

Senate Spring Quarter Newsletter

This newsletter reports on the work of several special committees, the service award to Amelia Regan, a child care petition, a quiz from the Graduate Council, and some answers to questions regarding Academic Personnel procedures.



Kenneth C. Janda
Senate Chair-Elect, Secretary



[Chancellor Search](#)

[UCI Childcare Petition](#)

[Questions and Answers Regarding Academic Personnel Procedures](#)

[Should UCI have a Provost?](#)

[Report on the Petition to Revise the Faculty Code of Conduct](#)

[School Review Procedures](#)

News from the Universitywide Senate

Review of the Privilege and Tenure Grievance Procedures

Academic Senate's Distinguished Mid-Career Awardee - Amelia Regan

Take the Graduate Council Quiz

- **Chancellor Search:** Three Senate members, Larry Overman, Brook Thomas and Sandra Irani, represented the faculty on the Chancellor search committee. We want to thank them each for this time-consuming service. Like the rest of the campus, we eagerly await President Dynes' decision.
- **UCI Childcare Petition:** While UCI has grown dramatically over the past 15 years, childcare services have not kept pace. The unmet need for infant/toddler care is particularly severe. Currently, 85 faculty and staff are wait-listed for on-campus infant/toddler care. The Faculty Women's Association is asking you to join them in urging the campus administration to make this issue a top priority. You can do this by signing their petition at: <http://tinyurl.com/8vxbm>. In addition, we have added this topic to our Senate discussion forum, in case you would like to transmit specific comments to the Senate and Campus leadership. To join our discussion forum, go to <http://www.senate.uci.edu/>.
- **Questions and Answers Regarding Academic Personnel Procedures:** Recently, a faculty member submitted several questions regarding general policy issues that affect how academic units handle faculty personnel cases. The answers to these questions, given below, were generated following consultation with the Council on Academic Personnel and other knowledgeable persons in the Senate office. Since these questions may be of general interest, we reproduce them below. The Council on Academic Personnel also has the answers to an extensive list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on the CAP web site (<http://www.senate.uci.edu/CAPFAQ04.htm>).

1. Does a departmental member have the right to know the vote (or outcome) on academic personnel cases they have voted on?

It is the general opinion of CAP members that this is a matter of departmental organization. Anecdotal information indicates that different departments handle this differently. It is, however, important that each department have a procedure that is followed that does not vary from case to

case.

2. What is the Department Chair's involvement in the preparation of the Department Letter, whether or not he or she writes a Chair's letter? Can the Chair rewrite or add to the Department Letter? Does the Department Letter go straight to CAP?

In a number of departments, it is the chair who writes the departmental letter. When this occurs the chair's letter should reflect the discussion and "document the vote of the review committee but not identify the voters." (APM 210 e. (1)).

When the chair's letter represents another level of review, the chair's vote should not be included in the departmental vote. If the chair disagrees with the department letter he can address this in his/her letter but he/she cannot alter the departmental letter. The departmental letter and chair's letter are transmitted to the Dean for comment and then forwarded to Academic Personnel where it is reviewed for completeness. After it is logged into the database it is forwarded to CAP for review.

3. Can the Chair be prevented from attending meetings when personnel cases are discussed?

APM 220-80 a. states that "formal consideration of appointments and reappointments, merit increases, appraisals, non-reappointments, and promotions are normally initiated by the department chair, after appropriate consultation with members of the department faculty."

CAP understands that there may be a situation where a faculty member and department chair may be at odds but is unaware of a faculty member's right to ban a chair from the departmental meeting. It is the chair who calls the meeting and his/her participation in the formal discussion is important.

4. Can a unit make extramural funding a requirement for advancement?

It would appear to CAP that this is within the purview of the department in developing its own policy for coming to departmental recommendations on personnel actions. However, since the department's recommendation is not a final decision, in cases where the department's recommendation was negative based solely on lack of extramural funding, the departmental recommendation might not be upheld at other levels of review. CAP has been consistent in treating extramural funding as evidence of promise of research productivity, but not as research productivity in and of itself.

5. What can a faculty member do if the Dean undervalues certain contributions -- conference papers, for example, in certain disciplines?

The value of certain contributions is determined at the Department/School level. It is the faculty member's responsibility to inform his Chair/Dean as to the specific nuances of his publication venues, etc. This information can then be conveyed to other levels of review via the Department, Chair or Dean's letters.

- **Should UCI have a Provost?** A special committee to consider adding a Provost position to the administrative structure has nearly finished its work. This committee consists of Peter Rentzepis, Chair; David Easton; Jennifer Fisher; Michael Selsted; William Sirignano; and Cecile Marie Whiting. The committee interviewed a broad spectrum of past and present UCI leadership to consider whether adding a Provost, or Chief Academic Officer, would benefit the University. A third person at the top of the chain of command could free up time for new initiatives and for the study of some of the hard choices that must be made. The flip side is that it would create a more diffuse decision-making structure. The committee report will discuss some of the pros and cons of adding a Provost. This report will be passed to the new Chancellor as early as possible.
- **Report on the Petition to Revise the Faculty Code of Conduct:** This year, a group of faculty at UCI has begun an effort to change the recently-instituted, universitywide Romantic and Sexual Relationship policy in the Faculty Code of Conduct. The part of the policy they are contesting forbids "Entering into a romantic or sexual relationship with any student for whom a faculty member has, or should reasonably expect to have in the future, academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory)."

