In Re: Proposed Updates to Appendices 18 & 24 of The CALL

Dear Tom,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine on the proposed changes to the CALL. The Executive Board, which speaks for the Senate on such matters, sought the advice of the Committee on Privilege & Tenure and the Council on Academic Personnel before developing its position. Although CAP chose not to comment and P&T was supportive of both of the proposals, the Executive Board only supports the proposal to make Appendix 24 reflect the current language of the Academic Personnel Manual. We recommend no changes to Appendix 18 at this time. With respect to the proposed changes to Appendix 18, the Board raised the following questions and concerns.

- At UCLA, endowed chairs, with limited exceptions (Term Chairs), are appointed for “an indefinite period of time” (APM 191.C.2). That same section of the APM states that the Chancellor may reassign a chair in accordance with campus procedures, including consultation with the Academic Senate (italics added). For a number of reasons, including academic freedom, an exceptionally high bar must be set in order to initiate a process to reassign a chair: for example, a finding by P&T of egregious violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct by the chair-holder. The suggested revisions to the CALL, App. 18, §I(A).4, would seem to broaden both the basis for such an action, and also who could propose the action. We are very concerned about the provision, “for good cause, including for reason of performance, the Dean, in consultation with a Department, may initiate a process to reassign the chair, …which includes removal of the current chair…The removal is subject to a faculty vote…” This is a very wide door through which interpersonal conflict, campus politics, bias (demographic, disciplinary), and even decanal exigencies could pass. In sum, although members agreed that the final decision to reassign a chair must rest with the chancellor, members also stressed that the decision to initiate a process whereby one is removed must also rest with the chancellor.

- Currently, there is no cycle for reviewing chair-holders, five-year or otherwise. Absent a compelling rational for initiating such reviews, the Board finds the proposal inadvisable.

- Members opined that no compelling reasons were made evident to the Board for the articulation of such a specific policy. Surely the need to remove a chair is a rare occasion, and we are reluctant to create legislation to cover rare events. Moreover, it seems that existing disciplinary policies vis-à-vis the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the Committee on Charges, the Faculty Code of Conduct and related research misconduct policies provide a sufficient administrative framework whereby an endowed chair can be reassigned.
Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine on these matters. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robin L. Garrell
Chair, Academic Senate

Cc: Jaime R. Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate