units and make recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Research that are based on reports of organized research Units.
5. Maintain formal liaison with relevant Senate committees.
6. Establish policies and procedures governing allocation of funds within the jurisdiction of the Faculty Grants Program Subcommittee for the conduct of research and travel to attend scholarly meetings; inform the Division of these policies, and evaluate them periodically.
7. Provide review of applications from various calls for research proposals that are associated with the Limited Submission Program of the Office of Research when so requested by the Vice Chancellor for Research.

## **PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAWS ELECTION TO, AND TERM OF OFFICE OF, THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES**

Submitted by the Committee on Committees.

Endorsed by Executive Council.

Davis Division Bylaw 39 sets the beginning of the term of newly-elected members of the Committee on Committees immediately after the determination of the outcome of the election. All other Divisional committee members begin their terms on September 1. Bylaw 39 also has all members of the Committee on Committees elected “at-large.” The following proposal would change the beginning of the term of newly-elected members of the Committee on Committees to the following September 1 by removing the special provision for the beginning of term from Bylaw 39, so that Bylaw 30(G) would govern the term of service, as it does for all other committees.

Currently, all members of the Committee on Committees are “at large” representatives of the entire faculty. It is proposed that each member of the Committee on Committees represent a specific constituency of faculty members.

### Rationale:

The current term of service on the Committee on Committees has led to difficulties in the functioning of the committee. Three members of the committee are rotated off in the middle of Spring Quarter, while the committee is still engaged in its business for the ongoing academic year. Moving the beginning of service forward to September would allow for continuity during the academic year and would bring new members onto the committee at the beginning of the academic year.

The current method of electing “at large” members of the committee does not guarantee that the membership of the committee will represent all sectors of our increasingly complex campus. In the current academic year, for example, there is no member from the School of Medicine. Committee assignments made by the Committee on Committees should be representative of the entire campus, and the presence on the committee of members from all sectors of campus would allow decisions about appointments to be more informed and more representative than they would be otherwise. For this reason, there should be a mechanism for representation for all sectors.

There are currently nine members of the Committee on Committees. Eight of the members would be drawn from the faculties of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, the College of Biological Sciences, the College of Engineering, the School of Medicine, the School of Veterinary Medicine, the Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies, the Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and the Division of Social Sciences. The other seat would be assigned to a representative from one of the remaining Schools, the Schools of Education, Law, and Management, each of which has a relatively small faculty. This is the most equitable distribution of the constituencies, given the size of the faculties.

To ensure that all groups are represented, each time a member of a constituency is due to complete his or her term, a slate of candidates representing that group would be nominated in the



next election. It would be the responsibility of the Committee on Committees to determine the groups from which the slates would be drawn.

The Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction therefore proposes that Davis Division Bylaw 39 be amended to change the term of office for members of the Committee on Committees to commence on September 1 and end on August 31 of the subsequent year, in accordance with Davis Division Bylaw 30(G). Therefore, the current specified date of service is proposed to be eliminated. Commensurately, Bylaw 40 would be amended to eliminate the requirement that the Committee organize itself immediately after the election, since the term of office would not begin immediately after the election. It is further proposed that membership on the Committee on Committees be apportioned according to Faculties, divisions of Faculties, and groups of Faculties (constituent groups), with elections to be conducted accordingly. It is proposed that the effective date for the first election conducted under the amended Bylaws be in Spring Quarter, 2009.

The transition from the present means of election would take place in the following manner. For the 2009 election, for each member completing a term of office, one election slate shall be reserved for the constituent group of that member. If two or more departing members belong to the same constituent group, then the slates shall include any constituent groups not represented by any of the remaining members. If there are none, then the constituent groups may be chosen at the discretion of the committee. The same procedure would be followed in subsequent elections until a regular rotation is established.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Bylaw 39 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by ~~strikeout~~; additions are in **bold type**.

### **Bylaw 39. The Committee on Committees: Elections and Terms of Office**

~~A. The elected members shall take office immediately after their election is determined by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction. They shall serve until the succeeding committee members are elected.~~

B. The nine elected members of the committee shall be chosen in the following manner:

~~1~~A. Three members shall be elected each year to serve for three years. Replacement members shall be elected to complete any unfilled term as may be necessary.

**B. Each of the following Faculties, divisions of Faculties, or groups of Faculties ("constituent groups") shall be represented by one member: (a) College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, (b) College of Biological Sciences, (c) College of Engineering, (d) School of Veterinary Medicine, (e) School of Medicine, (f) College of Letters and Science: Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies, (g) College of Letters and Science: Mathematical and Physical Sciences, (h) College of Letters and Science: Social Sciences, (i) All other Schools and Colleges of the Division.**

~~2~~C. Election shall be by ballot in accordance with Bylaw 16. The election shall be initiated by the Secretary during the first week in Spring Quarter each year. **Each ballot shall contain at least three slates of nominees and any slates needed for the completion of unfulfilled terms, including one for each of three constituent groups specified in the previous section. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Committees to determine which of the constituent groups will require new members. All nominations shall specify the slate on which the nominee would be a candidate, and the nominee must be a member of the constituent group for that slate.**

**All voters may cast one vote for one nominee on each of as many slates as are on the ballot. Voting on each slate shall be considered a separate election, and the nominee receiving a plurality of votes on his or her slate shall be declared elected.**

**Bylaw 40. The Committee on Committees: Powers and Responsibilities**

A. The Committee on Committees shall ~~organize immediately after its election~~, elect its own chairperson and secretary; and make its own rules of procedure, not inconsistent with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Senate and the Davis Division. The retiring Committee on Committees shall delegate one of its holdover members to call the new Committee on Committees together for the first meeting. The new committee shall fill vacancies in its own membership and may determine when such vacancies have occurred. A member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve only until the next regular election of members of the committee.

B. The Committee on Committees shall ascertain who are the members ex officio of standing committees and who are the members and chairpersons of standing committees not subject to appointment by the Committee on Committees and shall report these names to the Representative Assembly. (Am. 10/19/71, effective 12/21/71)

C. Members of the Committee on Committees shall be eligible to serve as officers of the Division; and as members, chairpersons, or vice chairpersons of other Divisional committees. (Am. 10/20/97)

D. The Committee on Committees shall have the power to receive and act upon resignations and to make appointments to fill vacancies in the standing committees of the Davis Division that may occur because of resignation, prolonged illness or disability, or dismissal for cause, according to Davis Division Bylaw 16.5. It shall report such appointments for confirmation at the next regular meeting of the Representative Assembly and, unless objection is made and an election called for by a majority vote of those present, the appointments shall stand. A person appointed to fill a vacancy shall take office at once and serve for the full remaining term, unless his or her appointment has been rejected by the Representative Assembly. (Am. 10/19/71, effective 12/21/71; Am. 10/20/97; Am. 06/01/06)

E. Unless otherwise specifically provided in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate or of the Davis Division, the Committee on Committees shall designate members of the Davis Division to serve on the standing committees of the University Academic Senate. (Am. 10/20/97)

F. The Committee on Committees, or at its discretion a committee appointed by it, shall serve as a properly constituted conference body of the Davis Division to consult with the President of the University or his or her representative concerning the appointment of deans and directors.

G. The Committee on Committees shall consult in confidence with other committees, appointing bodies, or officers on the Davis Campus and throughout the University to the end that the committee assignments of any individual shall not be too burdensome.

H. The Committee on Committees shall call for nominees and volunteers from the Faculty to fill vacant positions on committees it appoints, but shall not be obligated to accept any such nominees and volunteers. No one shall be appointed to any office or committee without his or her consent. (En. 6/3/69)

I. The Committee on Committees shall replace any officer of the Davis Division who dies, resigns, or is unable to perform assigned duties for a prolonged period. In the event of disability, the need for replacement shall be determined by the Executive Council. A replacement shall

serve the remaining term of the original appointee. A vacant office shall be filled no later than the beginning of the second full academic term after a vacancy occurs. Selection may be made among all members of the Academic Senate, including existing officers, but no person may serve in more than one divisional office simultaneously. If a serving officer is selected to fill a vacancy, the Committee shall select a replacement for the vacancy created. In making replacement selections the Committee shall consult in confidence with other committees, appointing bodies, and officers of the Davis Division. (En. 2/23/99)

**Brief Biography of Professor Charles H. Langley**  
**Academic Senate Faculty Research Lecturer Committee Choice for the**  
**2009 Faculty Research Lecturer Award**

The Faculty Research Lecture committee met, and reached a consensus choice for the Faculty Research Lecturer for 2009: Prof. Charles H. Langley, Professor of Genetics, Department of Evolution and Ecology. Despite a number of truly deserving nominees, this was an easy choice.

