



February 3, 2014

To: George Haggerty, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Helen Henry, Committee on Privilege & Tenure  
Mariam Lam, Committee on Committees  
Kathleen Montgomery, Committee on Academic Freedom  
Ziv Ran, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction  
Georgia Warnke, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Erica Edwards, CHASS Executive Committee  
John Levin, GSOE Executive Committee  
Barry Mishra, SOBA Executive Committee  
Akula Venkatram, BCOE Executive Committee  
Ameae Walker, SOM Executive Committee  
Gillian Wilson, CNAS Executive Committee

Fr: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Wudka".

**Re: Request to revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors.**

Attached please find a request submitted from Professor Karen Pyke, Department of Sociology, to consider a revision to the CAP bylaw. Professor Pyke suggests Associate Professors be allowed to serve on CAP.

Please submit your committee comments and response by March 17, 2014.

January 25, 2014

TO: Committee Chairs,  
Committee on Committees, Mariam Lam,  
Committee on Faculty Welfare, Georgia Warnke  
Cc: Academic Senate Chair Jose Wudka

FROM: Karen Pyke, Associate Professor, Dept. of Sociology

RE: Disenfranchisement of Associate Faculty from CAP Membership

My service as campus representative to the system-wide Faculty Welfare Committee has made me aware of various rules and procedures at UCR not shared with other UC campuses and which have deleterious effects on the welfare and morale of our faculty.

One such UCR rule is that regarding membership on the Committee on Academic Personnel:  
"All members shall hold the rank of full professor...."

source: [http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read\\_bylaws&code=d&section=08.04](http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=d&section=08.04)

UCR's disenfranchisement of associate professors from the most important Academic Senate committee is neither a system-wide practice nor a rule shared at other UC campuses. I have confirmed that Irvine, UCLA, Davis, and San Diego do NOT have such a rule, and I find no evidence of a similar rule at any of the other UC campuses<sup>1</sup>. At UC San Diego, for example, the CAP by-law states: "This committee shall consist of at least ten, but no more than twelve, ordinary members of the Division **holding tenure rank**." Source:

<http://senate.ucsd.edu/manual/bylaws/SDBylaw172.pdf>

As this rule is discriminatory, for reasons I outline below, it should be abandoned. Thus I write you with the hope your committee will endorse a change in CAP membership rules.

Based on data I received from the Executive Director of the Senate in May 2012, of the 680 Academic Senate faculty members, only 212 -- less than one-third -- are women. A disproportionate number of these women faculty are at the associate and assistant ranks. Similarly, the majority of faculty members from historically marginalized racial groups in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The language defining the goals of the Berkeley CAP (called the Budget Committee) suggest they do not disenfranchise associate faculty: "The founding principle of the Budget Committee is that faculty members' records should be reviewed by their *peers*" and "The members of the Budget Committee are appointed by the Committee on Committees, which is elected by the Senate's members." Source (also attached):

[http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/committees/bir/intro\\_to\\_bc.pdf](http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/committees/bir/intro_to_bc.pdf)

U.S. are also at the associate and assistant levels.<sup>2</sup> Hence the rule barring tenured faculty at the associate rank from representation on CAP amounts to institutional gender and race discrimination<sup>3</sup> as it disenfranchises a disproportionate number of tenured faculty who are white women and women and men of color, particularly those of Latino and African American descent.

Additionally, the disenfranchisement of associate professors effectively makes CAP a committee of elites. While CAP membership at UCR is limited to full professors, there is the COC practice of selecting more advanced full professors, often at Step VI or above. For example, when I was serving on COC, the committee chair directed COC members to select from among the most advanced of full professors for CAP service, further exacerbating what is already a problematic practice.

As noted by a fellow sociologist and social psychologist, who is also a College Dean at another UC campus (which does not have this rule), this practice gives the appearance of a conflict of interest for it allows an elite group to make decisions about the rest of the faculty that can have a direct bearing on the maintenance of their own elite status. That is, restricting gatekeeping privileges to elite faculty regarding personnel decisions empowers them to limit the number of faculty who enter their elite group, which it is in their interest to do as the elite status of a group is weakened when more members of the larger population join its ranks. I am not suggesting that this is the practice of the elite members of CAP, or that it is a conscious practice, but simply that having a CAP whose members hail from among the most elite of faculty encourages the appearance of a conflict of interest, thereby undermining faculty morale and confidence in the personnel process.

There is evidence that the elite status of CAP members might encourage greater conservatism regarding personnel policies. Take, for example, the Academic Senate's 2010 review of an off-scale policy requiring those denied a merit to lose their O/S. While the Planning & Budget and Faculty Welfare Committees opposed this policy, noting it contradicts efforts to bring UC salaries to a competitive level, CAP endorsed this punitive measure. (See attached). In fact, UCR

---

<sup>2</sup> While there are several non-white members of the current CAP, all of them grew up in countries where they were members of the racial majority and, further, were hired after securing their education abroad, suggesting their experiences with racial discrimination might be more limited than those of underrepresented faculty of color who grew up and/or were educated in the U.S. Also, none of the current CAP members *appear* to be under-represented faculty of African American or Latino descent.

<sup>3</sup> "Institutional discrimination" refers to structural policies and practices that have the unintended effect of disadvantaging women and/or racial minorities. Institutional discrimination is more covert and tenacious than other forms of discrimination and occurs despite the intent or desires of those perpetuating it. Race and gender inequities that are statistically evident but whose sources are difficult to pinpoint often are the result of institutional forms of discrimination. "As institutional discrimination is built into the normal working relationships of institutions, its perpetuation requires only that people continue 'business as usual.' Its eradication requires much more than good will; it requires active review of the assumptions and practices by which the institution operates, and revision of those found to have discriminatory results. Such an operation cannot be approached casually; inevitably, extra effort is necessary." Source: <http://www.uic.edu/orgs/cwluherstory/jofreeman/womensociety/institidiscrim.htm>

is the only UC campus to have this punitive policy at the same time that UCR faculty salaries are among the lowest of all UC campuses.

Restricting membership of CAP to current full professors can lead to a committee staffed by faculty who never served at UCR in the assistant or associate ranks, but were recruited as full professors from research labs or universities where rules, practices, and conditions can be very different from what they are at UCR. This would seem to undermine the ability of such CAP members to provide an informed evaluation of the personnel files of lower ranked faculty who labor in conditions that might be very different from those experienced by the evaluators. Among the current members of CAP, at least 4 were hired as full professors (Hille, Patterson, Chiarello, Ding), and a fifth, whose rank at hire I cannot determine (Gan), joined UCR after 8 years at a research laboratory. Hence fully half of the current CAP members did not move through the ranks from assistant to full at UCR but joined our campus from another research environment. Among the other five members of CAP, at least one (Haggerty) is at a rank beyond Step VI, which is a milestone marker of distinction within the full professor rank. Thus using the current CAP as an example, there is evidence of bias toward those who came to UCR later in their careers and/or are very advanced full professors.

The emphasis on staffing CAP with full professors likely contributes another bias favoring those who engage faster forms of scholarship and are thus able to produce more research products. Such faculty are more likely to enjoy a faster rise through the ranks.<sup>4</sup> If this is the case, CAP is more likely to be staffed by faculty who engage quantitative methods, and whose research productivity is aided by access to grants, research assistants, and post-docs. Conversely, faculty whose scholarship requires more time would be less likely to serve on CAP, such as creative writers and those who engage qualitative or ethnographic methods that are less likely to be supported with grants, course-buyouts, and the support of research assistants and post-docs. White women faculty and women and men faculty who are Latino and African American are disproportionately represented in those areas of scholarship that engage slower methods, and where research productivity does not occur at the same pace as in STEM and similar fields. Thus restricting CAP members to full professors can create a skewed CAP membership of faculty who engage faster research methods. This can further contribute a bias not only against faculty in general who engage qualitative and non-positivist forms of scholarship, but also against a disproportionate number of faculty in legally protected categories. This suggests yet another mechanism by which the rule banning associate faculty from participation on CAP is a mechanism of institutional gender and race discrimination, while also undermining the earning capacity and morale of all faculty engaged in slower research methods.

---

<sup>4</sup> UCR has the highest per capita number of publications among all the UC campuses. Given that UCR is not ranked among the top UCs, this suggests UCR puts more emphasis on volume of research products than quality, otherwise the high volume of UCR research products would better correlate with its reputation relative to other UC campuses. An evaluative standard based on number of research products can create a hard choice for faculty who engage slower research methods: they can opt to publish a higher number of lower quality research products so as to move through the ranks and win wage increases (at the expense, however, of building their national reputation), or they can publish fewer higher quality works that enhance one's national reputation (as well as that of their department/campus) but at the sacrifice of personal wages. (Berkeley addresses this by allowing completed chapters toward a book in progress to serve as a measure of productivity. Source: see attached, also footnote 1.)

Looking at current CAP membership for evidence of such a bias, there are 7 members who engage quantitative, positivist research methods, mostly in grant-supported lab settings, while only 3 members engage qualitative or ethnographic scholarship. While it is possible for members of CAP who come from labs and engage quantitative methods to be supportive and understanding of other kinds of scholarship, the very composition of this CAP gives the appearance of a bias that can hurt faculty morale and confidence in the personnel process.

When I've shared concern about the discriminatory CAP policy, some full professors have countered that it would be inappropriate for associate faculty to evaluate the files of full professors. Yet it is not deemed problematic under current practices to have full professors on CAP evaluate full professors of higher rank. Further, extending this logic would seem to require that we also deem it inappropriate to have faculty in STEM fields evaluate the files of those in the Humanities, and vice versa. Before any justification for the disenfranchisement of associate faculty from CAP can be entertained, its logic should be tested to ensure it applies to any and all CAP practices and policies, not just those pertaining to associate faculty.

Some faculty argue that the rule banning associate faculty members a voice on CAP is designed to protect associate faculty from the high service load. While one should be suspicious of paternalistic policies that effectively deny access to power or equity, in this case the alleged protection offered by this policy is challenged by the fact that CAP is the only Senate committee that rewards non-Chair membership with a course release.

Indeed, it is noteworthy that the current Chair of Committee on Committees is an associate professor woman of color who can, according to Senate rules, Chair this committee but is barred from having a voice on CAP. As Committee on Committees is the second most time-consuming Academic Senate committee at UCR, (according to a Senate study conducted around 2005, when I served on COC as a newly-tenured faculty member) the argument that this rule aims to protect associate professors from a service over-load simply does not hold water. Prohibiting associate professors from serving on CAP effectively denies them access to compensation for their non-Chair Senate service, reserving such compensation only for full professors, while allowing associate professors to serve on other high demand committees, including as campus representatives on system-wide committees, without compensation.

Because the Senate surveys faculty about their willingness to serve on committees, it would be easy for COC to only recruit associate faculty members for CAP who volunteer for such service, ensuring associate faculty are not pressured to serve. I suspect that we would still have a CAP membership that draws mostly from the ranks of the full professoriate, but allowing associates to serve if they should desire can enhance morale and confidence, promote a commitment to "peer" review, and allow greater inclusivity in Senate decision-making processes.

I hope your committee will consider these arguments and move to endorse a change in CAP membership rules.

## INTRODUCTION TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Updated February, 2006

The Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations is a committee of Berkeley's Academic Senate. Its name is misleading: it is an academic personnel committee, not a fiscal oversight committee.

### 1. History.

The founding principle of the Budget Committee is that faculty members' records should be reviewed by their peers. This is a principle that was first articulated in the early twentieth century during a faculty revolt against an autocratic administration. Prior to this revolt, the UC president appointed all deans and department chairs, as well as the members of the Academic Senate's committees. Consultation with deans and chairs was usually perfunctory, and faculty salaries were set by the central administration. Spurred by national agitation for academic reform and by the creation of the American Association of University Professors, the UC faculty called a meeting of the Academic Senate to demand faculty election of all deans and chairs and creation of a standing committee to confer with the president concerning appointment, promotions, tenure, salaries, and related matters.

The resulting Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations was created in 1920 "to confer with the President concerning the University budget, and to make recommendations to him respecting promotions, salaries, equipment, and related matters."<sup>1</sup> The Budget Committee in turn created the institution of confidential ad hoc faculty committees to review promotion cases, because it believed that the records of faculty members should be frankly assessed through a process of broad-based peer review.

As the UC system grew and more campuses were established, each campus developed its own Budget Committee. Other campuses now call their Budget Committee the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), but Berkeley has kept the original name. The responsibilities of these committees vary from campus to campus: on other campuses, some decisions about faculty members may be made by deans or other administrators without Senate advice, but the Berkeley Budget Committee continues to offer advice on all appointments, promotions, and merit increases for faculty members.

