November 23, 2012

To: Bronwyn Leebaw (Political Science), Vice Chair  
Piotr Gorecki (History), Secretary/Parliamentarian  
Richard Luben (Biomed), Senior Assembly Representative  
Bahram Mobasher (Physics & Astronomy), Junior Assembly Representative  
Byron Adams (Music), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)  
Bahman Anvari (Bioengineering), BCOE Executive Committee  
James Baldwin (Nematology), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)  
Gregory Beran (Chemistry), Academic Computing & Information Technology  
Ward Beyermann (Physics & Astronomy), Educational Policy (CEP)  
Jan Blacher (Graduate School of Education), Planning and Budget (P&B)  
Sarjeet Gill (Cell Biology & Neuroscience), Academic Personnel (CAP)  
David Glidden (Philosophy), Preparatory Education  
Irving Hendrick (GSOE), Faculty Welfare (FW)  
Jennifer Hughes (Religious Studies), CHASS Executive Committee  
Mariam Lam (Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages), Committees (COC)  
Mindy Marks (Economics), Undergraduate Admissions  
Connie Nugent (Cell Biology & Neuroscience), Graduate Council  
Leonard Nunney (Biology), Research (CoR)  
Melanie Sperling (Graduate School of Education), GSOE Executive Committee  
Ameae Walker (School of Medicine), School of Medicine Executive Committee  
Gillian Wilson (Physics & Astronomy), CNAS Executive Committee  
Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

Fr: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, November 26, 2012

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, November 26, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 220 2nd Floor, University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 1:05</td>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Approval of the agenda for November 26, 2012 and minutes of October 22, 2012.</td>
<td>pp 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:05 – 1:10</td>
<td><strong>2.</strong> CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENTS - RECEIVED: Academic Freedom, International Education, University Extension, College of Engineering Executive Committee</td>
<td>pp 7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10-1:30</td>
<td><strong>3.</strong> ANNOUNCEMENTS BY CHAIR WUDKA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-1:45</td>
<td><strong>4.</strong> REVIEW OF APM 430 - COMMITTEE RESPONSES</td>
<td>pp 11-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 – 2:00</td>
<td><strong>5.</strong> REVIEW OF APM 700 – COMMITTEE RESPONSES</td>
<td>pp 21-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:15</td>
<td><strong>6.</strong> REVIEW OF REBENCHING REPORT – COMMITTEE RESPONSES</td>
<td>pp 35-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 2:30</td>
<td><strong>7.</strong> REVIEW OF PILOT OF NEGOTIATED SALARY PLAN – COMMITTEE RESPONSES</td>
<td>pp 64-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 2:40</td>
<td><strong>8.</strong> COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH BY LAW CHANGE – RECEIVED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL 11/26/2012 – ON 11/27/2012 DIVISION AGENDA FOR SENATE APPROVAL</td>
<td>pp 84-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40 – 3:00</td>
<td><strong>9.</strong> UPDATES FROM SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
OCTOBER 22, 2012

Present:
Gregory Beran, Academic Computing
Jan Blacher, Planning & Budget
David Glidden, Preparatory Education
Jennifer Hughes, CHASS Exec Committee
Bronwyn Leebaw, Division Vice-Chair
Mindy Marks, Undergraduate Admissions
Leonard Nunney, Research
Ameae Walker, SoM Executive Committee
Jose Wudka, Division Chair

Ward Beyermann, Educational Policy
Sarjeet Gill, Academic Personnel
Irving Hendrick, Faculty Welfare
Mariam Lam, Committees
Richard Luben, Sr Assembly Representative
Connie Nugent, Graduate Council
Melanie Sperling, GSOE Executive Committee
Gillian Wilson, CNAS Executive Committee

Absent:
Byron Adams, CoDEO
James Baldwin, PRP
Bahram Mobasher, Jr Assembly Representative

Bahman Anvari, BCOE Exec Committee
Piotr Gorecki, Secretary/Parliamentarian
Rami Zwick, SoBA Executive Committee

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT:
The 2011-2012 Executive Council Conflict of Interest Statement was readopted for the 2012-2013 year.

APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AGENDA & MINUTES FROM OCT 8 MEETING:
The agenda for October 22 and the minutes from October 8 were approved as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:
New Analyst in the Academic Senate
Chair Wudka introduced Beth Beatty as the newly hired Committee Analyst in the Academic Senate. Beth will be supporting a number of committees and will begin contacting her assigned Committee Chairs’ to introduce herself and begin coordination activities. Beth will also maintain the Senate Division Chair’s calendar and is the point of contact to schedule meetings on the Chair’s calendar.

Chancellor’s Cabinet
Chair Wudka summarized the Chancellor’s Cabinet Meeting and offered that the meeting included an update from Peter Hayashida, who indicated that the Riverside campus has increased its award dollars from 30 million to 36 this year. There will be a new campaign effort which will include a focus on targeted areas and an effort to increase chaired faculty positions; these typically require a $1 million endowment, though this goes up to $3-$5 million in the medical fields.
The Cabinet meeting also included a report on the many programs offered to students, faculty and staff in any type of distress. Information on the various programs includes resources for issues such as personal health problems, financial issues, or workplace/family issues. Program info is being sent to the College Deans and Department Chairs. The Academic Senate will also eventually include a link on its webpage to the coordinating office and all resources, including the Office of the Ombudsman.

The final portion to the Cabinet meeting was spent discussing concerns about the UC budget and the potential implications if Proposition 30 does not pass.

Finally, it was announced that at its November 13 meeting, the Regents will decide who will be the interim Chancellor for our campus. The Regents will also discuss the budget, and if Prop 30 has passed, then the discussion will likely include stabilization of the budget. If Prop 30 has not passed, discussion will steer towards how the cuts will be distributed across the campuses. Chancellor White has estimated a cut of 1-3 million at UCR, plus a tuition increase of 15-20%.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENTS – RECEIVED:
Fifteen additional Conflict of Interest Statements have been received. To-date, there are approximately 5 remaining to be submitted.

BYLAW CHANGE – BCOE 4.1.1.6:
There was considerable discussion about the proposed changes to the bylaws for the Bourns College of Engineering. Specific concerns were as follows:
1) The proposal does not specify which meetings are included. Presumably this change includes all Executive Committee meetings but may also include meetings such as the Executive Council meeting and Executive Committee subcommittees.
2) The proposal does not indicate a limitation on the number of replacements, the frequency of such replacements, or on the number of “substitutes” any one meeting may include
3) The “7 day in advance” stipulation might not always be feasible to follow
4) There does not seem to be any other college/division/school at UCR which includes such a provision
5) There seems to be other options, such as participation by phone or video conferencing, instead of resorting to substitutes

The Committee agreed not to approve the bylaw change as the proposal is currently written. Chair Wudka will draft a correspondence to the BCOE Executive Committee asking them for further clarification, for justification for the change request, and offering suggestions for a re-write.
NAMING REQUEST – KRIEGER FAMILY LAB / CULVER CENTER COIL BROTHERS ATRIUM:
After review of the response received from Interim Vice Chancellor Rowley, the Executive Committee unanimously approved the naming request for the Krieger Family Laboratory and the Coil Brothers Atrium.

UCR ACADEMIC CALENDAR REVIEW – COMMITTEE RESPONSES:
After a thorough discussion and review of the proposed UCR Academic Calendar through the year 2023, the Executive Council determined it would like to invite the registrar and Vice Chancellor Sandoval to a future meeting to discuss concerns raised by individual committees during review. Specifically, the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity asks for information on how religious holidays are determined and/or if there is a standardized description of what constitutes a religious holiday. CEP’s concern is that the last day of classes is followed by the first exam. There was also discussion about late night and Saturday exams.

UPDATES FROM SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS:
Graduate Council – Connie Nugent
The Graduate Council received a request from Dean Cullenberg (received through the Graduate Division) to place a moratorium on the Sociology Department which has been placed into receivership. In 2010, the Graduate Council conducted an external review of this department, and though the review was closed with a satisfactory outcome, there were some concerns expressed so an internal review was scheduled to occur during this 2012-2013 academic year. The Graduate Council is moving forward with the review, keeping in mind that:
1. All actions so far are administrative
2. The Graduate Council does not impose moratoria, but can recommend such actions.
3. The current review is proceeding as was previously planned, and would have occurred regardless of the involvement of the Administration.

The Graduate Council is also reworking its Appendix 7 to include provisions for moratoriums and suspension as well as those that exist for disestablishment and discontinuation.

CHASS Executive Committee – Jennifer Hughes
The CHASS Executive Committee is working on issues of impacted majors within the college. A consequence of the budget cut has been simply that CHASS does not have enough instructors to teach its classes. It was advised that the college Executive Committee consult with the Committee on Educational Policy.

Undergraduate Admissions – Mindy Marks
The Undergraduate Admissions committee is discussing the Admission by Exception Policy (A-by-E), which states that each campus can admit by exception up to 6% of its students using A-by-E. In the past, UCR has had a very small
usage of the A-by-E process and so this policy hasn’t been of issue. However, last year much of the A-by-E pool was filled with non-resident students, which is a violation of the BOARS policy which states that non-residents have to be held to the same admission practice as residential students (all treated the same). Unfortunately, the existing guidelines for A-by-E are minimal and, in particular, do not specify governing principles. The Committee is now grappling with questions such as, “what determines whether an applicant is eligible for a second look?” The Committee is also analyzing data and working towards developing a fair and effective policy.

**Faculty Welfare – Irving Hendrick**  
Chair Hendrick reported that the Committee on Faculty Welfare is busily discussing the proposed APM changes currently open for review.

**GSOE Executive Committee – Melanie Sperling**  
Chair Sperling announced that the recently approved undergraduate minor in Education has begun this fall with good enrollments. In addition, the School just approved a Masters Degree in the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TOESL).

**Committee on Committees – Mariam Lam**  
CoC has met to fill several replacement spots on 5 committees, as well as to nominate faculty for the search committees for the Dean of Public Policy, the UNEX Dean and for the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution. The Committee will again in the next week or so to select nominees for the 3 UCR faculty appointments who will sit on the search committee for the Chancellor’s replacement.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Cindy Palmer*  
*Executive Director,*  
*Office of the Academic Senate*
The Committee on Academic Freedom has readopted the Conflict of Interest statement originally adopted in 1994-95, which is as follows:

If a member of the Academic Freedom Committee believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call the possible conflict to the attention of the chair. The chair will convene the committee, except for the individual with the possible conflict, and those present will decide by majority vote if a conflict exists. If the decision is affirmative, the individual with the conflict will leave the room during discussion of the conflicted matter and will not vote on that matter.

