



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521-0132

January 31, 2020

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Lucille Chia, Chair *Lucille Chia*
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM): APM Sections 240 and 246

The CHASS Executive Committee discussed the Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM): APM Sections 240 and 246 at the regular meeting on January 15, 2020. The CHASS Executive Committee offers the following comments:

1. APM 240-80, section b

--“Five-Year Review and Reappointment” (p. 9 of this part, p. 21 of the entire pdf) does NOT mention the need for a five-year review of deans who are leaving their positions. It would be beneficial for the university to have a five-year review of deans who are leaving their posts.

--Are the annual and five-year reviews of the Deans considered part of their personnel files and thus confidential? This poses a problem in that it deprives the Senate or any other group of the university of useful information about the governance of the school.

--in part (2): Suggest adding to part (2) that “The Chancellor shall develop with consultation with the Senate the criteria and procedures for conducting five-year Faculty Administrative reviews.”

--in part (3): How would the Senate or any other group of the university understand fully whether or not the Dean’s overall performance is judged as “distinguished” or “highly meritorious”?

2. APM Section 246-4, Section C: What does it mean that the Chancellor can designate additional eligible titles as appropriate? Examples?

3. APM Section 246-80 Review Procedures

--Are the annual and five-year reviews of the Faculty Administrators considered part of their personnel files and thus confidential? This poses a problem in that it deprives the Senate or any other group of the university of useful information about the governance of the school.

--Part b. Five-Year Review and Reappointment: Suggest that *all* Faculty Administrators, including those leaving their posts (and not just those up for reappointment) go through a Five-Year

Review, again because such a review, which should be made public, would contain useful information about the governance of the school.

--Suggest adding to part (2) that "The Chancellor shall develop with consultation with the Senate the criteria and procedures for conducting five-year Faculty Administrative reviews."

4. The Committee also wonders about possible inconsistencies in the appointments of faculty members to administrative positions. APM 246 applies only to Faculty Administrators who have a 100% appointment, but not to faculty members who have appointments less than 100%. One observation of the Committee is that although the percentage of the appointment may vary, it seems that the duties/work load did not. We would appreciate an explanation for these variations.