### 2. What the Budget Committee is.

The members of the Budget Committee are appointed by the Committee on Committees, which is elected by the Senate's members. The Budget Committee has nine members, and each one usually serves for three years. In its work, the Budget Committee is guided by two general mandates from the Senate: to maintain the excellence of the Berkeley faculty, and to promote the equal treatment of the faculty across campus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Minutes of the Academic Senate, April 19, 1920, p. 424.

The Budget Committee works year-round, usually meeting once or twice a week. The committee makes recommendations to the campus administration about hiring and advancing faculty members and about authorizing searches for new faculty members. It also makes recommendations to both the administration and the Senate about a variety of policy issues. The Budget Committee arrives at its recommendations through consensus.

The UC system is unusual in allowing faculty members to share this campus-wide perspective on academic personnel matters with the central administration; this enables the Senate to have a strong and independent voice in this important arena.

### **3. The process of academic review.**

Much of the Budget Committee's work involves the analysis of academic personnel cases. (In recent years, the committee has reviewed over 900 cases per year.) Cases for appointment, merit increases, and promotion come forward from departments along with supporting materials, including information provided by the candidate. The relevant dean then reviews the case, writes an analysis and recommendation, and sends the case to the Academic Personnel Office, which reviews it and then forwards it to the Budget Committee. If the case is for promotion or for a tenure-level appointment, the Budget Committee will recommend appointment of a campus ad hoc review committee of three to five faculty members. This committee will review the entire case, including the dean's recommendation, before preparing its analysis and recommendation.

When the Budget Committee receives a case for review, then, it has before it the department's recommendation and supporting materials, the dean's recommendation, and (if there is one) the campus ad hoc committee's report. Based on these case materials, the Budget Committee prepares an analysis of the faculty member's record of achievement in research, teaching, and service. Only after the entire committee has discussed the case and reached a consensus does it prepare the final written version of its analysis and recommendation.

This "minute" communicates the committee's reasoning to the central administration, which by long tradition incorporates much of the minute into the letter to the dean in which the administration conveys its decision. That letter may be slightly modified by the dean before being readdressed and sent to the chair, who may then share it with the faculty member whose record of achievement has been reviewed. These letters refer generically to "reviewers": that term can mean the Budget Committee, the chair, the dean, the ad hoc review committee, people who wrote external letters, or some combination of these.

Reconsideration of a case may be requested by the central administration, by a dean or department chair, or by the faculty member whose record has been reviewed. When the Budget Committee receives such a request, it will carefully review the new information that has been provided and then make a recommendation on that basis. After reviewing the request for reconsideration and the Budget Committee's recommendation, the administration may then alter its original decision. After a process of reconsideration,

the administration may in the end reach a decision different from the one that the Budget Committee ultimately recommended; such differences occur in a handful of cases each year.

Further information about the review process is available from the Academic Personnel Office [<http://apo.chance.berkeley.edu/>] and from the Academic Senate's Committee on the Status of Ethnic Minorities and Women [[http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/committees/SWEM\\_guide\\_AP.html](http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/committees/SWEM_guide_AP.html)].

#### **4. Merit increases and promotion.**

The Budget Committee is guided by the University of California's Academic Personnel Manual. [<http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-220.pdf>] Merit increases for faculty members ("steps") are normally awarded for excellent records during the review period in three areas of evaluation: research, teaching, and service. (A review period almost always ends one year before the effective date of the proposed advancement.) In general, the ladder gets steeper as it gets higher: in all three areas of review, more is expected of faculty in the upper reaches of the professoriate than of those at lower steps.

Reviews of promotions to tenure or to full professor, or of advancement to Professor Step VI or Special Salary, also focus on the three areas of evaluation, but they consider the faculty member's career achievements as well as the specific achievements since the last merit review. These four "milestone" reviews require external letters of evaluation; promotions to tenure or to full professor also require review by a campus ad hoc review committee. (A campus ad hoc review committee may also be required for a tenure-level appointment.)