Chuck Langley has been a faculty member at UC Davis since 1989 and earlier received his Ph.D. in 1971 from the University of Texas, Austin.

Chuck has made and is continuing to make fundamental contributions to understanding molecular evolution and molecular and phenotypic variation in natural populations through well over 100 refereed publications. He has been an internationally recognized leader in evolutionary genetics since the late 1970s. In 1999, he was the first population geneticist to be awarded the annual Genetics Society of America Medal for lifetime contributions. Last year, Langley was elected Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is unquestionably one of the most distinguished scholars on the Davis campus. Langley is one of only a handful of evolutionary geneticists in the last 50 years who has made both fundamental empirical and theoretical contributions. He follows the most influential tradition of experimental population genetics by concentrating his empirical work on the geneticist's "fruit fly," *Drosophila melanogaster*, one of the premier model systems for genetics research. As a graduate student, Langley refuted one of the leading theoretical conjectures of the pioneering days of molecular population genetics. He showed that there was little statistical association ("linkage disequilibrium") between genetic variants encoded by genes occupying different positions along chromosomes. This interest in patterns of association of genetic variants along chromosomes has remained a constant focus of his research. As a postdoc, he and Walter Fitch (a long-time member of the National Academy of Sciences) conducted the first rigorous statistical test of the "molecular clock." Moreover, accounting for variation in rates of molecular evolution among organisms, has greatly improved our ability to accurately reconstruct the history of the "Tree of Life." When he set up his own lab at NIEHS in Research Triangle, Langley began a career of postdoctoral training that has included many of the most influential molecular population geneticists of the following generations, including theoretician Dick Hudson, experimentalist Marty Kreitman (both fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences), and, more recently (at UC Davis), David Begun (now a UCD professor) and H. Allen Orr, both of whom have risen to international prominence.

Throughout his career, Langley has pioneered new molecular methods that have revolutionized our understanding of genetic variation within and among species. With each new advance, he produced more accurate estimates of genetic variation, the raw material on which natural selection acts. The first such assays were conducted in the mid-1960s and assessed only soluble proteins. Since coming to Davis, Langley has led both empirical and theoretical research on one of the most novel and fruitful observations concerning patterns of molecular genetic variation, namely that variation is reduced in regions of low recombination, *i.e.*, regions of the genome in which blocks of genes inherited from a single parent tend to be inherited together. Not only was the pattern important, but so was Langley's proposed explanation: natural

selection favoring a variant at one gene causes reduced variation at all closely linked genes by a “hitch-hiking effect.” This work has been central to a renaissance of population genetics research focusing on the roles of natural selection and linkage in molding molecular variation and evolution. His lab also pioneered the experimental study of the evolution of “recently evolved” genes with novel functions . Recently, Langley has initiated population surveys of complete genome sequences. This new work establishes UC Davis at the forefront of population-level surveys of genome variation, and is very well supported by grants from NIH.

Report of the Special Review Committee  
January 6, 2009  
ENDORSED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL: January 22, 2009

The Special Review Committee was appointed to investigate concerns regarding departmental voting in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (lack of compliance with bylaw 55), allegations of inappropriate involvement of the Dean's office, and lack of adherence to the principles of shared governance. The committee investigated allegations relevant to recruitment for the position.

The committee interviewed the Dean of the CA&ES, two Associate Deans, the past and present department chair, the chair of the search committee and an additional member of the department. We were provided with email correspondence, a copy of the Search Plan, Search Reports, minutes of faculty meetings and a variety of other information.

Three issues emerged as concerns to the committee. These include a) voting procedures within the department, b) the role of the External Advisory Committee and c) the Dean's office involvement in the search. A report of our findings and specific recommendations follow.

### **Summary of recommendations**

- We would request that the Academic Senate make a formal statement that clearly defines the role Academic Federation faculty can play in the recruitment of Academic Senate faculty within the CA&ES and to insure that this information is widely disseminated to departments within the College.
- We would request that the Academic Senate clearly define the conditions under which External Advisory Committees can be appointed and the format by which their views are reported. Safeguards must be in place to insure that reports of such committees do not have an undue influence on faculty and administrative hires. The opinion of external stakeholders should be solicited, when appropriate, but such input should be informal and advisory only
- We would request that the Academic Senate make a formal statement recommending that Associate Deans recuse themselves from attending confidential departmental meetings on new hires unless they decide in advance of the search not to communicate their opinions about search procedures and candidates to the Dean's office.

### **I. Departmental Voting Procedures in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences**

The committee was asked to investigate an allegation that the department voting procedures were not in compliance with bylaw 55.

The approved voting procedures of the department state that “All Senate faculty have the right to vote on all Academic Senate personnel actions involving new departmental appointments, advancements and promotions ...” The procedures also state “The department considers that our mission is best addressed by encouraging participation of all regular faculty in consideration of academic personnel processes to the fullest extent permitted by University and Academic Senate policies. To this end, the right to express an opinion has been extended to Specialist in Cooperative Extension and Agricultural Experiment Station...”

The Search Plan states “Upon completion of the interviews, the recruitment committee will meet, rank acceptable candidates, and prepare recommendations for discussion at a meeting of the departmental faculty and the search committee. The final recommendation will be based on a ballot that solicits written comments from all participants.”

The confusion generated in the voting on candidates for the position concerns the role of Academic Federation faculty in the review and voting process. The culture of the CA&ES administration appears to be that the views of Academic Senate and Academic Federation Faculty are given equal consideration in the hiring of both administrators and Academic Senate Faculty.

The college does require, in accordance with bylaw 55, that the final search report forwarded to the Dean contain only the votes of Academic Senate (AS) Faculty. The final search report must also contain an evaluation of the candidate by Academic Federation (AF) faculty although this cannot be reported in quantitative terms that would imply that a ‘vote’ was taken. The culture of weighing equally the views of all faculty (AS and AF), while at the same time reporting only the votes of AS faculty, allows departments to stay within the letter of the law but has the potential to create confusion and discord within the department. This was critical in this particular hire in that the AS faculty preferred candidate ‘A’ whereas the AF Faculty preferred candidate ‘B’. This was further complicated by the consideration to request an additional FTE so that the interest of both faculty groups could be met. This was the approach strongly supported by the Dean’s Office.

## **Findings**

Concerns raised during review of the documentation provided and the interviews conducted include the following.

1. Inconsistent information was provided by the Dean’s Office to the department concerning the appropriate involvement of AF faculty.
2. A vote of the AF faculty on the hiring of specific faculty was taken and reported to the Dean. The votes of AS and AF faculty were recorded separately in most cases.
3. The committee feels it was inappropriate for the AF faculty to vote in the meeting on the request for a second position. This vote was to make possible the hiring of candidate ‘B’ and accordingly was tantamount to a vote for candidate ‘B’.

4. The faculty vote to rank (hire) specific candidates for the positions at the faculty meeting of March 11, 2008, was by show of hands and not confidential ballot as required.
5. The votes cast at the Faculty Meeting were counted and recorded before those not in attendance voted.

## **Recommendations**

The role of Academic Federation faculty in the review and recommendation on faculty hires into Academic Senate positions needs to be clarified with departments in the CA&ES. The culture of placing equal weight on the views of both AS and AF faculty in hiring faculty with AS appointments, while only AS faculty can vote on such appointments, is problematic. When faculty comments are forwarded with the Final Search Report, those comments must be separated to identify those made by AS faculty and those made by AF faculty.

Although Bylaw 55 precludes AF faculty from voting on AS appointments, AF faculty should also not be allowed to vote on matters that are directly linked to the hire of a specific AS faculty member. For example, a vote to recruit two faculty in a given area is a matter of importance to the entire faculty of a department and both AS and AF faculty should have equal voting rights. However, if the consideration of requesting a second FTE is to enable the hiring of a specific faculty member, such as might occur late in the hiring process, extending the right to vote to AF faculty can be viewed as a violation of bylaw 55. Since the advantage of requesting a second position can become apparent at any time during the search, we recommend that once a Search Plan has been approved, only AS faculty can vote to request additional FTE for candidates applying to that search.

Clear guidelines are also necessary to define acceptable voting procedures. All faculty members should vote without prior knowledge of how other faculty members voted. Accordingly if a vote is taken at a Faculty Meeting, and faculty not in attendance vote later by mail ballot, the votes cast at the Faculty Meeting should not be tallied until all votes have been cast.

## **II. Role of External Advisory Committees**

The committee was asked to investigate allegations of “inappropriate involvement of the Dean’s office in departmental decisions” with regards to recent hires in the department. During this investigation, the role of external advisory committees in faculty hires was questioned.