If the chair is the individual in question, he/she will appoint an acting chair to consider the matter. The committee may ask the person in question to testify, but the person would not be present at other parts of the discussion or at the vote.
November 14, 2012

TO:  JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
     RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM:  LUCILLE CHIA, CHAIR
     COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

RE:  2012-13 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on International Education approved the adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2012-13:

The Committee on International Education has adopted the following policy for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. The committee member may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.
November 2, 2012

TO: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: GUANSHUI XU, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on University Extension approves the following conflict of interest statement:

If a course, credential program, certificate program, or other item/issue should come before the Committee on University Extension which affects the department of a committee member, the committee member will provide information, but will not vote on the item/issue. A Committee on University Extension member who is paid by University Extension for teaching or consultation with regard to a specific course, credential program, certificate program or other item/issue will provide information, but will not vote on the item/issue.
October 23, 2012

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division

FR: Bahman Anvari, Chair
    Executive Committee, Bourns College of Engineering

RE: 2012-2013 Conflict of Interest Statement

This was read and unanimously approved at the October 22, 2012 BCOE Executive Committee meeting.

Bourns College of Engineering
Executive Committee
2012-13 Conflict of Interest Statement

If the personal affiliation of a committee member with an organization or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, that member should bring this fact to the attention of the committee, and the committee member may be asked to provide information, as appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.
September 18, 2012

To: Sarjeet Gill, Chair
    Committee on Academic Personnel

    Connie Nugent, Chair
    Graduate Council

    Lucille Chia, Chair
    Committee on International Education

    Len Nunney, Chair
    Committee on Research

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed New Policy – APM 430, Visiting Scholars

Attached for your review is a proposed new APM Policy – APM 430 which allows for appointments of students and academics as Visiting Scholars.

Please discuss with your committee and submit your response by Friday, November 9, 2012.

Enclosure
COUNCIL OF VICE CHANCELLORS
LABORATORY DIRECTOR ALIVISATOS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR POWELL
ANR VICE PRESIDENT ALLEN-DIAZ

Dear Colleagues:

Re:  Systemwide Review of Proposed New Policy APM - 430, Visiting Scholars

Enclosed for Systemwide Review is proposed new policy APM - 430, Visiting Scholars. The proposal is responsive to campus requests to create a new title 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.

These visitors are ineligible for any other academic title. Educational criteria is flexible, and there is no salary requirement beyond the established campus minimum funding standards already in place to satisfy federal visa requirements relating to funding for exchange visitors. Self-funding, either by personal funds or third-party funding payable directly to the Visiting Scholar, is required. Visiting Scholars are ineligible for University compensation. University of California titles available for compensated appointments are within the postdoctoral scholar title series and the specialist title series.

This policy is intended to support the International Students and Scholars Offices (ISSO) as well as Visiting Scholars. The policy does not provide instruction related to visa classification. However, it assumes that the ISSO and Visiting Scholars will abide by current federal regulations as well as University and campus policy related to visa sponsorship.

Systemwide Review is a public review distributed to the Chancellors and Executive Vice Chancellors requesting that they inform the general University community, affected employees and unions about policy proposals. Systemwide Review also includes a mandatory, three-month full Senate review.

Employees should be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the draft new policy, available online at: http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/apm/review.html. Attached is a model communication which may be used to inform non-exclusively represented employees affected by these proposals.
August 31, 2012
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This letter and enclosures anticipate that you will begin Systemwide Review of the proposed draft and submit comments no later than **November 30, 2012**. Please send comments on the proposed policy to ADV-VPCARLSON-SA@ucop.edu. Questions may be directed to Janet Lockwood at Janet.Lockwood@ucop.edu or (510) 987-9499.

Sincerely,

Susan Carlson
Vice Provost
Academic Personnel

Enclosures:  *Draft new policy APM - 430*
*Model communication*

cc:  President Yudof
Chancellors
Provost Dorr
Executive Vice President Brostrom
Senior Vice President Vacca
Vice President Beckwith
Vice President Duckett
Vice Provosts – Academic Personnel
Academic Personnel Directors
Executive Director Fox
Executive Director Rodrigues
Executive Director Tanaka
Executive Director Winnacker
Deputy General Counsel Birnbaum
Senior Counsel Van Houten
Systemwide Policy Director Capell
Assistant Director Ernst
Manager Lockwood
Human Resources Policy Analyst Bello
Senior Administrative Analyst Rupert
Administrative Officer Abbott
430-4  **Definition**

A Visiting Scholar is a student enrolled in an institution outside of the University of California or an individual employed by or affiliated with an outside institution or agency who is visiting the University of California for the purpose of participating in UC-sponsored conferences and partnerships, or for a short-term educational, academic, or research project under the supervision of UC faculty.

430-10  **Criteria for Appointment**

Visiting Scholars will possess:

1) a baccalaureate degree; or

2) equivalent; or

3) recognized expertise in a field.

Undergraduate students may be sponsored as well at the discretion of the host campus.

430-18  **Salary**

a. Visiting Scholars are ineligible for compensation from the University of California.
b. Visiting Scholars are self-supported or have adequate support funds from external sources and provide evidence of such funding to the campus office charged with the responsibility to oversee these appointments.