Research: In ordinary merit reviews, the record of research will comprise the accomplishments since the last merit review. Factors taken into consideration may include the quality, number, and impact of refereed and non-refereed papers or books, the venues of publication, presentation of conference papers or talks, and awards. Completed chapters of a book in progress [[https://mossberg.berkeley.edu/CALmessages/display\\_message.asp?d=9/10/2004&s=101](https://mossberg.berkeley.edu/CALmessages/display_message.asp?d=9/10/2004&s=101)] may in some circumstances be considered as part of the research record. In some disciplines, the research record may comprise other forms of creative accomplishment.

Teaching: Ideally, assessment of classroom teaching [<http://apo.chance.berkeley.edu/evaluation.html>] is based on a wide range of information. While student evaluations are essential, other information may be equally important, for example, peer evaluation and self-assessment. Lack of success in a single class will not ordinarily be a cause for concern, but a pattern of declining teaching or poor teaching may slow or halt advancement. A teaching record also includes information about such accomplishments as writing a textbook or mentoring students (for example, by serving as an undergraduate advisor or a member of master's and dissertation committees). Once in

a career, a step may be awarded primarily for teaching that is exceptional in its quality and quantity, if the advancement is to a step that is below the level of Professor, Step VI.

Service: Berkeley faculty members offer many kinds of service, including service to their departments and to the Academic Senate. They also perform outreach service and service to governments, academia, and the community. Once in a career, a step may be awarded primarily for service that is exceptional in its quality and quantity, if the advancement is to a step that is below the level of Professor, Step VI. In this as in other areas of evaluation, more is expected from more senior faculty, and full professors are expected to shoulder responsibilities for leadership in their departments or on campus.

## **5. FTE allocation.**

Every year, the Budget Committee offers advice to the central administration about allocating faculty FTE (“full-time equivalents,” i.e., faculty positions) to campus units; and when the campus resets FTE targets, the Budget Committee also offers advice about the target size of each campus unit. Requests concerning FTE come forward from departments, are analyzed and reviewed by deans, and then are analyzed and reviewed by the Budget Committee. In making its recommendations, the Budget Committee is constrained by the central administration’s determination of the maximum number of FTE available.

In considering FTE issues, the Budget Committee takes many factors into account, including the general distinction and trajectory of the department, the relation of the department’s current size to its target size, the department’s programmatic needs, and its success in carrying out its teaching missions. In thinking about what to recommend, the Budget Committee must always weigh a given department’s needs against the needs of other units across the whole campus, because there are never enough FTE to satisfy all of the reasonable FTE requests that come forward.

## **6. Issues of concern to the Budget Committee.**

Long waits for news: Faculty members often wonder why they usually do not hear about the results of their merit or promotion cases until the spring, or even the summer or fall. Several factors affect the timing of the final decisions.

After a case leaves a department, it goes to the dean; depending on the dean’s workload, decanal review may take from several days to several months. The case is then received by the Academic Personnel Office, which may need time to consult with the dean’s office about various details of the case. Review by a campus ad hoc review committee, when that is necessary, will delay matters further, often by several months. These committees consist of three to five faculty members with relevant expertise from a number of different departments; campus ad hoc committees can be difficult to convene, and their work may involve time-consuming preparation and deliberation.

The Budget Committee gives priority to urgent appointment and retention cases, to promotions, and to any other cases marked as urgent by the Academic Personnel Office. Routine merit cases and requests for reconsideration receive attention only after urgent cases have been cleared from the agenda. The turnaround time for cases in the Budget Committee varies from a few days to several months, depending on its caseload.

Everyone involved in academic personnel review wishes the process were a faster one. Still, although the campus process is time-consuming, the many layers of assessment allow the campus administration to solicit informed opinion from many quarters and to ensure that the opinion of no one individual has undue weight in the decision making process.

Salary inequities: In recent years, the Budget Committee has been very concerned by broad issues concerning faculty salaries, and it has worked closely with the administration to try to keep Berkeley competitive in faculty recruitment and retention. Of equal concern to the committee, however, are inequities between the salaries of faculty members who have recently been recruited and retained and the salaries of faculty members who have not.