## **Background**

The position for the department was given to the department/college as part of the Agricultural Sustainability Institute, part of the 06/07 campus initiative process. The chair of the department was instructed by the Dean to include input from a “Advisory Group”. This group was selected by the department chair. The Search Plan for the position states that this committee would “submit a written report to the chair of the department” which would not only articulate the opinions of the committee but also rank the candidates. This committee was drawn from agriculture industry that relies on breed “A”. The Agricultural Sustainability Institute was more interested in breed “B.” This established from the beginning of the search a structural issue, with different ‘stakeholders’ external to the department that were given input into the selection of the new faculty member. The report of this advisory group to the chair stated they “appreciated the opportunity to be involved in the process of selecting a candidate.” They clearly felt their voice should play an important role in this process.

During the search, the Advisory Group met with the candidates and in many cases attended the candidates’ seminars. They presented a formal written report to the department chair that reported which candidates were ‘acceptable’ and which ‘unacceptable’ and supplied a ranking (similar to the report a department would make to the Dean about candidates). The #1 candidate by the vote of the Academic Senate faculty was ruled ‘unacceptable’, while the #2 was ruled ‘acceptable’ and highly ranked. The department was at odds with the wishes of the industry-based Advisory Group. The advisory group noted in their report that if their ‘acceptable’ candidates could not “accept this position, there should be another search for an individual with strong breed “A” research experience.” The Dean was now in a position where he must try to satisfy these industrial ‘stakeholders’ that are also strong donors or future donors to the College.

It is clear that this issue contributed to the pressure from the Dean’s office to hire two faculty to placate the industry donors and still fulfill the needs of the Agricultural Sustainability Institute where the position originated.

## **Recommendations**

The committee feels that the practice of seeking formal input from external ‘stakeholders’ in faculty appointments is inappropriate. We understand that the opinion of industry, particularly in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Science, is valuable and do not wish to discourage input from such sources. However, the establishment of a separate external advisory committee, that is asked to submit written input and the formal ranking of the candidates, listing which are acceptable and unacceptable (somewhat similar to the votes of the Academic Senate and the recommendation to the Dean), leads to the perception, if not the reality, that such a committee has significant input, if not veto authority. This is clearly inappropriate in a faculty hire.

We would request that the Academic Senate clearly define the conditions under which External Advisory Committees can be appointed and the format by which their views are reported. Safeguards must be in place to insure that reports of such committees do not have an

undue influence on faculty and administrative hires. The opinion of external stakeholders should be solicited, when appropriate, but such input should be informal and advisory only. One possible model is that similar to the Chancellor's Advisory committees used in administrative searches. The members could be asked to convey their views to the department chair or the chair of the search committee. There would be no formal meeting, vote or ranking by the advisory committee.

### **III. Role of Associate Deans in Searches within their own Departments**

As part of its charge to investigate "inappropriate involvement of the Dean's office in departmental decisions" with regards to recent hires in the department, the committee investigated the role of Associate Deans in searches within their own departments.

#### **Background**

The committee reviewed documentation concerning the role of Associate Deans in searches. This is a complex issue because Associate Deans have voting rights as members of the Academic Senate but they are also expected to report to the Dean. In this particular instance, after the Dean was informed by the chair of the results of a departmental meeting at which the two top candidates were ranked, the Dean asked the Associate Dean for advice, and the Associate Dean gave an opinion about what had happened in the meeting, based on observations as a member of the department who had attended the meeting. Subsequently, the Dean advised the Associate Dean not to attend any more departmental deliberations on the case.

#### **Recommendations**

Our committee believes that communications about a search between a Dean and an Associate Dean who has attended a confidential departmental meeting in a personnel action should be avoided. Such reports, whether verbal or in writing, run the risk of appearing to violate APM 015 about the "Breach of established rules governing confidentiality in personnel procedures." (II-D-4). Communications between an Associate Dean and a Dean (or other people in the Dean's office) about a search might be appropriate if the Associate Dean chooses not to attend departmental deliberations about whom to hire in the search and chooses not to exercise his/her right to vote. However, if an Associate Dean wants to attend such deliberations and vote, then he/she should inform the Dean of this decision before the search begins so the Dean does not subsequently seek advice from the Associate Dean about the search.

Furthermore, we recommend that even if an Associate Dean does choose not to attend confidential deliberations and vote in a hiring decision, he/she should not communicate any complaints or concerns about the search from other faculty members in the department to the Dean. If faculty members want to complain to the Dean about search procedures, that is their prerogative, but they should not expect an Associate Dean to serve as their conduit for raising objections with the Dean's office about a search. In a search, the line of authority should normally run from the Dean (or an Executive Dean responsible for reviewing search reports) through the chair of the department to the chair of the search committee and then to individual members of the department. If individual members want to by-pass the chair of the search committee and the chair of the department, they should not rely on an Associate Dean who has no designated authority over the search to relay their complaints to the Dean.

Respectively submitted,



Professor, Michael Dahmus  
(College of Biological Sciences, Molecular and Cellular Biology Department)



Professor, Ted Margadant  
(College of Letters and Sciences, History Department)



Professor, Ann Orel  
(College of Engineering, Applied Science Department)

November 5, 2008

To: Executive Council Membership

Fr: Davis Division Vice-Chair Pablo Ortiz

Re: Chancellor Vanderhoef and Interim Provost Horwitz discussion with Executive Council on Friday, October 17, 2008

The following is a summary of the discussion between Chancellor Vanderhoef, Interim Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Horwitz and the Executive Council membership. The discussion took place on Friday, October 17, 2008, and the topic was another three-year interim appointment to a campus leadership position (College of Engineering Dean):

Vice Chair Ortiz made clear this issue is not about personalities or the individuals in the current interim positions. The issue is shared governance and appropriate consultation. The Academic Senate objects to three-year interim appointments. The Academic Senate believes that three-year interim appointments deviate significantly from the practice envisioned in Academic Personnel Manual 240-24-b (which states that temporary appointments are "normally for a period not to exceed twelve months.") and also avoid appropriate Senate consultation. The Representative Assembly expressed concerns that the practice of lengthy interim appointments could extend to other positions, circumventing searches. The Senate views interim appointments in excess of 1 year unfavorably. Further, comments made during Representative Assembly reflect broad disapproval of the practice in general. The comments included outrage from some of the members, including members representing departments within the College of Engineering.

Professor Oakley stated there was a lot of energy in the Representative Assembly around this issue; and stated the Chancellor needs to know that.

Chancellor Vanderhoef stated that they did make a concerted effort to consult with the Academic Senate. They believed they were making a good faith effort to consult with the Academic Senate by initiating discussion and seeking advice from the College of Engineering faculty and Faculty Executive Committee. In fact, Chancellor and Provost felt they were going to great lengths in attempting to consult with the Academic Senate concerning an interim appointment. They met with the college Faculty Executive Committee and department chairs asking them how they should proceed. They asked for appointment of a faculty committee and the Faculty Executive Committee solicited a member of the college administration (Associate Dean Karen MacDonald) to ensure there was someone involved that understood the role/work of the Dean.

Committee on Planning and Budget Chair, Bruno Nachtergaele, made the point that the failure to have a regular search is not just a procedural concern. Regular searches lead to the identification and selection of the highest quality candidates. He also noted that interim status has the potential to undermine the effectiveness of an appointee. Provost Horwitz, however, felt that interim deans could nonetheless be effective.

Committee on Academic Personnel-Oversight (CAPOC) Chair, Bill Casey, shared that CAPOC has noted concerns with recruitment process and reported those concerns to the Vice Provost-Academic Personnel. He noted the erosion of the open search process reduces the perception of fairness.

The five-year review of Deans was discussed. The lack of reviews regarding both appointments and termination of appointments was noted as it may undermine accountability and oversight, leaving the Academic Senate out of the process. If a three-year appointee is not facing a review, the appointee's actions might be different than if facing a review. Appointment of an interim dean may mean nothing happens...it's a waiting period.

The College of Biological Sciences had an interim Dean appointment for three years and it is now ending. In response to a question from the CBS Faculty Executive Committee Chair, Sue Bodine about the status of the CBS Dean interim (three-year) appointment, Chancellor replied that next steps were still under consideration. The Chancellor stated that the former Dean of the College of Biological Sciences left a significant financial problem and the interim appointment of a CBS Dean for three years was an extraordinary circumstance. In fact, he discussed what to do with the college Faculty Executive Committee and it was the faculty who convinced him an interim appointment for three years was the best solution for the CBS at that time.

The Chancellor indicated that other campuses may not call it a three-year interim appointment...rather a one-year interim appointment, that then is extended to two-year interim appointment, and then to a three-year interim appointment. At UC Davis the campus chooses to be forthright concerning the length of time it takes to complete the process.

The Chancellor truly believes Enrique Lavernia is best person for the interim provost position. Also felt California is in a position that requires someone with understanding of our campus and issues of the state. However, the Chancellor acknowledged that if he had the opportunity, he might have handled this situation differently in terms of an interim Provost, and College of Engineering Dean.

One member indicated that there is concern the economic situation in the State and for the University may turn some candidates away. The Chancellor responded that it already has turned candidates away.

The Chancellor and Provost stated they need to have regular dialog with the Academic Senate. He stated that he is scheduled to meet with the UC Davis Chancellor Search Committee next week and intends to mention that the next Chancellor should consider breaking with the tradition that Chancellor provides an annual "State of the Campus Address" during the winter Representative Assembly meeting opting instead to address the Representative Assembly at every meeting to ensure there is routine dialog.

The Provost stated that when she served as the Vice Provost-Academic Personnel she made a point of not attending Representative Assembly meetings. She wanted to protect the campus from a charge that she decided a merit or promotion case in one way or another because of a faculty member's comments during a Representative Assembly meeting. However, as long as there is a prescribed time when the Chancellor or Provost attends and addresses the membership that should mitigate the concern.

Chancellor and Provost asked about attending Executive Council meetings. It was explained that the practice was changed three years ago. The Senate opted to forego including the Chancellor/Provost at Executive Council meetings in favor of meeting with them together, quarterly, in an effort to ensure all of the standing committee chairs could be in attendance.

Davis Division Parliamentarian Jay Helms suggested the Chancellor and Provost utilize the Senate policy established in spring 2008 which calls for all Administration requests for review or consultation to be addressed to the Davis Division Chair. This ensures that the appropriate Senate committees are involved in formulating a response while also insulating the Administration from criticism for having undertaken inappropriate consultation.

The Provost and Chancellor ended the session stating that they want to develop a less adversarial relationship between campus administration and the Academic Senate especially in light of economic issues in the next couple of years. Tough decisions will need to be made and everyone needs to work together to make them happen.

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE  
2007-2008**

TO: Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

The following amendments were made in the Bylaws and Regulations of the Faculty of the College of Letters and Science during academic year 2007-2008.

**By-Laws:**

Under the auspices of the College Executive Committee, a Special Committee on Bylaws was established during the academic year 2006-2007. Membership consisted of Howard W. Day (Chair), Debra Long, Dann Trask, and David Webb.

The original charge to the Special Committee was to recommend minor changes in the Bylaws made necessary by the change in the structure of the College. After the College Assembly failed to achieve a quorum for the second successive year, the Special Committee's charge was broadened to also include considering changes that would permit the faculty of L&S to conduct its business more efficiently.

Following a comprehensive review, the Special Committee recommended an array of amendments to the Bylaws intended to: more closely align with Davis Division Bylaw terminology and procedures; better reflect the current College structure; revise and clarify selected policies and practices, including Faculty membership and representation; and expedite the business of the Faculty.

With minor modifications, the recommendations were approved by the College Executive Committee and submitted for consideration at the Spring 2008 meeting of the College Assembly where the proposal gained the required margin for approval.

The amended Bylaws appear on the following pages (with additions indicated in **bold** and deletions by ~~strike-through~~).

Yvette Flores, Chair  
Faculty of the College  
of Letters and Science  
2007-2008

FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE

~~BY LAWS~~ **BYLAWS**

PART I. FUNCTIONS

1. The Faculty of the College of Letters and Science (Davis) shall conduct the government of that college through its elected College Assembly. (~~Academic Senate By-Law~~ **Bylaw 30133**) (Am. 3/6/73; 6/4/08)

PART II. MEMBERSHIP

2. (A) The Faculty of the College of Letters and Science (Davis) shall consist of:
  - (1) The President of the University;
  - (2) The local Chief Campus Officer;
  - (3) The ~~Dean~~ **Deans** of the College of Letters and Science;
  - (4) The University Librarian and the Registrar of the Davis campus;
  - (5) All members of the Academic Senate who are members of departments in which students in the College of Letters and Science may elect their major work;
  - (6) All members of the Academic Senate who are members of the following departments and programs: Military Science and University Writing Program;
  - ~~(7) From the Faculty of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and from the Faculty of the College of Engineering representation as follows: one representative for each twenty Academic Senate members of these faculties. Representatives shall be members of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate and they shall be chosen in such manner as the faculties may prescribe.~~

(Am. 6/6/83; 6/6/89; 6/4/08)

- (B) Instructors of less than two years' service shall not be entitled to vote. (~~Academic Senate By-Law~~ **Bylaw 34**) (Am. 6/4/08)

PART III. OFFICERS

3. **Term of Office.** Unless otherwise noted, the term of office for all officers specified under Part III of these Bylaws shall be one year. Officers shall serve from September 1 through the following August 31 or, in the case of replacement, from the date of appointment through the following August 31. (En. 6/4/08)
4. ~~Chairperson~~ **Chair.** The ~~chairperson~~ **Chair of the faculty** shall be ~~chairperson~~ **Chair** also of the Executive Committee, shall serve as presiding officer of the College Assembly, and shall appoint committees of the Faculty not otherwise provided for. (Am. 3/6/73; 6/4/08)
5. ~~Vice-Chairperson~~ **Vice-Chair.** The Faculty shall elect annually a ~~vice chairperson~~ **Vice-Chair** according to the provisions of ~~By-Law~~ **Bylaw 16**. The election results shall be announced at the spring meeting of the College Assembly. The ~~vice chairperson~~ **Vice-Chair shall** automatically assume office as ~~chairperson~~ **Chair** upon the occurrence of a vacancy in that office or **the completion of his or her term of service as Vice-Chair.** ~~after the following spring election of a vice chairperson.~~ The ~~vice chairperson~~ **Vice-Chair** shall be an ex officio (**voting**) member of



the Executive Committee and shall preside in the absence of the ~~chairperson~~**Chair** at meetings of the **Executive Committee and the** College Assembly. (En. 3/6/73; Am. 6/4/08)

6. ~~Secretary~~. The ~~secretary~~**Secretary** of the Executive Committee shall serve as ~~secretary~~**Secretary** of the Faculty. The ~~secretary~~**Secretary** shall annually prepare and send to each member of the Faculty a list of members of the Faculty. (Am. 4/24/67; 3/6/73; 6/1/81; 6/4/08)
7. The ~~chairperson~~**Chair**, or the ~~vice-chairperson~~**Vice-Chair** if that officer is absent, is authorized to call informal meetings of the Faculty for the purpose of presentation or discussion of matters of interest to the Faculty. At such meetings the formal order of business shall not be applicable, and no formal resolutions shall be passed or votes taken except such as affect the program, place, or time of meeting of such informal sessions. (Am. 4/24/67; 3/6/73; 6/4/08)

#### PART IV. COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

8. The Faculty of the College of Letters and Science shall govern itself through an elected College Assembly.

(A) The College Assembly shall consist of:

- (1) At least one representative from each of the teaching departments of the College of Letters and Science.
- (2) Additional representatives from the administrative departments of the college, which shall be determined as follows:
  - (a) A second representative from each administrative department of the college with more than twelve and less than twenty-five members who are also members of the Academic Senate (Davis);
  - (b) A third representative from each administrative department of the college with twenty-five or more members who are also members of the Academic Senate (Davis);

~~(3) From the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (Davis) and the College of Engineering (Davis), one voting representative each; representatives shall be members of the Academic Senate (Davis) and they shall be chosen in such manner as the faculties of each college prescribe;~~

(43) And nonvoting ex officio members:

- (a) The President of the University;
- (b) The local Chief Campus Officer;
- (c) The ~~Dean~~**Deans** of the College of Letters and Science;
- (d) The University Librarian and the Registrar of the Davis campus;
- (e) Members of the Executive Committee in their capacity as committee members;

(Am. and Renum. 6/4/08)

- (54) The ~~chairperson~~**Chair** and ~~vice chairperson~~**Vice-Chair**, who may vote only if presiding at a meeting of the College Assembly and if that vote is required to break a tie. (Am. and Renum. 6/4/08)

(Am. 6/6/89; 6/4/08)

- (B) Faculty members of the college who teach in one or more interdepartmental programs but who do not hold at least a one-half time appointment in an established department of the college shall vote for interdepartmental representatives to the College Assembly. The number of such interdepartmental representatives shall be determined in the same way as the number of representatives for regular departments. It shall be based on the number of individuals who fall in the category described rather than FTE. Solicitation of nominations and balloting for interdepartmental representatives shall be ~~handled directly by the Dean of the college~~ **supervised by the Executive Committee**. In discharging this responsibility, the ~~Dean~~**Executive Committee and its designated agent(s)** shall follow the procedures for such elections in regular departments, consulting all faculty members in the category described. (Am. 2/27/75; 6/4/08)

- (C) The College Assembly shall meet at least once each year during the spring, and otherwise at such times as the ~~chairperson~~**Chair** of the Executive Committee believes that the business before the college warrants calling a meeting. Attendance at such meetings shall be recorded and published with the minutes of the Assembly, and the minutes shall be distributed to all members of the Faculty of the college. Upon written request of ten voting members of the College Assembly, the ~~chairperson~~**Chair** or, in that officer's absence, the ~~vice chairperson~~**Vice-Chair** must call a meeting. (Am. 6/1/78; 6/4/08)

- (D) ~~Thirty of~~**A majority of** the **elected** voting members of the College Assembly shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of **legislative** business (**i.e., changes to the Bylaws, Regulations, or Guidelines**). **A quorum for the transaction of all other business shall be 25% of the elected voting members. In the event that a quorum is not achieved at a meeting, the Chair, or Vice-Chair acting in the absence of the Chair, may call for an electronic vote by the members of the College Assembly. Quorum requirements for an electronic ballot shall be the same as for any meeting.** (Am. 6/4/08)

- (E) Balloting. During the Spring Quarter the ~~chairperson~~**Chair** of each department shall solicit nominations of a number not less than one and one-half times the number of Assembly members to be elected, including at least one candidate of a rank below Professor, for each position to be filled. The latter requirement may be waived only with consent of the Executive Committee.

- (1) The departments shall elect representatives ~~by paper ballots~~ during the spring. All department members who are also Academic Senate (Davis) members shall be entitled to vote.
- (2) Departmental members shall be entitled to cast votes equal to the number of representatives to be elected from their department. The candidate(s) with the most votes shall be elected.
- (3) At the time of a regular or special election a department may elect one or more alternate representatives (prescribing their order of priority) to serve when a regular departmental representative is temporarily unable to serve. (En. 5/29/80)
- (4) In the event of a vacancy in a department's representation, the ~~chairperson~~**Chair** of that department shall arrange a special election according to the procedures of this section **to fill the balance of the term of the vacant representative or**

**alternate representative. The term of service of a replacement representative or alternate representative begins five days after the Secretary of the Faculty has been notified of the election.**

- (5) Representatives shall be elected for two-year terms. These terms shall be staggered so that approximately one-half of the Assembly is elected each year.
- (6) The department ~~chairperson~~**Chair** shall notify the ~~secretary~~**Secretary** of the Faculty of the results of the election.

(Am. 6/4/08)

- (F) Any member of the college faculty may attend and speak at College Assembly meetings, but only members of the Assembly may make or second motions or vote; members of a standing or special committee of the college may move for, but not second, the acceptance of reports or recommendations, or amendments thereto presented by their committees.
- (G) The Faculty may request a mail ballot of any policy decision made by the College Assembly. Upon receipt of a petition signed by thirty-five members of the college faculty, the Executive Committee must refer the matter to the Faculty for its determination. The Faculty decision shall be binding. (En. 3/6/73)
- (H) Any decision taken by the Executive Committee may be brought to the Assembly floor for reconsideration if a request for reconsideration is made thirty days or less following its announcement in the circulated minutes of the Executive Committee. A request for reconsideration requires a petition of either (a) ten voting members of the Assembly or (b) any thirty-five members of the Faculty. The Executive Committee must refer the matter as expeditiously as possible to a meeting of the Assembly. A two-thirds majority of all voting members present shall be required to override any decision of the Executive Committee. (En. 6/1/81)

## PART V. COMMITTEES

### TITLE I. APPOINTMENT AND TENURE

- 10. (A) Standing committees, except as otherwise specifically provided in these ~~By-Laws~~**Bylaws**, shall be appointed each year, ~~after at the last regular meeting of the College Assembly~~**Executive Committee. and before July for a term ending the following year at the time when new committees are appointed. Standing committees not approved by the Executive Committee at that time shall be approved as early as possible. The term of service for members of standing committees shall be one year, extending from September 1 through the following August 31, or, in the case of approval by the Executive Committee after September 1, from the date of appointment through the following August 31.** (Am. 11/14/60; 3/6/73; 6/4/08)
- (B) Each standing committee shall report its recommendations for action to the Executive Committee. Each standing committee shall formulate standards and policies which will ensure uniformity and continuity in the fulfillment of its duties, such standards and policies to be subject to review by the College Assembly, after approval by the Executive Committee. (Am. 3/6/73)
- (C) Each standing committee shall submit directly to the College Assembly **an** annual written reports summarizing its activities. (Am. 3/6/73; 6/4/08)

- (D) Any standing committee may report directly to the College Assembly at any time on any recommendation made to the Executive Committee upon which the Executive Committee has failed, after a reasonable time, to act or has taken action substantially at variance with the recommendation. Before such direct report to the College Assembly is made, a standing committee shall notify the Executive Committee in writing of its intention and include reasons therefor. (Am. 6/8/53; 1/5/55; 3/13/56; 3/6/73)

TITLE II. LIST OF STANDING COMMITTEES: THEIR POWERS AND DUTIES

11. Executive Committee. The ~~chairperson~~**Chair** of the Faculty shall be ~~chairperson~~**Chair** of an Executive Committee of six appointed members. Each member shall serve for a period of three years. **The Vice-Chair shall annually submit to the College Assembly at its spring meeting the names of the candidates to replace members of the Executive Committee in their last year of service. The College Assembly shall confirm all appointments to three-year terms of service.**~~The College Assembly shall confirm all appointments. Two members shall be replaced each year by the chairperson between the time that officer's term begins and the July 1 following.~~ The ~~chairperson~~**Chair** shall make temporary appointments to replace those members, who because of sabbatical leaves or for other reasons, are unable to serve. Such appointments shall be automatically terminated at the time the regularly appointed member is able to resume service or at the end of the regularly appointed member's term, whichever is sooner. Each Executive Committee shall elect its own ~~secretary~~**Secretary** from among appointed members. The ~~vice-chairperson~~**Vice-Chair** of the Faculty shall be an ex officio (voting) member of the committee. The ~~Dean~~**Deans** and Associate Deans of the College of Letters and Science shall be ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee. (Am. 4/24/67; 3/6/73; 6/4/08)

- (A) To this committee the Letters and Science portion of the courses of instruction section of the annual General Catalog, and other University publications used by the students in arranging their work, shall be submitted before publication for such advice or suggestion as the committee may offer to the committees or persons responsible for the publications in question. The committee shall have general oversight of the welfare of the students in the college and shall have power to bring before the College Assembly any recommendations that the committee may deem advisable. (Am. 3/6/73)
- (B) Requirements for the majors, including prerequisites and limitations on programs, and alternative electives, shall be submitted by the departments to the Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science for approval, before publication and before they become effective.
- (C) The Executive Committee shall be responsible for certifying completion of graduation requirements to the Executive Council and for recommending variances. The authority to certify completion may be delegated to the ~~Dean~~**Deans** or Associate Deans of the college. The authority to recommend variances may be delegated to the Subcommittee on Student Petitions. (En. 6/6/83; 6/4/08)
- (D) Group or interdepartmental majors may be set up by conference between members of two or more departments or programs of the college subject to the approval of the Executive Committee. The governing body for that interdepartmental program shall be known as the Program Committee. It shall number no fewer than five members nor more than ten. The membership shall include all faculty members with regular appointments in the program and such other faculty members as may be nominated by the Program Director, after consultation with the Program Committee, if established, subject to review by the Executive Committee of the college. The Program Director, designated by the Dean in consultation with the members of the Program Committee, if established, shall also serve as chair of the Program Committee, unless the Program Committee chooses to select another of its members for this responsibility. The Program Committee shall be

responsible for certifying to the proper authorities the completion of graduation requirements in these programs. (Am. 6/6/83)

- (E) Each Executive Committee shall appoint the other standing committees. Each Executive Committee may appoint special committees, from within and/or without its membership, to advise it concerning matters within its jurisdiction. In appointing committees, the Executive Committee shall designate the ~~chairperson~~**Chair** thereof. The Executive Committee shall determine policies for the replacement of committee members who, for any reason, are unable to serve. (Am. 6/8/53; 3/13/56; Renum. 6/6/83; Am. 6/4/08)
- (F) The Executive Committee shall take action on the recommendations of the standing committees; subject to the qualifications stated in ~~By-Law~~**Bylaw** 10. (Am. 1/19/53; 6/8/53; 1/5/55; Renum. 6/6/83; Am. 6/4/08)
- 12. Courses of Instruction. There shall be a standing Committee on Courses of Instruction, to be composed of seven members, at least two from each area of instruction in the college (arts and humanities, social sciences, and mathematics and natural sciences), and appointed in the same manner as the other standing committees of the college. To this committee shall be referred for study and recommendation the following: (A) requests for approval of new courses, (B) requests for changes in existing courses, (C) requests for cancellation of existing courses, and (D) such other matters relating to courses as may be referred to it by the Executive Committee. Recommendations of this committee concerning approval, change, or cancellation of courses shall be regarded as final, unless appealed by a member of the Faculty to the Executive Committee. (Am. 4/24/67; 5/19/94)
- 13. Honors. There shall be a standing Committee on Honors composed of three members to be chosen in the same manner as the other standing committees of the college. This committee shall recommend students for honors and supervise regulations concerning honors in the college. (Am. 6/8/53; 1/5/55)
- 15. Educational Policy. There shall be a standing Committee on Educational Policy consisting of six members, at least one from each area of instruction in the College, to be chosen in the same manner as the other standing committees of the college. It shall be the duty of this committee to make such studies, reports, and recommendations concerning questions of educational policy and matters of curricula as it may deem appropriate or as may be referred to it by the ~~Dean~~**Deans** of the college, ~~chairperson~~**Chair** of the Faculty, other committees, or by the College Assembly. The ~~vice chairperson~~**Vice-Chair** of the Faculty shall be an ex officio (voting) member of the committee. (Am. 4/24/67; 3/6/73; 6/1/78; 5/19/94; 6/4/08)
- 16. Nominations and Elections Committee. There shall be a standing Committee on Nominations and Elections consisting of three members to be chosen in the same manner as the other standing committees of the college. During each Winter Quarter this committee shall nominate and announce to each member of the Faculty one or more candidates for the position of ~~vice chairperson~~**Vice-Chair** of the Faculty. Additional nominations for candidates may be made by petition signed by any five members of the Faculty and received by the Committee on Nominations and Elections within ten days following its announcement of a candidate or candidates. Each proposed nominee shall certify acceptance of the nomination. Elections will be conducted according to the provisions of Davis Division ~~By-Laws~~**Bylaws** 16(C) and 71. (Am. 6/4/08)
- 17. Rules and Jurisdiction. There shall be a standing Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction consisting of three members to be appointed by the Executive Committee for terms of three years, one member to be replaced or reappointed at the end of each year. This committee shall have the following responsibilities:

- (A) To review all proposed amendments to the ~~By-Laws~~**Bylaws** and Regulations of the college for clarity and for consistency with the currently established ~~By-Laws~~**Bylaws** and Regulations of the Faculty and the Academic Senate. (Am. 6/4/08)
  - (B) To recommend to the Executive Committee, for action by the College Assembly, any changes and additions to the ~~By-Laws~~**Bylaws** and Regulations that it finds are needed to meet the criteria stated in section (A). (Am. 6/4/08)
  - (C) To advise the college, its officers, committees and members in matters of jurisdiction and interpretation of legislation. (Am. 2/17/75; 6/1/81)
18. Library Committee. There shall be a standing Committee on Library consisting of three members, one from each area of instruction in the College, to be chosen in the same manner as the other standing committees of the college. It shall be the duty of this committee to advise the Librarian and to consider other matters relating to the Library. (Am. 4/24/67; 5/19/94)
19. Individual Majors. There shall be a standing Committee on Individual Majors consisting of five members to be chosen in the same manner as the other standing committees of the college. This committee shall include at least one member from each of the following areas: Humanities, Social Sciences, **and** Physical Sciences, ~~and Biological Sciences~~. The Associate Deans of the college shall be ex officio, nonvoting members of the committee.
- To this committee shall be referred for study and recommendation all petitions for individual majors. Recommendations of this committee concerning approval of individual majors shall be regarded as final when the decision is unanimous. In all other cases the recommendations shall be returned to the Executive Committee for final action. (En. 12/7/70; Am. 6/1/78; 6/4/08)
20. Committee on the Study of Foreign Languages. This committee shall have seven members, including at least two members from the language departments. If possible, all Undergraduate Colleges should be represented among its membership. The members of this committee shall be appointed in the same manner as other standing committees of the College.
- (A) The primary function of this committee is to promote the study of foreign languages by such means as publicity, and close cooperation with the ~~Office of Relations With Schools and the Office of Undergraduate Admissions~~. (Am. 6/4/08)
  - (B) The committee shall periodically compare the foreign language standards at UC Davis with those of other University of California campuses and other colleges and universities.
  - (C) The committee shall periodically re-evaluate the current levels of foreign language requirements across the campus curricula, especially in the light of the statement of the purpose of foreign language study prepared by the College and found in the General Catalog.
  - (D) The committee shall advise ~~Dean~~**Deans** and other University officers on needs to strengthen current or establish new programs in foreign languages. (Am. 6/4/08)
  - (E) The committee shall maintain liaison with the Committee on the Education Abroad Program of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate to explore how campus programs in foreign languages can enhance the Education Abroad Program and vice versa.
- (Am. 4/24/67; 6/6/90, Eff. 9/91; 6/4/08)
22. Teaching Program Planning and Review. There shall be a standing Committee on Teaching Program Planning and Review consisting of seven members chosen in the same manner as other committees of the college. This committee shall include one member each from the Social

Sciences, the Humanities, **and** the Physical Sciences, ~~and the Biological Sciences,~~ and one ~~member ex officio,~~ **non-voting member** from the Executive Committee of the college. It shall be the responsibility of this committee to assist programs and departments to realize their full potential as teaching units, and to advise the ~~Dean~~**Deans** concerning the allocation of resources. It shall also supervise the review of all college teaching programs. The final report on the program reviewed shall be prepared by the standing committee and be transmitted to the ~~chairperson~~**Chair** of the teaching program reviewed, the Dean~~(s)~~ and the ~~chairperson~~**Chair** of the Executive Committee~~(s)~~ of the college~~(s)~~. (Am. 5/25/76; 6/6/83; 6/4/08)

#### PART VI. ORDER OF BUSINESS

- (A) The first item of business at each meeting of the College Assembly shall be a roll call of members. Members present and members absent shall be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. A roll call vote on any matter before the College Assembly must be recorded in the minutes upon the request of any College Assembly member present.
  - (B) The order of business at meetings of the College Assembly subsequent to the roll call of members shall be as follows:
    - (1) Minutes
    - (2) Announcements by the President
    - (3) Announcements by the ~~Chairperson~~**Chair**
    - (4) Announcements by the ~~Dean~~**Deans**, or other executive officers
    - (5) Special orders
    - (6) Reports of special committees
    - (7) Reports of standing committees
    - (8) Petitions of students
    - (9) Unfinished business
    - (10) New business
- (Am. 6/4/08)
- (C) The regular order of business may be suspended at any meeting by a two-thirds vote of the voting members present.
  - (D) The rules contained in Robert's Rules of Order shall be the authority except where inconsistent with the provisions of these ~~By-Laws~~**Bylaws**. (Am. 6/8/53; 3/6/73; 6/4/08)

#### PART VII. SUSPENSION OF RULES

- 29. The rules of the Faculty may be suspended at a meeting by vote of the College Assembly, provided that not more than two voting members present object to such suspension.  
(Am. 4/24/67; 3/6/73)
- 30. The College Assembly shall not make recommendations to the Academic Senate as to the amendment or repeal of Senate legislation, or as to new legislation, unless written **or electronic** notice of the proposed recommendations shall have been sent to each member of the Faculty at

least five days previous to the College Assembly meeting at which the recommendation is to be moved. (Am. 4/24/67; 3/6/73; 6/4/08)

31. Recommendations to the Academic Senate as to the curriculum of the College of Letters and Science are subject to a further restriction. Any such recommendation may be finally adopted at the meeting of the College Assembly at which it is first presented only if the sense of the recommendation as circulated is preserved. If adopted with amendments from the floor which change the intention of the measure, such adoption shall be regarded as preliminary. The recommendation shall then be circulated, as amended, with the call for the next meeting of the College Assembly. (Am. 4/24/67; 3/6/73)

| PART VIII. AMENDMENT OF ~~BY-LAWS~~ **BYLAWS**

- | 32. The foregoing ~~By-Laws~~ **Bylaws** may be added to, amended, or repealed at any regular or special meeting of the College Assembly by a two-thirds vote of all voting members present, provided that written notice of amendment shall have been sent to each member of the Faculty at least five days previous to the meeting at which the amendment is to be moved, and provided also that the proposed amendment shall have been presented to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (See ~~By-Law~~ **Bylaw** 17) for study and analysis.

(Am. 4/24/67; 3/6/73; 6/4/08)

| PART IX. ~~MAIL-BALLOT ON REGULATIONS AND BY-LAWS~~ **BYLAWS**

- | 33. Upon petition of twenty-five members of the Faculty or upon request of two-thirds of the members of the Executive Committee voting, any proposed regulation or any proposed ~~By-Law~~ **Bylaw** approved by a standing committee of the college shall be submitted to a ~~mail-ballot~~ of the Faculty according to the provisions of the Davis Division. This ~~By-Law~~ **Bylaw** will go into effect immediately.

(En. 5/27/69; Am. 6/4/08)



December 15, 2008

**LARRY N. VANDERHOEF**

Chancellor

**BARBARA HORWITZ**

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

**Re: Proposal: Reappointment of Interim CBS Dean**

I discussed the proposal to extend the appointment of Interim College of Biological Sciences (CBS) Dean Ken Burtis with the Executive Council on December 5, 2008. I distributed the summaries of the November 10, 2008, meeting between the CBS Department Chairs and Directors, Members of the CBS Faculty Executive Committee and others, to the members of Executive Council, in preparation for the discussion.

The Executive Council wishes to restate its opposition to interim appointments of a length greater than one year while a simultaneous national search is conducted. Our resolve remains in light of the issues presented to members of CBS. The Executive Council recognizes that the campus, state, nation and world are experiencing a dramatic financial crisis. The members understand that initiating a national search during this tough financial period is difficult at best. To further exacerbate the difficulty, as reported in the summaries, you have stated the campus has no funds available to conduct a national recruitment for a Dean in the sciences including the College of Biological Sciences.

The Council is troubled by the impact of the CBS debt depicted in both summaries. We are well aware of the multi-million dollar debt that CBS is assigned. Our Committee on Planning and Budget met with then Provost Hinshaw and interim Dean Burtis to discuss the debt, reasons it occurred and how it was to be managed soon after its discovery. The Executive Council is also acutely aware that all of the appointment and start-up package commitments made by former Dean Wise required approval from the Chancellor or his delegate. Thus, it is inaccurate to describe the debt incurred as being the sole responsibility of the former CBS Dean when such actions require central campus approval and oversight. It is also inconceivable that the campus' "strategy" for settling this debt requires CBS to pay \$250,000 per year for roughly the next 24 years. Faculty morale, aspirations and desire for visionary (and validated) leadership cannot be sacrificed for essentially the remaining careers of all current members of the College.

We wish to echo the sentiments of the CBS faculty that a national search for the CBS Dean is necessary to bring stability and credibility to the CBS Dean's position, the College of Biological Sciences and UC Davis. It is with significant reservation that I report the Executive Council is willing to consider that there is a need to extend the interim appointment of CBS Dean Ken Burtis through June 30, 2011. We consider this based on the discussion summaries and the commitment to complete a full five-year review (described in APM 240-80) of Dean Burtis prior to June 30, 2011. Interim Dean Burtis and CBS deserve a thorough five-year review given his performance is described as excellent.

As you are aware, during the Representative Assembly's winter meeting a report concerning the appointment of interim administrators, following the interim appointment of a College of Engineering Dean for three-years, is expected. This memo and the accompanying documents will be made available to the Assembly to ensure full disclosure.

Sincerely,



Robert Powell, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Chair & Professor: Chemical Engineering and Materials Science  
Professor: Food Science & Technology

c: Executive Council Members

December 31, 2008

**CHAIR ROBERT POWELL**

Davis Division of the Academic Senate

Dear Chair Powell:

Thank you for your letter of December 15 that provides the Executive Council's perspective regarding the extension of Ken Burtis' term as Dean of the College of Biological Sciences (CBS). We appreciate the Council's recognition of the extraordinary fiscal challenge confronting the campus and the difficulty that it presents in conducting a national search for the next dean at this time.

Although we welcome the Council's support (albeit with significant reservation) of extending Dean Burtis' appointment until June 30, 2011, we would like to take this opportunity to clarify issues raised in your letter and to share our thoughts on the matter.

First, this action does not represent an interim appointment "of a length greater than one year," as referenced in your letter. Dean Burtis was appointed to an interim position for one year (2005-2006) and subsequently appointed to a three-year term as dean (not interim dean), effective July 1, 2006. At that time, his appointment was supported by the Biological Sciences' Advisory Committee and department chairs. The extension of his appointment now is supported by the college's Faculty Executive Committee and department chairs and directors, based on recognition of the current fiscal difficulties and on the dean's performance.

Second, we would like to address the issues raised in your letter regarding the circumstances surrounding the debt incurred by CBS in the years prior to June 2005 and the impact of the debt on the search for a new dean. We agree with you that the debt is a significant burden for the college, and we have, in fact, been working with the college to reduce and eventually eliminate this deficit.

The debt resulted primarily from an imbalance between the resources available to the college from all internal and external sources and college expenditures on rapidly increasing new faculty startup costs, including lab renovations. A failure in timely, complete, and accurate information from the college to the central campus administration regarding available college resources, combined with delegated responsibility to deans for most financial commitments led to significant over-commitments by the college and resulted in CBS' debt.

In recognition of the importance of CBS to the mission of the university and the serious constraints facing this (and other colleges) in meeting the ever-increasing costs of faculty startups and retentions, we have been working cooperatively with Dean Burtis over the past four years to return the college to a sound financial condition while sustaining the excellence of its programs. Our efforts have included central campus contributions to

**CHAIR ROBERT POWELL**

December 31, 2008

Page 2

reducing the debt (\$2.7 million over the past four years), negotiated contributions from CBS that were scaled to minimize unduly negative impacts on the academic and research missions of the college, and a significant increase in campus contributions to faculty hiring costs and retentions in the college that have permitted maintenance of the *status quo* in faculty headcount over the past four years (i.e., 14 faculty were successfully hired after the deficit plan was implemented). Moreover, a four-year plan to halve the debt is proceeding ahead of schedule.

We recognize and share the concern of the Executive Council about the impact of the remaining debt on the ability of CBS to carry out a national search for a new dean. However, with the serious financial constraints facing the entire university, there is a need for shared sacrifices in sustaining critical university programs for the next few years. It seems not unreasonable that CBS should continue to share in the repayment of its debt, given that it continues to benefit from the services of the outstanding faculty hired using the funds in question. As the university emerges from the challenging financial constraints under which it now operates and is once again in a position to make increased investments in areas of importance such as the biological sciences, we will make every effort to ensure that CBS is on equal footing with the other schools and colleges. We also agree that there should be a full five-year review of the performance of Dean Burtis prior to June 30, 2011, as stipulated in your letter.

We understand that you intend to make your December 15 letter and accompanying documents available to the Representative Assembly. We ask that you make this response available as well.

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Larry N. Vanderhoef  
Chancellor



Barbara A. Horwitz  
Interim Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

/lah

c: Executive Council Members



COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES  
SECTION OF NEUROBIOLOGY,  
PHYSIOLOGY, AND BEHAVIOR  
(530) 752-0203  
FAX: (530) 752-5582

ONE SHIELDS AVENUE  
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8519  
INTERNET: <http://www.npb.ucdavis.edu>

November 28, 2008

TO: Barbara Horwitz, Ph.D.  
Interim Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

FR: Sue Bodine, PhD.  
Chair, Executive Committee, College of Biological Sciences

RE: Meeting with Chancellor Vanderhoef and Provost Horwitz on November 10, 2008

On November 10, 2008, a meeting was held to discuss the deanship in the College of Biological Sciences. The meeting was requested by Chancellor Vanderhoef and Provost Horwitz, and was attended by the CBS Department Chairs and Directors, the Members of the College Executive Committee and representatives from the Dean's Office. In attendance from CBS were: Donna Olsson, Diana Myles, Leo Chalupa, Bill Lucas, Doug Nelson, Jodi Nunnari, Maureen Stanton, Richard Michelmore, Brad Shaffer, Sue Bodine, Rick Grosberg, Michael Turelli, Sharon Strauss, Valley Stewart, Sebastian Schreiber, and John Wingfield.

The issue under discussion was what to do regarding the deanship of the College of Biological Sciences. Ken Burtis was in the last of a three-year term as Dean of the College of Biological Sciences. Ken was appointed to the position following the departure of Phyllis Wise. Ken Burtis was given a 3-year term as Dean by Chancellor Vanderhoef following consultation with the Department Chairs. It should be mentioned that at the time of the appointment, CBS was still the "Division of Biological Sciences", and did not have an Executive Committee.

The overall consensus of those in attendance at the Nov. 10<sup>th</sup> meeting was that Ken Burtis has done an excellent job as Dean under very difficult circumstances. With respect to the future, the faculty representatives at the meeting were in agreement that the first choice would be to run a robust National Search for a new Dean. Further, many felt that Ken Burtis was a viable candidate for the position and should be encouraged to apply if there was a National Search.

The Chancellor and Provost were asked what resources would be available for a National Search, and the answer was "none" (i.e., little if any major resources). It was also mentioned that CBS has a considerable debt that was generated by Dean Wise. The CBS faculty felt that this debt would hinder our chances of getting outstanding candidates to apply for the position and/or will prevent us from recruiting our top candidate. Following some discussion, there was no indication by either the Chancellor or the Provost that the debt would be forgiven or reduced at this time.

Given the lack of resources and the current debt, it was agreed that it would be impossible to run a national search. An extended discussion took place regarding the future of the College of

Biological Sciences on the UCD campus. There was general concern by the faculty regarding the future strength and growth of the College, and the commitment by the Administration to maintaining strength in the Biological Sciences on this campus. The major concerns discussed at the meeting were: 1) the morale of the faculty, 2) the ability to replace retiring faculty, 3) the ability to recruit outstanding faculty, and 4) the ability to retain current faculty.

In general there was no interest in running an Internal Search for a temporary Dean. As mentioned, there was general agreement that Ken Burtis's performance as Dean over the last 3 years has been excellent. There was consensus from the faculty in attendance at this meeting that Ken Burtis should be offered another term as Dean of CBS. One option discussed was to offer Ken another 3-year appointment. Appointment of Ken Burtis to another 3-year term, however, would mean that there would be no 5-year review as is normal following the typical 5-year term given individuals who are recruited as the result of formal search. An alternative proposal was suggested, which was to offer Ken Burtis a two-year extension to his current appointment, thus extending his original appointment to 5-years. At the end of the 5-years, a formal 5-year review would be performed, and a decision would be made about whether to continue his appointment or perform a National Search.

The meeting was concluded with everyone in agreement that Chancellor Vandehoef would meet with Ken Burtis to discuss his interest in continuing his position as Dean, and in extending his appointment for 2-years. The Chancellor and/or Provost was also going to set up a meeting with Bob Powell, the Chair of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate to discuss how to move forward

Meeting Summary: College of Biological Sciences  
Discussion of Dean position  
November 10, 2008

#### List of Attendees

##### Chancellor/Provost Office

Larry Vanderhoef, Chancellor  
Barbara Horwitz, Interim Provost/EVC

##### College of Biological Sciences Executive Committee

Sue Bodine (EC Chair), Neurobiology, Physiology and Behavior  
Rick Grosberg (EC Vice-Chair), Evolution and Ecology  
Sharon Strauss (at-large member), Evolution and Ecology  
Michael Turelli (at-large member), Evolution and Ecology  
Ken Kaplan, Molecular and Cellular Biology (absent)  
Sebastian Schreiber, Evolution and Ecology  
Neelima Sinha, Plant Biology (absent)  
Valley Stewart, Microbiology  
John Wingfield, Neurobiology, Physiology and Behavior

##### Chairs/Directors:

Leo Chalupa, Neurobiology, Physiology and Behavior  
William Lucas, Chair, Plant Biology  
Douglas Nelson, Chair, Microbiology  
Jodi Nunnari, Chair, Molecular and Cellular Biology  
Maureen Stanton, Chair, Evolution and Ecology  
Richard Michelson, Director, Genome Center  
Brad Shaffer, Director, Center for Population Biology  
Edward Jones, Director, Center for Neuroscience (absent)

##### Associate/Assistant Deans:

Carol Erickson, Executive Associate Dean (absent)  
Diana Myles, Associate Dean  
Donna Olsson, Executive Assistant Dean

#### Summary of Recollections from Donna Olsson:

The Chancellor said the current dean term is ending soon (June 30, 2009), and he wanted input from the group on how to approach next steps. Several faculty mentioned that if there is sufficient funding available from the campus, they would prefer to do a national search. However, they noted that this is a very difficult budget time to devote money to a dean search, and the College also has a deficit that would need to be addressed prior to a national search. If

sufficient resources are not available for a national search, many faculty said that Ken Burtis was doing a very good job and should be re-appointed. (Note: The deficit predicted for 2011-12 was \$12.8 million in 2005-06, and is now predicted to be cut to \$6.0 million, in 2011-12. The deficit primarily resulted from high cost faculty start-ups and facility renovations.)

A faculty member asked how the campus could afford the two current dean searches. The Chancellor's response was that the two dean searches are in social sciences and management, where dean recruitment/appointment costs are far lower than in the biological sciences.

Throughout the meeting, two major themes surfaced. First, many faculty mentioned that the deficit is a dark cloud for the College, and should be eliminated. Second, many faculty mentioned that it is very important for the College to continue to replace faculty when they retire, and retain faculty who have other offers.

After considerable discussion, it appeared that sufficient resources for a science dean recruitment and deficit elimination are not available at this time to embark on a national search for dean.

Many faculty mentioned that Dean Burtis has been doing an excellent job as dean, and is perceived as being fair and working very hard to hire and retain excellent faculty under very tight resource constraints. In fact, there were no negatives and many positives expressed about Dean Burtis during the meeting.

One faculty member mentioned that he had been surprised when Dean Burtis was hired without a national search. Other faculty were aware of the major College deficit that affected the dean appointment process at the time. A few mentioned that consultation had occurred with the chairs and vice chairs at the time, since the College Executive Committee had not yet been established. The Chancellor suggested that perhaps there was uneven communication about the College circumstances at the time.

One chair said that the dean position is extremely important and that Dean Burtis is doing an excellent job. However, he wished that Dean Burtis had the opportunity to be selected after a search, which would support his role as dean. However, another faculty member said that he had heard that Dean Burtis might not apply if there were a search, as sometimes the presence of an inside candidate reduces the number and excellence of other applications.

The faculty recommended, without objection, that Dean Burtis be reappointed for a two year term, so that his dean term would be for a total of five years, consistent with other deans. One chair mentioned that his one-year interim dean term should be excluded from the total, and there was apparent agreement on this. (Note: since the dean term is from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2009, the recommendation would be to extend the term through June 30, 2011.)

The Chancellor urged the chairs to go back to their faculty and make sure they are aware of the budget circumstances now that led to the group's recommendation that Dean Burtis be reappointed. Several faculty members mentioned that they would be happy to send a letter to the Chancellor from the group stating that they support the extension of Dean Burtis's term to 2011.

Submitted by: Donna Olsson  
November 26, 2008



**Internal/External Senior Management Team Appointments**  
**Made by UC Davis Chancellor Larry N. Vanderhoef**

A blend of internal and external appointments indicates a campus is successful at growing its own leadership and providing opportunities for those who excel, and that it is also open to bringing in new people with different ideas and approaches. Goal is the best match for the position at the time of the recruitment.

	<u><b>Internal</b></u>	<u><b>External</b></u>
<b>Deans</b>		
Ag & ES	Schneeman (initially completed term of dean who died unexpectedly)	*Van Alfen
Bio Sci	Burtis, **McNamee	*Wise
Education		*Levine
Engineering	White (temp. for Lavernia)	*Laub, *Lavernia
Grad. School of Mgt.	*Biggart	*Nat'l search underway
HArCS		*Langland, *Owens
Law	*Perschbacher, *Johnson	
Medicine	Silva	*Pomeroy (at UCD less than 2 yrs at time of appt.; also holds title of VC/Human Health Sciences)
Math/Physical Sciences	*Ko	
Social Sciences	*Sheffrin	*Offer declined; search re-initiated
Vet Med	*Osburn	

**Vice Chancellors**

Provost	**Grey Lavernia (interim short-term)	*Hinshaw
Administration	**Nosek	
Graduate Studies	**Gibeling	*Gonzalez
Research	*Smith, **Klein	
Resource Mgt. & Pl.		*Meyer
Student Affairs	*Wall, *Wood	*Sakaki
University Relations	**Sandeem	*Rose

**Vice Provosts**

Academic Personnel	+Klein, Horwitz	
Info & Ed. Tech		*Bruno, *Siegel
Outreach/Int'l Programs		*Lacy
Undergraduate Studies	+Dale, +Turner	

\* *National search*  
 \*\**Interim short-term, then appt'd after national search*  
 + *UC search*

*Note: The founding deans of L&S' three divisions were purposely chosen from among L&S' leaders (Rock, Metcalf, Holoman/Cannon). Interim Provost Horwitz/Interim VP White temporary appointees following Provost Hinshaw's departure.*