430-20 Conditions of Appointment

a. Visiting Scholars are appointed for short periods of time not to exceed one year (12 months), and more typically, for six (6) months or less. The appointment is self-terminating unless the appointee is otherwise notified.

b. Service as a Visiting Scholar constitutes neither formal employment nor enrollment as a student at the University of California.

c. Visiting Scholars may not be UC-registered students, currently working for UC as contractors, or have any other active appointment or employment with the University of California.

d. The University of California reserves the right to withdraw the privileges and terminate the appointment without prior notice.

e. Visiting Scholars may be eligible for reimbursement of business and travel expenses. A reimbursable expense is an expense incurred which is related to activities that contribute to any one of the University’s major functions of teaching, research, patient care, or public service.¹

¹ See Business and Finance Bulletin G-28 for guidelines related to reimbursement of business and travel expenses.
430-24 Authority to Appoint

a. The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost or the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost’s designee may approve an exception to extend an appointment beyond twelve months when conditions warrant.

b. Subject to the provisions of this policy statement, each campus should establish authority and procedures to appoint and reappoint Visiting Scholars.
September 26, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Sarjeet Gill, Chair
      Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed New Policy - APM 430, Visiting Scholars

On September 24, 2012, CAP voted unanimously to approve APM 430 - Visiting Scholars (+10-0-0). In addition, CAP suggests that appointment of Visiting Scholars be delegated to the Deans.
November 13, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

Fr: Len Nunney, Chair
    Research

Re: APM 430, Visiting Scholars

The Committee on Research discussed APM 430 pertaining to Visiting Scholars. There was strong support for having such a title, and the committee's only major concern was that its use should not be restricted by a narrow interpretation of a scholar’s need to be "affiliated" with an outside institution or agency. The committee felt that if a scholar is being supported by a scholarly agency (e.g. the MacArthur Foundation), they should be permitted to come to UCR even though they may not be strictly "affiliated". The committee suggests explicitly broadening the definition to include scholarly funding.
November 2, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Connie Nugent, Chair
    Graduate Council

Re: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF PROPOSED NEW POLICY – APM 430, VISITING SCHOLARS

Graduate Council discussed APM 430 at its October 18, 2012 meeting and agreed that it clarifies issues surrounding the visiting scholar title. Visiting Scholars play an important role in spreading the impact of UCR internationally. This policy was considered to be beneficial to both UCR and to the scholar. One question the committee raised is whether housing assistance for Visiting Scholars would be permissible under this policy.
To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Academic Senate, Riverside Division

From: Lucille Chia, Chair  
International Education

Re: Comments from IEC on the APM 430 Review

The Committee on International Education has reviewed the APM 430 Review (allowing for appointments of students and academics as Visiting Scholars) document and is in support of the policy. The committee’s comments in support of APM 430 are as follows:

The new academic title makes sense. A committee member provided the example of losing a visiting scientist who had support from his government to come to UCR for a research leave. However, the visiting scientist’s stipend was below the UC pay scale for a postdoc and UC required that a large supplement from grant funds be provided, which was not available using the current available grants at that time. Even after the visiting scientist offered to set up an account to support himself from personal funds, he still was unable to come to UCR because postdocs cannot be self-supported according to UC rules. The new category proposed here eliminates this problem by creating a nonpaid category for visiting scholars who are self-supported or who come here with support from their own government or university.

One committee member who supported APM 430 did question if the policy will come with the same privileges such as library access, ID card, and network ID as other titles have access to.

As chair of the committee, I support the new policy, since it provides greater flexibility, which is much needed, in welcoming students and post-docs from abroad to come to UCR, who otherwise may encounter regulations that do not allow them to come.
September 18, 2012

To: Tom Morton, Chair
    Committee on Academic Freedom

    Timothy Close, Chair
    Committee on Charges

    Irving Hendrick, Chair
    Committee on Faculty Welfare

    Helen Henry, Chair
    Committee on Privilege & Tenure

    Ziv Ran, Chair
    Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
      Riverside Division

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Changes to APM 700

Attached for your review is a proposed revision to APM 700. The revisions are in response to campus requests to address the need for a presumptive resignation policy.

Please discuss with your committee and submit your response by Friday, November 9, 2012.

Enclosure
COUNCIL OF VICE CHANCELLORS
LABORATORY DIRECTOR ALIVISATOS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR POWELL
ANR VICE PRESIDENT ALLEN-DIAZ

Dear Colleagues:

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised APM - 700, Leaves of Absence/General, Presumptive Resignation

Enclosed for Systemwide Review are proposed revisions to APM - 700, Leaves of Absence/General. The proposal is responsive to campus requests to address the need for a presumptive resignation policy.

This policy is proposed to address circumstances under which an academic appointee chooses not to return to his/her University appointment following the expiration of a leave of absence, or if he/she chooses to be absent from that appointment without obtaining approval for a leave. The presumptive resignation policy is designed to prompt an appointee under these circumstances to take affirmative steps to counter the University’s presumption that the appointee’s intention is to resign the University appointment.

The policy is intended to address resignation from an appointment due to absence from duty: it does not address dismissal procedures; it does not apply when it is established that an academic appointee is absent due to intersession, illness, injury or disability; and it does not address disciplinary matters or academic competency matters.

Key concepts in the policy cover advance written notice of the intent to presume resignation as well as the appointee’s right to respond to the notice, to return to service, to appeal any decision, and to request a hearing before the appropriate governing body. The appointee continues on pay status during the notice period, and pay status terminates on the response deadline date.

The proposed policy applies to academic- and fiscal-year faculty and academic appointees. Absence from duty is defined as a period of thirty (30) days following the expiration of an approved leave or 30-day absence from academic duty without approval. Instances of neglect of academic duty that do not meet this standard will be handled according to applicable academic personnel policies, including but not limited to APM - 015, The Faculty Code of Conduct, APM - 016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline, APM - 150, Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal, and APM - 075, Termination for Incompetent Performance.

Proposed draft language describes the process of providing written notice by which the campus would implement good faith efforts to locate the absent appointee, the content of such notice, to whom the appointee would respond, and the date the response is due. It requires that the Chancellor confer with the
August 31, 2012
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Chair of the Privilege and Tenure Committee should a faculty member fail to respond to the initial written notice within sixty (60) days. Communications between the Chancellor and the Privilege and Tenure Committee Chair must be documented.

Systemwide Review is a public review distributed to the Chancellors and Executive Vice Chancellors requesting that they inform the general University community, affected employees and unions about the policy proposals. Systemwide Review also includes a mandatory, three-month full Senate review.

Employees should be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the revisions, which are available online at: http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/apm/review.html. Enclosed is a model communication which can be used to inform non-exclusively represented employees affected by these proposals.

This letter and enclosures anticipate that you will begin Systemwide Review of the proposed draft and submit comments no later than November 30, 2012. Please send comments on the proposed policy to ADV-VPCARLSON-SA@ucop.edu. Questions may be directed to Janet Lockwood at Janet.Lockwood@ucop.edu or (510) 987-9499.

Sincerely,

Susan Carlson
Vice Provost
Academic Personnel

Enclosures: Draft revised policy APM - 700
Model Communication

cc: President Yudof
Chancellors
Provost Dorr
Executive Vice President Brostrom
Senior Vice President Vaccar
Vice President Beckwith
Vice President Duckett
Vice Provosts – Academic Personnel
Academic Personnel Directors
Executive Director Fox
Executive Director Rodrigues
Executive Director Tanaka
Executive Director Winnacker
Deputy General Counsel Birnbaum
Senior Counsel Van Houten
Systemwide Policy Director Capell
Assistant Director Ernst
Manager Lockwood
Human Resources Analyst Bello
Senior Administrative Analyst Rupert
Administrative Officer Abbott
700-0 Policy

The basic policy for academic leaves of absence is set forth in Standing Order 100.4(e) of The Regents.

The President is authorized to grant leaves of absence with or without pay, in accordance with such regulations as the President may establish.

Academic year appointees are expected to be present from the beginning of the Fall Semester (Quarter) through the end of the Spring Semester (Quarter). Any appointee returning after the beginning of the Fall Semester (Quarter) or leaving before the end of the Spring Semester (Quarter) should apply in advance for a leave of absence in accordance with these sections.

Fiscal-year appointees who render service throughout the calendar year (12 months) shall also apply in advance for leaves requested outside of vacation days.

700-8 Types

Specific regulations have been established by The Regents and the President on for certain types of leaves of absence. These are as follows:
a. Sick leave (APM - 710)

b. Family and medical leave (APM - 715)

c. Holidays (APM - 720)

d. Vacation (APM - 730)

e. Sabbatical leave (APM - 740)

f. Leave for service to governmental agencies (APM - 750)

g. Military leave (APM - 751)

h. Leave to attend professional meetings or other University business (APM - 752)

i. Other leaves with pay (APM - 758)

j. Other leaves without pay (APM - 759)
k. Family accommodations for childbearing and childrearing (APM - 760)

700-30 Presumptive Resignation Policy & Procedures

If any academic appointee is absent from academic duty for 30 calendar days or more without an approved leave, or does not return to academic duty for 30 calendar days or more after an approved leave expires, the University shall presume (subject to the conditions set forth below) that the academic appointee has resigned from his or her University appointment and shall separate that appointee consistent with the timelines and provisions below.

This presumptive resignation policy does not apply to absences due to intersession nor does it apply when it is established that an academic appointee is absent due to:

- illness, injury, or disability addressed by APM - 710 (medical leave) and APM - 080 (medical separation) when medical leave is no longer approved in anticipation of medical separation; or

- discipline imposed by University APM - 015 (The Faculty Code of Conduct), APM - 016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and Administration of Discipline) and court action(s) including stay-away orders.
a. **Written Notice of Intent to Separate the Appointee**

Following a 30-day absence as described above, as well as a documented effort to contact the appointee via phone, mail, email and internet search, the Chancellor will send to the appointee’s home address on payroll file a written notice of intent to deem the appointee’s unapproved absence as a presumed resignation. The notice shall state that within 60 calendar days after the date of the letter if the appointee has not (a) returned to academic duty or (b) sought and been granted an appropriate leave, the appointee may be deemed to have resigned from the University effective on the 61st day after the date of the letter with a resulting cessation of pay and benefits. The written notice of intent to deem the appointee’s unapproved absence a presumed resignation shall advise the appointee that s/he has a right to make an oral or written response to a named campus administrator within 60 calendar days of the date of the letter. The notice shall include the name and address of the person to whom the appointee should respond, and the date by which a response must be received.

b. **Response to Written Notice of Intent**

1. **Subject to b.2. (below), an appointee’s oral or written response that s/he is not resigning shall be followed by either (a) return to academic duty or (b) an approved leave.** An appointee’s failure to return to duty or to
obtain an approved leave may result in a deemed resignation effective on the 61st day after the date of the notice of intent to deem the appointee’s absence as a presumed resignation, with a resulting cessation of pay and benefits.

