November 29, 2012

Robert Powell
Chair, Academic Council

Re: APM 430 Proposal

Dear Bob,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine upon the proposed APM 430. I requested review from the Council on Planning and Budget, the Council on Research, the Graduate Council, the Undergraduate Council, and the Faculty Executive Committees. I have attached their responses, for your information.

UCLA is not opposed to the proposal in principle, but cannot support it in its current form. Chief among our concerns are the following:

1. No compelling rationale for the creation of the policy was articulated. Existing policies and practices at UCLA appear to be adequate for regulating both visiting students and academic personnel. We are not aware of any compelling difficulties being addressed by the creation of the APM 430, and are therefore reluctant to endorse it.

2. The draft policy requires a statement that it does not supersede campus policies. UCLA has a well articulated Visiting Graduate Researcher policy (see attached). The policy is in a three year pilot period and is enabling us to gather important data on visiting graduate researchers, applicable fees, and the like. It may well be that UCLA will have a policy that can inform the formation of a systemwide policy on the matter.

3. Faculty are concerned that the APM is being modified to regulate non-employees in the UC. It strikes us that the APM is best reserved for policies governing employees.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review this proposed policy. We would be happy to review it again, when these important concerns have been addressed.

Sincerely,

Linda Sarna
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Cc: Carole Goldberg, Vice Chancellor, UCLA Academic Personnel
    Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Jaime R. Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate
Deans, Directors, Department Chairs, and Senate Faculty:

I am pleased to announce a new campus policy for Visiting Graduate Researchers (VGRs). The Graduate Council, Deans’ Council and EVC/Provost have endorsed implementing this policy as a four-year pilot program. As part of this policy, VGR appointments will be made through the Graduate Division, rather than the International Education Office, beginning July 23, 2012 for visits that will commence on or after September 24, 2012.

The VGR policy applies to individuals, both domestic and international, who are enrolled as degree-seeking graduate students at their home institutions and who are invited to conduct short-term doctoral research or participate in a "prescribed course of study" such as a mentored or independent research project or master’s research collaborations with a faculty member at UCLA. The initial VGR appointment can range from 3 weeks to 12 months; the maximum stay is 24 months.

The posted chart describes the elements of the VGR program, along with the existing No Degree Objective (NDO) mechanism for visiting students. For the fee schedule, please visit here. The schedule includes specific fees that were approved by the Office of Academic Planning and Budget and vetted by the Graduate Council and Deans’ Council. At the Provost’s direction, it also includes a VGR supplemental fee of $535 per quarter. Taken together, the total fees for an international student visiting for 12 months in 2012-13 will be the same as they were in 2011-12. Please note that students whose current health insurance does not meet the UCLA minimum coverage requirements will need to purchase the supplemental health insurance.

Key features of the VGR policy:

- Allows a VGR to conduct research at UCLA for a minimum of three weeks to a maximum of two years. The initial appointment would be for up to one year and could be renewed through the Graduate Division for a second year contingent on approval by the mentor and the availability of appropriate resources.

- Requires the faculty mentor, host department and the Graduate Division, in coordination with Dashew Center for International Students and Scholars or other appropriate campus visa office, to vet the VGR appointment.

- Requires faculty mentors to be members of the Academic Senate, i.e., eligible to mentor doctoral students.

- Places no specific limit on the number of VGRs a faculty member can sponsor at one time. Department chairs are empowered to decline to authorize appointments if they have concerns.

- Allows the VGR to receive fellowship stipends from UCLA funding sources or engage in up to 20 hours of employment at UCLA (50% work appointment in specific title codes such as a Staff Research Associate) subject to visa limitations.

- Enables VGRs to enroll in UNEX courses or UCLA courses via concurrent enrollment (which requires faculty permission to enroll) at existing fee-per-unit rates.

- Provides the VGR with a BruinCard, UID, BOL account, and library access (fees to be paid by the student, faculty mentor or host department).
• Requires the VGR to have health benefits coverage through the Visiting Scholar Injury and Sickness Insurance Plan (VSISP). The VGR can opt out if he or she can demonstrate equivalency of coverage.

• Requires the VGR to comply with relevant campus policies including intellectual property, and lab safety training.

The Graduate Division will begin to accept VGR appointment requests on July 23, 2012. For information about the application process and requirements, please visit [here](#). Individual faculty who would like to host a visitor but who have concerns about their or their visitor’s ability to pay the required fees should contact their school or divisional dean, who will work with me to identify appropriate resources.

Sincerely,

Robin L. Garrell  
Vice Provost for Graduate Education  
Dean, Graduate Division
November 14, 2012

Professor Linda Sarna  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Proposed New Policy, APM 430, Visiting Scholars: Council on Planning and Budget Response

Dear Professor Sarna,

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed the proposed APM 430, Visiting Scholar Policy, at our meeting of October 22, 2012. No clear statement was presented of the problem that this APM was designed to solve or respond to, other than being “responsive to campus requests”.

Since a number of CPB members have routinely utilized a title of Visiting Scholar for appointments of visiting faculty for terms typically one year or less, it was not clear to the Council that a new APM was necessary for this constituency. In fact, we currently are able to request an appointment of up to two years for visiting scholars, and the proposed APM would be more restrictive, limiting the appointment to one year. The inclusion of students in the policy also appears to create a potential for circumventing enrollment of students to avoid some costs associated with the existing policy on Visiting Graduate Researchers. The Council expressed concern that the utilization of an appointment category for visiting students that precluded compensation from the University of California may contribute to reduced diversity and access, as the student or sponsoring University would have to provide full support for the term of the visit. Since this may not be a significant issue for visiting faculty, treating students and faculty equally in the single APM is unwise.

In summary, CPB does not see a clearly defined and valid rationale for creating an APM for Visiting Scholars, particularly one that simultaneously attempts to include both students and faculty. Existing policies and practices at UCLA appear to be adequate for appointing visiting students and faculty, and we are not aware of any difficulties being expressed by UCLA faculty that would be mitigated by the proposed APM 430.

Sincerely,

Neal Garrett  
Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Jan Reiff, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Andy Leuchter, 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
MEMORANDUM

November 14, 2012

FROM: Timothy R. Tangherlini, Chair, COR
TO: Academic Senate
RE: APM 430

The Council on Research has considered the proposed system-wide APM 430, a policy that would “create a new title to accommodate domestic and international visitors who are students enrolled in universities in the United States and abroad, or academics employed at institutions visiting the University of California for a short-term academic or cultural exchange experience.”

In its broadest formulation, COR supports this initiative, and believes that the flexibility for short-term visitors encapsulated in this proposal is one that helps foster the type of research environment that we support here at UCLA. We believe that this title will be particularly useful to various units on campus that hold short-term workshops, such as the Institute for Pure and Applied Mathematics, that have their own rigorous review process and regulations concerning participation. As this title augments, rather than replaces, the existing campus options for visitors, we believe that this increased flexibility is a positive addition as we move to support complex research projects here on campus.

That said, COR also recognizes that APM 430 raises a possible conflict with a pre-existing local policy governing Visiting Graduate Researchers. Although we largely support the VGR policy as an important and necessary control protecting the rights and responsibilities of visiting graduate researchers, it has been brought to our attention that the VGR policy can saddle attendees at short term workshops with high fees that may not be appropriate for their stay (e.g. a health services fee for a student at another university campus who has health insurance may not be appropriate for an attendee at a three week workshop). The VGR policy also has fairly onerous restrictions concerning IP agreements that may dissuade potential graduate students from participating in these educational opportunities. Several members of council pointed out that PI’s might be very reluctant to allow their graduate students to attend workshops at UCLA if their status required such an IP agreement. Currently, sponsors of short-term projects or workshops must seek individual exemptions from the VGR policy to avoid duplicate work, unnecessary fees, and/or onerous IP agreements. We believe that the adaptation of the APM 430 policy, with its flexible “Visiting Scholars” title, may help alleviate some of this burden.
To: Linda Sarna, Chair/Academic Senate

From: Joseph Nagy, Chair/Graduate Council

Date: November 15, 2012

Re: Senate Item for Review – Proposed New APM 430, Visiting Scholars

At its meetings on October 12 and November 9, 2012, the Graduate Council reviewed the proposed new policy for visiting scholars (APM 430) as distributed by UC Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Susan Carlson. Despite our lengthy discussions, no vote was taken, given the general confusion about the origins of the proposed policy and its impact on existing policies for “visiting” categories at UCLA. With this response, I register the Council’s general consensus that: 1) the policy as proposed is much too vague and all-encompassing to serve the UCLA campus well; and 2) its restrictive conditions that prohibit compensation and limit visits to more than one year will likely not serve other UC campuses well either.

The distribution of this newly proposed policy immediately following our own Division’s implementation (as a three-year pilot program) of an even more elaborate and granular policy caused significant confusion and skepticism. Given our existing categories of “Visiting Scholar,” “Visiting Graduate Researcher,” and “Visiting Undergraduate Students” (as overseen by the office of the UCLA Vice Chancellor for Research), the proposed one-size-fits-all APM 430 confuses matters in regard to the different types of “academic visitors” that may come to a UC campus, as well as in regard to their varying needs for campus services and privileges.

Much of the confusion centers on the potential implementation of this policy and whether it would be mandatory or optional at each campus. Could, for example, faculty who wish to sponsor a student and not pay the associated fees to appoint them as a VGR opt to appoint the student as an APM 430 Visiting Scholar, understanding that the visiting student would not be eligible for any form of compensation and would be restricted to an appointment of no more than twelve months? Will the Division provide guidance on this matter if the policy is approved and implemented at UCLA? Or would it require the elimination of existing “visiting” categories, for which administrative frameworks already exist? Would such an action be operationally efficient and meet the needs of every campus in the UC system?

At the very least, members felt that a preamble should be added to the policy to clarify its intent, how far-reaching it is, and to what extent campuses with existing definitions and corresponding categories are bound by it. Additionally, given the consensus that the policy is much too broad, members endorsed a recommendation to refine it and make distinctions between current degree-candidates and advanced scholars who have already received a terminal degree. For lack of any background information, members could only surmise that the intent of the policy was to create a broad definition for campuses...
without existing frameworks for accommodating “visiting scholars,” but its very broadness will ultimately serve to complicate matters when those campuses are confronted with questions about compensation and extended durations of a visiting scholar’s stay at the University. Hence members of the Graduate Council cannot endorse the proposed policy in its current form.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on this important matter.

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Assistant CAO, Academic Senate
    Kyle Cunningham, Policy Analyst, Graduate Council
    Dorothy Ayer, Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
November 16, 2012

To: Professor Linda Sarna, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Professor Troy Carter, Chair
      Undergraduate Council

Re: Undergraduate Council Response to Proposed New Policy APM 430: Visiting Scholars

On behalf of the Undergraduate Council, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review and opine on the proposed new policy, APM 430: Visiting Scholars. The Council thoroughly reviewed and discussed the proposal at its October 19, 2012 meeting. While the Council decided to raise no objections to the proposal, our discussion noted the following concerns:

- Although the policy does not address this fee, Council members are aware of a $3,000 fee paid by Visiting Scholars at UCLA. Perhaps the policy should indicate that fees may be collected from visitors carrying this status. It is also not clear to the membership how this fee is determined or how the funds are allocated.

- Members are concerned that section 430-18b of the policy, which requires visiting scholars to be self-funded, could potentially limit the number of visiting scholars from developing countries. This may have long-term implications in regards to the diversity of visiting scholars. Allowing for a mix of funding – partial from home institution or country, with some support from the University of California – might be warranted.

If you have any questions, please contact me (x54770; tcarter@physics.ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Policy Analyst Melissa Spagnuolo (x51194; mspagnuolo@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Dorothy Ayer, Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
    Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Melissa Spagnuolo, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
To: Linda Sarna, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
Fr: Michael Meranze, Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee
Date: November 13, 2012
Re: College FEC response to the proposed creation of APM 430 (Visiting Scholars) and revisions to APM 700 (Leaves of Absence)

The College FEC appreciates the opportunity to review and opine on the creation of section 430 (Visiting Scholars) and the proposed revisions to section 700 (Leaves of Absence) of the Academic Personnel Manual. We discussed the proposals at our November 9, 2012 meeting, and I recount here a brief summary of the points that were made during that discussion:

1. **APM 430**: Members generally agreed on the importance of creating a formal system that can accommodate visiting scholars on UC campuses; however, the APM is reserved for policies that pertain to the employment relationship between academic appointees and the University of California. APM 430’s explicit statement that Visiting Scholars are not academic employees of the University suggests the policy does not belong in the APM.

