



▶ AD HOC COMMITTEE  
ON SHARED  
GOVERNANCE.....2

○ ISSUE 3 | ○ VOLUME 4 | ○ 2007-2008



▶ NEWS FROM THE  
COUNCILS .....7



▶ RELOCATION OF THE  
ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE  
.....8

# Academic *Senate*

SPRING NEWSLETTER 2008

## GREETINGS FROM THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Dear colleagues and friends,

This is the final Newsletter for this academic year. It contains the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance. Moreover, we provide information about the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations for improving shared governance practices at UCI with regard to dean searches and dean reviews, and about the decisions made by the Senate Assembly on May 15 regarding each of these recommendations. We hope that in this way the UCI Academic Senate can help to turn the difficult events from the beginning of this academic year into progress for our campus. We will do our best to work with the administration on this and the many other matters of importance to our campus.

In addition, we have several reports from Senate Councils and a note on the upcoming relocation of the Senate office to third floor of Berkeley Place South. It was a great pleasure to serve as the editor for this year's Senate Newsletters. I would like to thank Jill Kato for her great work compiling the material and doing the layout for the Newsletters.

I look forward to working with you all next year in my new role as Chair of the Academic Senate at UCI!

Jutta Heckhausen  
Chair Elect of the Academic Senate  
[chaire@uci.edu](mailto:chaire@uci.edu)

# AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE

In response to the difficult events surrounding the recruitment of our new Law School Dean, Professor Erwin Chemerinsky, the UCI Academic Senate Assembly had decided at its emergency meetings on September 20 and November 1, 2007 on two moves. First, to send a small group of faculty (appointed by Senate Chair Tim Bradley) to discuss the events with Chancellor Drake. This group has met with Chancellor Drake on October 31, 2007 and has given their report to the Assembly meeting on November 1 (see Newsletter Fall Quarter, 20007, Document 2, [http://www.senate.uci.edu/senateweb/default2.asp?active\\_page\\_id=122](http://www.senate.uci.edu/senateweb/default2.asp?active_page_id=122)).

Second, we decided to convene an Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance to discuss how practices of shared governance at UCI, particularly with regard to the search for deans and review of deans, could be improved. Chair Tim Bradley appointed the members of this committee: Alan Barbour, Tim Bradley, Ellen Greenberger, Jutta Heckhausen, Spence Olin, and William Sirignano. The committee met numerous times, including meetings with EVC&P Michael Gottfredson and Chancellor Michael Drake, conducted a survey among UCI faculty, wrote a report, and submitted a set of specific recommendations about dean searches and dean reviews. On this and the following pages, we inform about the Ad Hoc Committee's report and about the recommendations as voted on by the Senate Assembly on May 15.

---

## AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE REPORT

### Introduction

The official website of the University of California contains the following statement, which is signed by the UC President, The Regents, and the UC Academic Senate:

“For more than a century, shared governance between the Board of Regents, the systemwide president and the faculty has ensured the highest standards of excellence in fulfilling the University of California’s mission of teaching, research and public service... The Academic Senate is the representative body of the University faculty.”

To fulfill our mission in teaching, research, and public service, it is essential that the principles and practices of shared governance among the university, the campus administration, and the Academic Senate (and its councils and committees) be maintained. These practices include, but are not restricted to, such matters as undergraduate and graduate courses, curricula, degrees, admissions, and requirements for Academic Senate consultation in budgeting and in faculty appointment and advancement.