Several members of the Budget Committee served in 2003-04 on the Chancellor's Task Force on Faculty Compensation. The Task Force's recommendations [<http://evcp.chance.berkeley.edu/documents/Reports/documents/FacCompTaskForcefinalreport.pdf>] received the support of the Academic Senate's Divisional Council in the fall of 2004, and the Budget Committee hopes the campus administration will begin to phase in the Report's recommendations as soon as possible. As these new policies are phased in, the campus will be adopting a new way of thinking about salary equity: while the campus-wide ideal will still be that faculty members of equal accomplishment will be at the same rank and step, it will no longer be a campus-wide ideal for all faculty members at the same rank and step to receive the same salary. Rather, the ideal will be for faculty members at the same rank and step *within the same discipline* to receive the same salary. This is probably the best way for Berkeley to conceive of equity while preserving the rank-and-step system, remaining competitive, and decreasing inequities within disciplines.

October 12, 2010

TO: DAVID BOCIAN  
VICE PROVOST, ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

FM: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

**RE: *Off-Scale Policy***

Three Academic Senate Committees, P&B, CAP, and FW, and the Executive Council (EC) have all closely examined the O/S Policy request of August 19, 2010. The reports from the three committees are attached. These reports and the proposed policy were discussed at length at the Executive Council meeting on October 11, 2010.

I summarize below the views expressed in each of the reports, and then I provide you with some additional perspectives from the EC regarding the proposed policy.

1. **Planning and Budget.** P&B voted 4 to 3 in opposition to this policy. The majority view was that the policy would interfere with any effort to re-establish a competitive salary scale at UC. They were also concerned about the absence of any description of the process whereby a “lost” O/S could subsequently be restored.
2. **CAP.** CAP supports the policy in general but recommends the following:
  - a. The timing for removing O/S should be altered to include a one-cycle “grace” period so that a faculty who receives an unsatisfactory review would not automatically lose the O/S but have an additional review cycle to attain a satisfactory review.
  - b. Satisfactory Academic Progress to retain the O/S should be based on excellence in all three categories (research, service, teaching).
  - c. Specific procedures for reviewing proposed O/S actions need to be developed and approved as soon as possible.
3. **Faculty Welfare.** The Faculty Welfare Committee opposes the policy because it undermines efforts to restore competitive salaries campus wide, and it encourages the use of other procedures, such as seeking outside offers, as a means of increasing compensation. The Committee also notes that there is an active systemwide task

force charged with developing mechanisms for restoring the salary scale, and the Committee regrets that the campus O/S policy was installed without benefit of this task force's findings.

**Executive Council.** The Executive Council recommends the following regarding the O/S policy:

1. The EC endorses the notion that a faculty member with an O/S salary needs to maintain satisfactory academic progress for the O/S to continue.
2. The EC is concerned that the proposed scheduling of reviews could be potentially problematic and lend itself to the possibility of someone "gaming the system." For example, as currently described a faculty member may have a satisfactory quinquennial review followed by a qualified satisfactory quinquennial review, which would result in the maintenance of the O/S for 5 to 10 years beyond the reward of the O/S.
3. The EC is concerned that the proposed scheduling of reviews could have different implications across diverse disciplines. For example, in the sciences where evidence of regular progress is the norm, an unsatisfactory review in a single cycle may have a very different meaning than in the humanities where the usual products (e.g., books) may take longer to produce.
4. The EC is seriously concerned that the O/S policy, even with this change, undermines efforts at the campus and systemwide levels to restore a competitive faculty salary scale. The continued use of O/S salaries to make *ad hoc* adjustments to compensate for the noncompetitiveness of the salary scale undermines the ability of the campus to address the salary scale issue financially, while also lowering the morale of faculty who are unable to regularly seek outside offers to obtain and maintain salaries.
5. The EC would welcome the opportunity to engage in examination and consultation regarding the O/S procedures and policies on the campus. We note that APM 620-80 states that

"Chancellors in consultation with the appropriate committee(s) of the Division of the Academic Senate, and the appropriate Vice President shall develop local procedures for the implementation of the off-scale policy. Such procedures shall include the criteria for appointment or advancement to a position with an off-scale salary as well as an appointee's continuation with an off-scale salary or return to an off-scale salary."

Although the August 19, 2010 request asks for Senate involvement in the implementation of one aspect of the O/S policy, we feel that consultation is needed concerning other aspects of this policy, including but not limited to, procedures for the initial appointment to a position with an O/S salary.

Cc: Dallas Rabenstein  
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost