November 15, 2013

Professor Jan Reiff  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Revisions to APM 600: Faculty Welfare Committee Response

Dear Professor Reiff,

The Faculty Welfare Committee reviewed the proposed revisions to the APM (Academic Personnel Manual) 600.

No issues were identified with the proposed revisions and therefore, the committee raised no objections.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the proposal. If you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at kominski@ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Gerald Kominski

Gerald Kominski  
Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee

cc: Joel Aberbach, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Linda Sarna, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Maya Moore, FWC Policy Specialist  
Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee
November 1, 2013

Professor Jan Reiff
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Revisions to APM 600: Council on Planning and Budget Response

Dear Professor Reiff,

The Council on Planning and Budget reviewed the proposed revisions to the APM (Academic Personnel Manual) 600 at our meeting on November 4, 2013.

No issues were identified with the proposed revisions and therefore, the Council raised no objections.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the proposal. If you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at rbecerra@ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Rosina Becerra
Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Joel Aberbach, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
Linda Sarna, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
To: Jan Reiff, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Fr: Christina Palmer, Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee

Date: November 19, 2013

Re: College FEC response to the proposed revisions to APM 290 (Regents’ Professors and Regents’ Lecturers), APM 510 (Intercampus Transfers), APM 650 (Technical Assistance Projects), APM 661 (Additional Compensation/Summer Session Teaching), APM 662 (Additional Compensation/Additional Teaching), and APM 666 (Additional Compensation/Lectures and Similar Services)

The College FEC appreciates the opportunity to review the proposed changes to the Academic Personnel Manual in the areas related to compensation. Our discussion at the FEC’s November 15, 2013 meeting was aided by Lauren Na, Director of College Academic Personnel, who joined us to provide clarification about the proposed changes. While the committee did not elect to endorse changes with a formal vote, I recount here a brief summary of the points that were made during our discussion:

1. APM 290: In the current version, funds to compensate the Regent’s Professors or Regent’s Lecturers come from the Office of the President. This has been deleted because UCOP no longer distributes general fund allocations. No new language is proposed and the assumption is that the Chancellor would provide the funds to compensate these individuals. While there is a process that involves the administration and faculty in the selection of these individuals, given that the university will be directly responsible for their compensation, we would like some new language inserted that provides reassurance that Regent’s Professors and Lecturers cannot be imposed on a campus. Also, in section 290-1(A)(1), the FEC requests clarification of the term “vicinity.”

2. APM 510: The committee asks for clarification of “Indexed Compensation Level” used in 510-18(B). This term is new to the text and not defined.

3. APM 650: No comment.

4. APM 661: The committee recommends a revision of the sentence in 661-16(B), “Compensation for fiscal-year appointees may not exceed one-twelth per month of the annual salary,” since the intention appears to be meant to permit one-twelth of the annual salary per month of teaching. One committee member also raised the concern that setting a maximum amount of compensation for summer ‘teaching’, as the proposed changes do, focuses exclusively on non-field-based teaching and does not recognize that summer session ‘teaching’ is not always confined to the classroom. For example, there are faculty in the College who teach field-based summer courses where they supervise and are present with students for an extended period of time (e.g. field work). We recommend a mechanism for properly compensating faculty who exceed the typical number of contact hours with students.
5. **APM 662:** The committee felt the changes to APM 662 are premature since the University has yet to memorialize policies governing online education. Depending on the course (and possibly the discipline), excellent online training and educational opportunities are only possible with significant additional investment by the instructor. For example, absent face-to-face interaction, it may take more time for an instructor to assess student comprehension, to understand sources of confusions, and to prompt and guide students in their own understanding of the material. Some members felt the current changes appear conservative and errantly equate instructional hours for online courses in the same way as instructional hours for in-person or hybrid courses. As one member pointed out, online courses are similar to developing and publishing a multi-media textbook—textbooks require an immense amount of time to develop the material. For some courses, the development of the online material may be sufficient and require little or no ongoing engagement with students; while for other courses, development of the online material is only part of the teaching enterprise. In sum, members recommend delaying changes to APM 662 until an online policy is developed and questions of workload are addressed.

In APM 662, we also note that self-supporting programs (SSPs) are discussed and that in section 662-16 it explicitly states that teaching within an SSP can be considered part of a faculty member’s normal teaching load if the department Chair makes this assignment. However, this discussion seems incompatible with more recent discussions that describe teaching in SSPs as outside of the normal teaching load expectations of faculty. The FEC recommends this discrepancy be addressed before formal approval of these changes.

6. **APM-666:** No comments

As always, our membership appreciates the consultative process and welcomes the opportunity to opine on important matters like this. You are welcome to contact me at cpalmer@mednet.ucla.edu with questions. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Lucy Blackmar, Associate College Dean, College of Letters and Science
November 7, 2013

Jaime Balboa
Chief Administrative Officer
UCLA Academic Senate

RE: Proposed Revisions to APM 600

Dear Jaime Balboa,

The David Geffen School of Medicine Faculty Executive Committee (DGSOM FEC) reviewed and discussed the proposed revisions to APM 600 at its meeting of November 6, 2013.

The Committee concurs with Linda Sarna that UCLA not support the revisions of APM 661, 662-17.b.ii, and 664 but likewise has no objections to the other modifications and agrees the APM needs updating to be consistent with the anticipated UC Path.

Sincerely,

Jonathan S. Jahr, M.D.
Chair of the Faculty (DGSOM Faculty Executive Committee)
Professor of Clinical Anesthesiology, Step VI
David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA
Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center
757 Westwood Plaza, Suite 3325
Los Angeles, California 90095
310.267.8678 f 310.267.3899
js Jahr@mednet.ucla.edu
To: Jan Reiff, Chair, 
UCLA Academic Senate 

From: Jean-François Blanchette, Chair, 
GSE&IS Faculty Executive Committee 

Date: October 31, 2013 

Re: Senate Item for Review—Revisions to APM 600 

On behalf of the Faculty Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, I write in response to your request for comments on the proposed revisions to APM 600. The GSE&IS FEC met on October 16, 2013, and expressed concern with item 662-17-b, which provides rules for calculating time limits for compensation for additional teaching. The rules specify metrics of equivalence between the time required to teach traditional, “hybrid in-person”, and “fully online” courses. In particular, it specifies that “for fully online courses, hours will ordinarily be determined under the assumption that online courses require workloads equivalent to the same or similar in-person course formats.” 

Members of the Committee observed that the institutional rules and structures for online teaching are gradually being put in place within the UC system (see for example the Report of the 2013 UCLA Special Programs Task Force). Proposed item 662.17-b specifies metrics whose impact vastly exceeds the limited context of compensation for additional teaching. Rather than spread such rules and definitions across various administrative documents likely to go unnoticed by faculty, the Committee suggests that such rules would be best put in documents that comprehensively and coherently address the institutional changes required by the development of online teaching. 

The Committee endorsed the proposed changes, contingent on revisions to APM 662, item 17-b. 

If you have any questions concerning this response, please do not hesitate to contact me. 

cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO Academic Senate 
Marcelo Suárez-Orozco, Dean, GSE&IS.
November 22, 2013

TO: Jan Reiff, Chair Academic Senate

FROM: Scott J. Brandenberg, Chair, HSSEAS Faculty Executive Committee

RE: Revisions to APM 600

The proposed revisions to APM 600 were discussed during the November 1st HSSEAS Faculty Executive Committee meeting. We realized in our discussion that we overlooked this issue last Spring when it was originally proposed for faculty input, and the information was not routed to the FEC members and we did not discuss it previously. As a result, our members were not familiar with the proposed revisions, and we have no comments to contribute on this issue.
Jamie Balboa

The FEC of TTV was unable to meet as a group, however all members were sent the matters to be considered for their review. For the most part there was no objection to the matters at hand, with one exception, that being the bundling of all special programs. It was noted that not all units have the demonstrated capacity to produce on-line content, and with that the caution that TFT maintain control of our own services.

Respectfully submitted,

Hal Ackerman, FEC Chair
Dear Professors,

Last year, we were asked to review and opine upon the proposed changes to APM 600, which was revised in anticipation of the UC Path rollout. As some of you will recall, a review of APM 600 was conducted last spring. In response to Academic Senate concerns, UCOP’s Academic Personnel Office has issued an annotated, redlined version of the proposed changes (revisions that elicited no comment or concern in the prior round of review are not included). Please note that three pdfs are attached: (1) Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Jacob’s letter, along with Vice Provost Carlson’s request for review and the Academic Council’s response to last spring’s review; (2) the review materials, including the existing APMs under review and annotated and redlined versions showing the proposed changes and (3) the response UCLA submitted to last year’s proposal (along with the response by the Council on Planning and Budget, upon which the campus response was based).

The Executive Board will review the proposed revisions, along with comments from committees, at its meeting on November 21, 2013, in order to respond by the systemwide due date of November 25, 2013. Therefore, we ask that you please respond by Friday, November 15, 2013. Please address your response to Senate Chair Jan Reiff, with a copy to me. Responses are most helpful when they include a clear statement of endorsement of the proposal, a statement of endorsement contingent upon revisions, or a statement of opposition to the proposal. Committees may also decline to comment or raise no objections.

Sincerely,
Jaime

Jaime Ronaldo Balboa, Ph.D.
Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate
www.senate.ucla.edu
T. (310) 825-3852
F. (310) 206-5273