Recent experiences, however, indicate that at UC Irvine some of the practices of shared governance have become compromised. In particular, this is the case regarding the search processes and performance reviews of higher administrators such as deans of schools, campus-wide deans, and Vice Chancellors. While the final decision in selecting a dean resides with the Chancellor and EVC&P, we assert that recruitment of excellent candidates, and appropriate selection among them, requires the informed, engaged, and meaningful participation of the faculty. A simultaneous development reveals a decline in faculty involvement in Academic Senate matters. This decline may be partly explained by the fact that many new faculty members are unfamiliar with the principles, practices and opportunities of shared governance.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance was convened to provide recommendations for improving shared governance and transparency of process within UC Irvine. The Assembly of the Divisional Senate at UC Irvine therefore charged the Ad Hoc Committee to examine all aspects of shared governance on campus, with particular attention at this time to the process by which deans are appointed and reviewed. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance have interpreted our charge so as to focus on academic deans, thereby eliminating from consideration, for example, the Dean of Continuing Education and the Dean of Students.

To address this charge, the committee met on nine separate occasions (including once with Chancellor Drake and once with Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost Gottfredson), beginning in early January and concluding in late April. It also solicited opinions and analyses from UCI faculty members, from all of the academic deans, from a number of individuals who have recently served as deans, as well as from Academic Senate divisional chairs and faculty from other UC campuses.

The information derived from these sources only serves to confirm our initial belief that improvements are needed at UC Irvine in both the search and the review processes for academic deans. Our report contains a discussion of the problems we believe exist as well as specific recommendations in regard to improvements.

### Issues and Problems

The selection of a new dean for an academic unit requires a process that assures the best possible pool of candidates for the position, an informed and broadly-based assessment of the final candidates, and a capacity to persuade the individual deemed best suited for appointment to accept the position. Faculty confidence in the process is essential, if the newly appointed dean is to move quickly and successfully into the responsibilities of academic and administrative leadership. Similarly, the mandated fifth year review of deans requires a process that combines understanding of a dean's multiple responsibilities and activities with assessment by individuals who are highly familiar with the particular dean's performance. All faculty members in the academic unit, together with other constituents, should know that their voices will be heard, their concerns evaluated fairly, and their comments allowed to contribute to actions leading to reappointment, conditional or time-limited reappointment, or non-reappointment. Restriction of opportunities for the full faculty of a School to participate in the activities of dean searches and dean reviews deprives the campus of potentially valuable input and has a negative impact on faculty morale.

The faculty and administration both have vital functions in the operation of a School, and have unique and shared goals and perspectives. Arguably, the stakeholders (i.e., campus administrators, School administrators, faculty) currently involved in the selection and review of deans agree about these principles of shared governance. However, there is far less agreement about whether current practices have consistently and successfully assured that all School faculty have the opportunity to express opinions and have them taken seriously in the decision-making process. A segment of the faculty at UCI is convinced that current practices do not assure that faculty are able to exercise their rights of shared governance in the dean searches and dean reviews.

In the recruitment of deans there are numerous, specific concerns. These concerns center upon (a) the selection and composition of search committees; (b) minimizing conflict of interest in the selection of committee chairs; (c) the level of confidentiality currently observed in some dean searches and the possible costs and benefits of such confidentiality; (d) the opportunity of faculty members who are not on the search committee to contribute to the search process at both early and advanced stages; and (e) the access of faculty to the dean candidates, particularly in the final stages of their recruitment.

The issue of confidentiality is complex, and opinions differ. On the one hand, there are proponents of maintaining confidentiality throughout the entire process of recruiting an external dean, until its conclusion and the Chancellor's announcement of his choice of dean. Underlying this position is the belief that such a high level of confidentiality is warranted to attract exceptionally well-qualified candidates, who may not wish their candidacy to be known at their own institutions. This seems to be an increasingly common practice and one not limited to professional schools. But there appears to be little empirical data beyond anecdote on how often this strategy leads to the desired outcome and, if it does, at what cost, such as to faculty morale. In any case, maintaining confidentiality throughout the entire search process is an unrealistic goal, particularly once campus visits by the candidates are underway.

On the other hand, there are proponents of openness throughout the search process, including the initial solicitations and receipt of applications. They claim that the full faculty, and not just a limited number, should have the opportunity to meet with the finalists for the position of dean. In the view of these individuals, a full flow of information and opinions from School faculty to the finalists, and the opportunity of the candidates to respond to and initiate discussion, should result in a better outcome. Among other things, a more open process may allow dean candidates to consider whether they believe they can meet the challenges of the dean position.