2. **APM 700**: A concern was raised about the adoption of the phrase “absence from duty,” which suggests the absence of a work product (e.g. teaching, research, service). We believe the APM should include a definition of “absence from duty” in the same manner that “leaves of absence” are defined in 700-8.

3. **APM 700**: Members were concerned about the proposed 30 day trigger. It is more conventional in employment matters such as these to allow 90 to 180 days before the process begins. The FEC could imagine various scenarios where a 30 day trigger might lead to a premature start of the process. Given that once the process is started, the burden falls on the faculty member to prove that s/he has not resigned, this short trigger seems unjustified.

4. **APM 700**: While members were not necessarily opposed to the remedies proposed under APM 700, several wondered whether there was a genuine need for such a policy and why other provisions in the APM (e.g. APM 016: University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline, or APM 075: Termination for Incompetent Performance) could not be used to handle situations where academic appointees abandon their teaching, research, or service responsibilities.

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 meranze@history.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, Interim Associate College Dean, College of Letters and Science
Dear Jaime,

Visiting Scholars

GSEIS’s FEC saw no particular impact from the changes proposed in the Visiting Scholars program.
RESPONSE OF THE HSSEAS FEC TO THE PROPOSED NEW UC APM 430

Date: November 14, 2012

To: Linda Sarna
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: Alan Laub
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
UCLA Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science

Re: Assessment of the proposed APM 430 on Visiting Scholars

The UCLA SEAS FEC has considered the proposed new policy on UC Visiting Scholars, documented as APM 430 and available at http://fec.ea.ucla.edu/f12_fec_documents-jan_joe/Transmittal%20Letter%20for%20Proposed%20New%20Policy%20APM%20430%20Visiting%20Scholars.pdf. We offer the following commentary.

The SEAS FEC appreciates the development of this new UC title and policy, designed "to accommodate domestic and international visitors who are students enrolled in universities in the United States and abroad, and academics employed at other institutions who are visiting the University of California for short-term academic or cultural exchange experiences." The SEAS FEC agrees with the constraints on such visitors described in this new policy, i.e., the time limit for visitation of 12 months (with the possibility of extension by exception), that visitors be ineligible for compensation from the University of California, and that they may be eligible for reimbursement of business and travel expenses.

We believe that this policy is fair and appropriate, especially for the increasing numbers of graduate students from other institutions who wish to visit UC campuses to perform research for a short duration. The prohibition on compensation for these visitors from UC sources is entirely appropriate in that it will avoid the potential for disadvantaging our own UC graduate students, who necessarily must have their tuition and benefits covered, in addition to salary. We do not want to make employment of visiting students so financially attractive to faculty and/or departments as to limit opportunities for our own graduate students. It is also important, of course, to verify that these visiting students have sufficient support for their stay at the campus.

We do note, however, that some campuses such as ours impose fees to cover necessary campus staff time, etc., that are associated with processing paperwork and otherwise accommodating such visiting students (see
http://www.gdnet.ucla.edu/gss/postdoc/vgrfees.htm, for example). If these visitors do not have funds to cover these fees, one might consider allowing the ability for research grant funds, for example, to cover these fees.
Dear Jaime:

The School of Arts and Architecture Faculty Executive Committee welcomes the opportunity to opine on APM 430 Visiting Scholars Policy. The SOAA FEC endorses the proposed changes with revisions.

While SOAA FEC recognizes the need for clarity and specificity regarding visiting scholars versus other academic positions, such as those funded by the university, the current wording is ambiguous. It appears to apply to all academic visitors, from undergraduate students to visiting faculty. We would therefore request that the policy be clearer in its definition of the term ‘scholars.’ In addition, it appears unclear from the documentation how the title of visiting scholar is conferred. We would urge greater clarity in the policy regarding the process through which a visiting academic receives the title visiting scholar.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine on APM 430.

Best Regards,
Janet O’Shea
Chair, SOAA FEC
UCLA SCHOOL OF THEATER, FILM, AND TELEVISION

FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

S.I. Salamensky, Chair (ss@tft.ucla.edu)

REPORT TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE, NOVEMBER 9, 2012:

Proposal Paper: APM 430, Visiting Scholars

Response: We endorse this initiative.