2. An appointee’s response may rebut the presumption of resignation by establishing through the provision of reliable information that, through no fault of his/her own, the leave could neither have been obtained prior to the first day of absence nor during the intervening period.

3. An appointee’s response that s/he is resigning constitutes an actual, not a presumptive, resignation.

c. Written Notice of Action to Separate the Appointee

Following review of the appointee’s response, if any, and written notification of the chair of the Privilege and Tenure Committee and the Committee’s response, the Chancellor will make a final determination whether an appointee shall be deemed to have resigned and so notify the appointee in writing. The written notice shall advise the appointee of a right to a hearing (see APM - 700-30-d).
The authority to make the final determination rests with the Chancellor and may not be redelegated with respect to Academic Senate members. The authority may be redelegated with respect to non-Senate academic appointees.

d. Right to Grieve a Hearing

Academic Senate faculty members who are deemed to have resigned pursuant to this policy have the right to a hearing before the division Privilege and Tenure Committee under Academic Senate Bylaw 337. Other academic appointees who are deemed to have resigned pursuant to this policy have the right to a Step III Hearing as described in APM – 140.

700-94 Applications

Applications for certain leaves require information in addition to that included on the standard form. If additional information is required, it will be described in subsection 94 of the section covering the particular leave.
At its meeting on November 14, UCR's Committee on Academic Freedom discussed concerns regarding APM700, particularly with regard to the possibility that it might serve to disincline faculty from pursuing field work that entails a risk of being kidnapped or held incommunicado. For that reason, the committee voted to endorse the proposal transmitted by UCR's Committee on Faculty Welfare in its memo dated November 8, that APM700-30 be expanded so as to expedite restoration of UC employment (along with salary and service credit) to faculty held against their will and presumed to have resigned under the terms of the proposed wording of APM700.
November 2, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Timothy Close, Chair  
Committee on Charges

Re: Systemwide Review of APM 700

The Committee on Charges reviewed the revisions to APM 700 and has no concerns related to the charge of the Committee.
November 8, 2012

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Irving G. Hendrick  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Review of Proposed Changes to APM 700

The Committee on Faculty Welfare appreciates the need for the University to discontinue the appointments of faculty and other academic employees who, while able to communicate their intentions, consciously leave their positions without notifying their departments or other appropriate officers of their intention. Under such circumstances, the time periods, review procedures, and rights of appeal stated in APM 700 appear fair and appropriate. We do, however, offer the suggestion that a time line of conditions, consequences and next steps would make the policy clearer.

Beyond that, we can imagine certain conditions that may warrant the full reinstatement of the employee without the need for an elaborate system of administrative and committee review and appeals procedures. In particular, it is possible that conditions other than physical illness, injury, or disability might preclude a faculty member from communicating his or her intentions. An example of such a situation might be involuntary detention. Such extraordinary conditions could arise from foreign travel or field work in a remote location. Should such improbable conditions be shown to exist, we would wish that Section 700-30 be expanded to include such exceptions to the policy.
October 26, 2012

To:                Jose Wudka
                    Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From:              Helen Henry
                    Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Re:                Systemwide Review of Changes to APM 700

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure has considered the proposed revision to APM 700 - the policy of presumptive resignation - at its October 15 meeting. We note that there is a provision for the Chancellor to notify and receive a response from our Committee prior to making the final determination on whether an appointee will be considered to have resigned. Furthermore, a member of the Academic Senate who has been deemed to have resigned can appeal the decision before P&T. With these provisions in place, we believe the policy is a sound one and support it.
October 3, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Ziv Ran, Chair  
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Systemwide Review of APM 700

The proposed changes are about situations where the University may infer a resignation, absent an explicit one. Broadly, we feel the changes are necessary and appropriate. However, we think the situations under purview must be narrowed to take into account the case of circumstances, either known or unknown to the university at the time, that make a resignation inference invalid.

Specifically, we propose
1. Below the second bullet point on p. 3, add

   •Circumstances known to the University which furthermore make it impossible for the appointee to communicate with the University.

2. Elsewhere in the document, add the following

   An appointee who can prove that the cause for his or her separation under this rule is due to an inability to communicate within the required time-frame resulting from extraordinary circumstances beyond his or her control, shall be entitled to reinstatement.
October 2, 2012

To: Chairs of Standing Senate Committee
    Chairs of College Executive Committees

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

As indicated in the attached memo, I am distributing to all Committee Chairs the Report and Recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee. The rebenching project is the next step in the systemwide overhaul of the internal UC budget process, which began with Funding Streams. The intent of the rebenching effort is to create equity in the formulas which allocate state funds to individual campuses.

Please submit your committee response by November 16, 2012.