At the March Senate meeting, David Theo Goldberg, Ellen Burt and Steven Mailloux presented objections to the current policy which they found too broad and ill-defined to be fairly implemented. While they share the concern prompting the policy that there is a potential for abuse of power in faculty-student relationships and feel that regulation is needed, they also worry that the policy implemented has considerable potential for unfair and arbitrary application, and criminalizes relationships that ought not to be criminalized.

Next year the policy will be brought up for discussion at the UC wide Faculty Welfare Committee through the efforts of UCI's Faculty Welfare Representative, Douglas Haynes. The group has plans to field a virtual exchange on the policy over the web in the fall, and expects to hold a Town Meeting in the winter.

The group has initiated a petition for making it an action item at the Faculty Senate which can be accessed at: <http://www.petitiononline.com/ucicode/>

- **School Review Procedures:** Another important special committee was formed to review the way that we review academic units. This committee was chaired by Kenneth Janda, and committee members were Matthew Foreman, William Reeburgh, Michael Clark, Rudi Berkelhamer, Karen Lawrence and Katherine Haines. After obtaining opinions from a variety of sources, the committee recommends that the current joint review process be retained and optimized. Among the recommendations for improving the procedure were to stretch out the review cycle to ten years, to offer teaching release to the Chair of the Academic Review Program Committee to compensate for the heavy workload, and to upgrade the Chair position to Senate Cabinet level to affirm the importance of the reviews relative to other Senate business. The committee also worked to create a Joint Review Procedures Document. This document has been submitted to the Graduate Council and the Council on Educational Policy for comment. If they approve the proposed changes, a Senate Bylaw will be needed to formalize the changes.
- **News from the Universitywide Senate:** There are two developments at the recent Systemwide Senate Assembly that may be of interest to the UCI faculty. First, the Merced Division was formally approved. This means that they now may form their own Senate. Second, the Assembly voted to approve the Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Source that was a subject of one of our Senate Discussion Forums earlier this year. The essence of this resolution is that academic units may not vote to limit the ability of individual faculty members to accept research funding.
- **Review of the Privilege and Tenure Grievance Procedures:** Members of the Special Committee to Review the Privilege and Tenure Process (Linda Cohen, Chair; Roger Crumley; James Meeker; Robert Newsom) met several times in winter quarter to fulfill the charge from the Divisional Senate Assembly for a thorough investigation to ensure that the rights and privileges of faculty members are maintained. The Committee considered current bylaws and comments from grievants, past CPT Chairs, and the Administration. The Committee plans to submit its findings soon.
- **Academic Senate's Distinguished Mid-Career Awardee - Amelia Regan:** The inaugural recipient of the

Academic Senate's Distinguished Mid-Career Faculty Award for Service is Professor Amelia Regan. An Associate Professor affiliated with the Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Science, the Henry Samueli School of Engineering, the Paul Merage School of Business, and the School of Social Sciences' Transportation Science Graduate Program, Professor Regan has been involved in a wide range of service activities on campus and off, since she first arrived in spring 1997.



Highlights of Professor Regan's service include:

- Academic Senate membership on the Committee on Teaching, the Council on Faculty Welfare, the Faculty Board for Undecided/Undeclared Students, and the Council on Student Experience.
- For the Administration, Professor Regan served as Acting Associate Dean in the Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE) during summer and fall of 2004, and this year she is a member of the search committee for the Dean of DUE.
- Off-campus activities include outreach to the K-12 educational community. Girls Inc., COSMOS, program director and mentor to several CAMP/McNair Scholars are just a few of the mentoring and professional networks that Professor Regan is associated with.
- At the national level, Professor Regan is actively involved in the managerial and editorial activities of the Transportation Research Board. She currently serves as Chair of the Transportation Science and Logistics Section of the Institute for Operations Research and Management Sciences and is past President of Women in Operations Research and Management Sciences. She remains committed to programs that encourage more women to participate in science, math, and engineering.

While pursuing an excellent research and teaching agenda, Professor Regan's service continues to benefit UCI by increasing the campus' visibility in the research and professional community. She is to be commended for her uncommon energy in service to the broad educational mission of UC Irvine.

Information on the other Academic Senate Award recipients is available on the Academic Senate web site at: http://www.senate.uci.edu/5_FacAwards/DFL_Index.html

● **Take the Graduate Council Quiz:**

Are you trying to make changes to your graduate program?

Do you know what changes need to be approved by the Graduate Council?

What needs to be approved in Oakland?

Can you spot the difference between an "emphasis," a "concentration" and a "track"?
What about the difference between a "qualifying exam" and a "comprehensive" exam?
What is the point of Advancement to Candidacy?
Can an exam be the capstone requirement for a Ph.D.?
Has your favorite graduate student gone "Doctoral 2A"?
Do you have GSARs? Is it curable?

If you are designing a new graduate program/degree or planning on proposing modifications to existing degree requirements you will want to consult the Glossary of Terms developed by Carol Sokolov and the Graduate Council. It will give you the definitions and rules used by the Graduate Council to approve changes in and supervise all of the graduate (non-MD) programs on campus. It is available in PDF format at http://www.rgs.uci.edu/grad/students/forms/glossary_of_terms.pdf