A solution to these opposed positions recognizes some advantages of each approach. This is to have full transparency and faculty participation at two points of time in the dean search process. The first is at the very beginning when criteria for dean selection are identified and before specific applicants are even screened. The second is towards the end of the search process, when the pool of candidates has been reduced to a few finalists.

In the review of deans, there are concerns about how faculty input is solicited and evaluated, the role of CAP and other councils of the Academic Senate, confidentiality, the selection and composition of appropriate review committees, and potential problems, including conflict of interest in naming a review committee chair from among the other academic deans. While it is recognized that the review of deans is an administrative personnel action and as such requires a high level of confidentiality, arguably even higher than dean searches, there is concern that the input solicited should be broad and inclusive. Finally, there is a lingering apprehension that faculty efforts invested in a dean's review are without consequence, because, in the case of disagreement between faculty and the Chancellor/EVC&P about whether a dean's performance should lead to reappointment, it is most likely that the priorities of the central administration will be weighed more heavily than concerns about the dean's efforts raised by the faculty.

The following recommendations address the concerns we have identified in a way that strengthens the commitment of both the Academic Senate and the campus administration to the principles of shared governance and thus contributes to the continued vitality and growth of the Irvine campus.

Tim Bradley, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology  
Jutta Heckhausen, Psychology & Social Behavior  
Alan Barbour, Microbiology and Molecular Genetics  
Ellen Greenberger, Psychology & Social Behavior  
Meredith Lee, German  
Spence Olin, History  
William Sirignano, Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering

The Ad Hoc committee proposed a set of recommendations for the search and review of academic deans. These recommendations were discussed, some of them were amended, and all were voted on at meeting of the Divisional Senate Assembly on May 15, 2008.

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEAN SEARCH AND REVIEW PROCESSES**

The Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance submitted its report and recommendations for the search and review of deans to the Senate Assembly. The following recommendations received strong endorsements in votes at the Assembly meeting on May 15, 2008.

### Recommendations

#### Composition of Dean Search Committees

Recommendation 1: Upon initiation of a search for the dean of a school, the Executive Committee or in its absence, a representative body of the School faculty, shall, following consultation with the faculty, submit to the Chancellor and EVC&P the names of faculty members from that academic unit whom they recommend for service on the search committee. There shall be no limit placed on the number of recommended faculty. In the instance of searches for the Dean of the Graduate Division or Dean of Undergraduate Education, the Chair of the Senate shall convene a committee to provide nominations to the Chancellor and EVC&P for service on the search committee.

Recommendation 2: The Committee on Committees shall submit to the Chancellor and EVC&P the names of faculty members whom they recommend for service on the dean search committee. The Committee on Committees may nominate faculty members in the School, faculty members outside of the School who are UCI Academic Senate members, current

and past deans, and/or community members (if deemed relevant). There shall be no limit placed on the number of recommended faculty.

Recommendation 3: A minimum of one-half of the members of dean search committees shall be comprised of faculty recommended by either the School's Executive Committee or in its absence, a representative body of the School faculty, or the Committee on Committees.

#### Dean Search Committee Procedures

Recommendation 4: Once the dean search committee is formed, and at the very beginning of the search process, the search committee shall convene a forum (or multiple fora) with all faculty members of the School in which the dean will be appointed in order to discuss selection criteria for the new dean.

Recommendation 5: The search committee shall review the qualifications of identified candidates in strict confidence and determine the 3-5 candidates to be invited for interviews on campus. At that point the identities of the candidates shall no longer be held confidential. All faculty members in the School to which the dean will be appointed should have access to all finalists by means of an open forum with each candidate. This may or may not include a formal research presentation.

In those rare situations where the advantage of a more closed search process outweighs the problems, the Chancellor/EVC&P should be able to make a convincing case to the stakeholders before campus interviews are conducted. Confronted with convincing arguments, a school faculty could agree to confidential campus interviews.

Recommendation 6: All faculty members shall have an opportunity to provide written evaluations regarding the dean finalists, and those evaluations shall be reviewed and given serious consideration by the search committee, the EVC&P, and the Chancellor.

Recommendation 7: The search committee meets with the Chancellor and/or EVC&P and provides a list of top choices.

Recommendation 8: At the conclusion of the search process, the Chancellor and/or EVC&P shall meet with the dean search committee in order to report on the outcome of their deliberations and negotiations.

Recommendation 9: If for any reason the above procedures do not yield an acceptable dean, the Chancellor and/or EVC&P shall ask the committee to continue the search beginning again with Recommendation 6. Should a new committee for the dean search become necessary, the above procedures shall be initiated beginning with Recommendation 1.

#### Composition of Dean Review Committees

Recommendation 10: When the academic dean of a School is due for review, the Executive Committee or in its absence, a representative body of the School faculty shall, following consultation with the faculty, submit to the Chancellor and EVC&P the names of faculty members from that academic unit whom they recommend for service on the review committee. There shall be no limit placed on the number of recommended faculty. In the instance of reviews for the Dean of the Graduate Division or Dean of Undergraduate Education, the Chair of the Senate shall convene a committee to provide nominations to the Chancellor and EVC&P for service on the review committee.

Recommendation 11: The Committee on Committees shall submit to the Chancellor and EVC&P the names of faculty members whom they recommend for service on the dean review committee. The Committee on Committees may nominate faculty members in the School, faculty members outside of the School who are UCI Academic Senate members, current and past deans, and/or community members (if deemed relevant). There shall be no limit placed on the number of recommended faculty.

Recommendation 12: A minimum of one-half of the members of dean review committees shall be comprised of School faculty recommended by the School's Executive Committee or in its absence, a representative body of the School faculty, or the Committee on Committees.

Recommendation 13: No current dean shall serve as chair of a dean review committee.

Dean Review Committee Procedures:

Recommendation 14: Once the dean review committee is formed, the review committee shall send out a call to all faculty in the School for evaluations of the strengths and weaknesses of the current dean, along with recommendations for improvements, and an indication of whether the dean should be re-appointed. These evaluations shall be reviewed by the dean review committee and treated with strict confidentiality.

Recommendation 15: The review committee shall evaluate the work of the dean during the review period, including the faculty statements and written input from the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) and other councils judged relevant, and prepare a report to the Chancellor and EVC&P that includes a recommendation regarding re-appointment/non-reappointment. The committee could also recommend re-appointment of less than a full 5-year term. We reaffirm that it is solely the Chancellor's responsibility to determine re-appointment of the dean. All materials shall be treated with strict confidence.

Recommendation 16 : At the conclusion of the review process, the Chancellor and/or EVC&P shall meet with the dean review committee in order to report on the outcome of their deliberations.

Recommendation 17: If the Chancellor and EVC&P do not agree with the review committee's recommendation to either extend or terminate the appointment of the sitting dean, they shall meet with the review committee and explain their reasons. This information shall be treated as privileged and confidential.

Annual Assessment

Recommendation 18: At the end of each academic year, the Senate Chair shall see that the Irvine Division reviews the organization and operation of dean searches and dean reviews conducted during that year and distribute to all faculty a report regarding the extent to which the recommended guidelines have been followed.

Special Meeting of the Divisional Senate Assembly, May 15, 2008

---

## NEWS FROM THE COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

### **Council on Faculty Welfare**

The Council on Faculty Welfare (CFW) met with EVC & Provost Gottfredson on April 15 to discuss several issues that are relevant to faculty welfare. The Council followed up on its previous correspondence to the Senate Chair and the Administration regarding:

- A request for faculty salary data for each year from October 1998 to April 2008
- budget estimates for 2008-09 and how the faculty salary scales will be affected
- the recommended use and success of Career Equity Reviews
- faculty housing issues including: ways to improve the management of University Hills; the responsiveness and transparency of ICHA operations; the logistics of pairing faculty with homes of suitable size and price; and future development plans for on and off campus housing

We are happy to report that all of the data Academic Personnel makes use of in its analysis of equity issues (available on the web at <http://www.ap.uci.edu/Equity/index.html>), has been recently shared with the Council and we are looking forward to sharing our conclusions with the Cabinet and Administration when our analysis has been completed.

We are reviewing a proposal for an Ethics Committee that the UCI Emeriti Association and CFW's Subcommittee on Emeriti Affairs has presented. The final proposal, with the Council's endorsement, will be forwarded to the Senate Cabinet for discussion.

### **Council on Educational Policy**

We continue with reviews of programs. The School of Biological Sciences has received a copy of the external review report. We are planning for our reviews next year of Upper- and Lower-Division writing and of the First-Year Integrated Program, FIP. FIP is a three-quarter multidisciplinary sequence for freshman which fulfills some breadth requirements and a lower-division writing requirement. This year we will review the U-Teach program, in which undergraduates, under the guidance of a faculty advisor, teach a lower-division seminar to other undergraduates.

At the end of this academic year, the Council on Educational Policy is thinking of issues to address next year. To that end we met with Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Michael R. Gottfredson. Among other topics, we discussed the organization of the campus by School, the allocation of teaching assistants across units, the wisdom of creating new majors for undergraduates, and the extent to which our culture on campus values teaching. We would much appreciate your advice on the issues we should address that would best improve education on campus.

### **Graduate Council**

Graduate Council (GC) has proposed that the Graduate Student Housing Guarantee Policy be revised to include late admits. The policy currently states that all PhD and MFA students who are able to meet the May 1<sup>st</sup> Student Housing deadline are guaranteed housing for a term of one year less than normative time to degree. Students who are unable to meet the May 1<sup>st</sup> deadline, by possibly no fault of their own (e.g. international students who have problems with their visas), are ineligible for the guarantee.

According to GC's proposed revision, late admit students who are unable to meet the May 1<sup>st</sup> deadline, or who are unable to arrive at campus by fall, would not be immediately guaranteed a housing assignment when they arrive on campus. However, once student housing became available, they would remain eligible to receive the guaranteed housing offer for normative time to degree minus one year from the starting date of their academic programs. GC hopes their proposal will be approved as policy and continues to work with the Administration on this important issue.

### **Council on Research, Computing and Libraries**

This Spring CORCL will review 62 single and multi investigator grant applications from all of the Schools at UC Irvine. The number of applications is up significantly compared to recent past years. CORCL expects to opine on a number of Campus Center and Research Unit renewals and designations. The UCI Libraries have also informed CORCL about new projects including Next Generation Melvyl and the new NIH Open Access Policy.

### **Council on Student Experience**

The Council on Student Experience has been involved in reporting on ways that teaching is evaluated at UC Irvine, and has suggested a more effective process for the evaluation of teaching. CSE has recommended to the Cabinet that instructors might improve the response rate of evaluations by emphasizing the importance of evaluations and reminding students that evaluation ratings and comments could lead to future improvements in the course content, textbook, syllabi etc. CSE also recommended that in addition to student evaluations, other equally important methods of evaluation and documentation be used for judging teaching whenever possible including:

1. opinions of other faculty who are knowledgeable in the field based on class visitation and performance of students in the class;
2. data regarding the number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate and of those attracted to the campus by the candidate's repute as a teacher; and
3. evidence demonstrating the development of new and effective techniques of instruction, including techniques that meet the needs of student from groups that are underrepresented in the field of instruction.

---

### **RELOCATION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE**

The Academic Senate Office will be relocating to the third floor of Berkeley Place South this summer.

This will be followed by another and final move to 307 Aldrich Hall (Administration Building) in the summer of 2009.