Enclosure
SENATE DIVISION CHAIRS
SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Re: Systemwide review of “Rebenching” report

Dear Colleagues:

I have enclosed for systemwide review in Fall 2012 the report and recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee, which met from April 2011 to March 2012. The rebenching project is the second phase of the University’s overhaul of its internal budgeting processes, following Funding Streams, which addressed non-state revenues and which was implemented in 2011-12. The intent of rebenching is to increase transparency and equity in the formula for allocating state funds across the campuses.

Comments should be sent to SenateReview@ucop.edu by Monday, December 3, 2012. I encourage you to circulate this report and recommendations widely in order to engage the broadest possible range of faculty in discussion of the future shape of the University. I thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Anderson, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council
Executive Director Winnacker

Encl.
PRESIDENT MARK G. YUDOF

Dear Mark,

Enclosed please find the report and recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee. At your request, we convened this Committee in June 2011. The Committee was broadly representative of the University and its ten campuses, including six Chancellors, five members of the Academic Senate (including the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council), two Executive Vice Chancellors, and four Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget. The committee deliberated over the better part of the year, holding its last meeting on March 7, 2012. The committee approved the framework and recommendations of the report at the last meeting and this report was reviewed extensively by a drafting committee representative of the full Committee.

While not every member of the Committee agreed to every detail of the proposal, there was consensus on the need to move forward on the general principles behind the proposal. In particular, there was strong consensus that the University needs a more transparent and equitable process for allocating funds received from the State of California to its ten campuses. And there was strong consensus that such allocations need to be guided by core principles derived from the University's mission. Specifically, that UC’s excellence is found in all of its parts and that state support per student should not depend on the campus a student attends. The Committee also felt strongly that rebenching should occur, if possible, out of new State funds rather than by further cutting existing State support at any campus.

Given the volatility and uncertainty surrounding the State budget, the Committee did recognize the need for year-to-year flexibility in implementing these changes. In particular, such flexibility would be needed in years of small or no budget increases. Other issues that would need to be addressed in implementation include:

- The development over the next year of a long-range enrollment plan that will provide the basis for the rebenching enrollment targets beginning in 2013-14. The campuses will be asked to begin such planning in early November, after the results of the November tax measure are known.
- The methodology for annual adjustments to the UC Merced and UC San Francisco budgets (proposals are referenced in the report).
Establishing a method for determining and annually adjusting the appropriate allocations to "off-the-top" programs including the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES), the Scripps Institute, the Neuropsychiatric Institutes, Mental Health Teaching Support, the MIND Institute, SAPEP programs, and any State General Fund adjustments to student financial aid in order to even out the student work/loan commitment across campuses.

In is our belief that, similar to Funding Streams, adoption of rebenching will create a framework that allows for the transparent resolution of many of these issues. Many of these issues concern funding that was allocated to the campuses for a specific program at the request of the state government and are related to how that funding has grown or been cut over the years since it was originally allocated.

The enclosed report includes two documents (Appendix A and B) that show the results of the rebenching model calculations. However, one of the implementation tasks is to verify these numbers with the campuses. Thus, the numbers and results in these appendices will change prior to implementation. They should not be considered final numbers. In addition, there are additional appendices that will be compiled and transmitted to you over the next few weeks.

We are transmitting the report for additional review and comment to a broad range of University constituents. We look forward to discussing the report and its implementation with you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Lawrence H. Pitts
Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs

Nathan Brostrom
Executive Vice President
Business Operations

Enclosures

CC: Chancellors
    Rebenching Budget Committee Members
    Executive Vice Chancellors
    Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget
    Rebenching Budget Committee Staff
University of California
Rebenching Budget Committee

Committee Report and Recommendations

Reduced state support prompts reexamination of UC funding models. Beginning in 2008, the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) initiated a comprehensive review of how the University budgets and allocates its various fund sources. This became particularly urgent in the intervening years as the state dramatically reduced state support to the University and non-state fund sources became an ever-increasing share of the University’s total budget. This review and subsequent deliberations in the University led to a recommendation in 2011 to adopt Funding Streams, a new budget allocation model for current funds.

Funding Streams. Funding streams, implemented for the 2011-12 budget year, is based on the principle that campuses would retain all the revenues they generate and that central operations would be funded through a new assessment on expenditures from all fund sources. Funding streams was implemented for all revenues except State General Funds. Fundamentally, it did not change how State General Funds are currently distributed across campuses.1 The distribution of State General Funds among campuses is a result of a long history of State and University funding allocation decisions. Because campuses grew at different periods under different allocation models, the base allocation of State General Funds could no longer be explained by any one set of factors or principles.

The need for rebenching. Parallel to the funding streams discussions, there were a number of discussions about the need to address the distribution (or redistribution) of the State General Funds that comprised the campus base budgets. One such body, the UC Commission on the Future (COTF), recommended, subsequent to funding streams, that the University examine the rationale for distributing state General Funds and design a proposal for “an equitable and transparent readjustment of base funding formulas.” The need for such a change included concerns about the “considerable disparities” among campuses in per-student funding and “the complexity and opaqueness of the current model.” This “readjustment” or reallocation of core State General Funds came to be known as Rebenching.

Rebenching Budget Committee. Provost Pitts and Executive Vice President Brostrom appointed the Rebenching Budget Committee which held its first meeting in April 2011 and deliberated for the better part of year. At its meeting of March 7, 2012, the committee agreed to the recommendations for the rebenching of state General Funds.

1 There were adjustments to campus General Fund allocations associated with Funding Streams and state General Funds are included on the expenditure side in the calculation of the assessment.
Core principles. The recommendations below are based on the following core principles:

- Unrestricted State General Funds provided to University shall be allocated to the campuses for the purposes of UC’s core missions based on the number and type of students they educate.
- UC has a common standard of excellence across its 10 campuses. The state subsidy per student should not depend on the campus a student attends. Thus, the amount of state General Funds allocated per student should be the same for each type of student across all of the campuses.\(^2\)
- Rather than reducing the state funding provided to any campus, if possible, rebenching should be implemented in a way that seeks to bring all campuses to up to current highest level of per-student funding. This requires additional state funding.
- Graduate education is such an integral part of UC’s mission and excellence that it needs to be recognized in any allocation model.

Committee recommendations. Those core principles as well as a number of others are inherent in the recommendations for rebenching adopted by the committee. The following are recommendations agreed to by the committee at its last meeting:

- Initially, UC Merced and UC San Francisco are not included in the rebenching model and adjustments to their State General Fund allocations will occur through different means. The intention is that, as it grows, UC Merced will transition to the funding allocation method recommended here for the other campuses. A determination will need to be made as to when UC Merced begins to be part of the normal rebenching formula. For UCSF, there is a proposal for a corridor for increases and decreases that was not reviewed by this committee. Under the proposed corridor, UCSF would get 100 percent of its share of augmentations for the first two percent increase in State General Funds and then 50 percent of its share for any further increases. UCSF would take 100 percent of its share of any cuts for the first one percent decrease in State General Funds and 25 percent of any decreases beyond the one percent cut.
- Rebenching will be implemented starting with allocations for the 2012-13 fiscal year.
- The transition to a fully-rebenched state General Fund allocation at each campus will occur over six years.
- At full implementation, all campuses are to receive per-student funding equal to the highest campus’ per-student average\(^3\) (by level – see next bullet)
- Per-student funding is to be distributed on a weighted basis in which undergraduate, postbaccalaureate, graduate professional, and graduate academic master’s students are weighted at 1, doctoral students at 2.5, and health sciences students at 5 (except health sciences undergraduate students are at 1 and health sciences academic doctoral students are at 2.5).

\(^2\) The Academic Senate stated it this way: “The state subsidy per student should not depend on the campus the student attends; this recommendation follows from our core value that UC is one university with one standard of excellence at its ten campuses. The cost of a UC-quality education is the same on every campus, and the campuses should be funded accordingly.”

\(^3\) The committee did discuss options for implementation that, in the absence of sufficient resources, would prioritize campuses furthest from the rebenching target and/or would rebench to the second highest campus.
• At the undergraduate level, only California resident students will enter into the formula for determining the allocation of state funding in the model. At the graduate level, all students are included.

• Only enrolled students up to a targeted number established in a systemwide enrollment planning process will be included. Students above targets will not be included in the weighting formula.

• For 2012-13, current budgeted enrollment targets\(^4\) will be the basis for rebenching. A new long-range enrollment plan will be developed over the next year and this plan will be the basis for rebenching enrollment targets in future years.

• There will be a penalty if a campus falls below its undergraduate California resident targets by more than a particular percentage over a particular time frame. For each student below the target, a campus will lose its per-student funding times a multiplier. The tolerance, time frame, and multiplier for assessing the penalty will be determined in implementation. For example, it has been proposed that the penalty be assessed if a campus falls below its target by more than one percent calculated using a three-year rolling average and that the multiplier be 1.5.

• Campuses with academic doctoral student proportions below 12 percent (ratio of Ph.D. to undergraduates) will be provided funding to increase the numbers of such students up to the 12 percent level.\(^5\)

• Campuses are assigned a set-aside of $15 million in State General Funds prior to application of the weighting formula to recognize fixed costs that every campus has to cover unrelated to the number of students served.

• State General Funds allocated for specific state purposes and restricted to those purposes are funded “off-the-top” – that is, these funds are allocated to campus or systemwide budgets prior to application of the weighting formula.\(^6\)

• As determined in Funding Streams, there is a student financial aid self-help contribution policy for resident undergraduate students common across all campuses. Currently, no State General Funds are used for leveling the student work/loan expectations among campuses pursuant to this policy. If state General Funds are used for this purpose in the future, those fund will also be treated as an “off-the-top” and not available for rebenching.

There were a number of issues that the committee left for resolution during implementation, including verification of the figures in the rebenching model.\(^7\) Two were mentioned above – the appropriate way to allocate state General Funds to UCSF going forward and the timing of the transition of UC Merced to the rebenching formula. Others include:

\(^4\) 2007-08 budgeted enrollments as adjusted in 2010-11. “Over-enrollment” (students enrolled beyond the budget targets) will not be included.

\(^5\) The rebenching model includes funding at 12 percent for those campus now below 12 percent; thus, those campuses will realize funding for additional doctoral students as rebenching is phased in over the six years. Funding will be withdrawn for any shortfalls in achieving these numbers at the end of an appropriate phase-in period.

\(^6\) “Off-the-tops” agreed to by the committee include Agricultural Experiment Station, the Neuropsychiatric Institutes (NPIs) including Mental Health Teaching Support, Scripps Institute, SAPEP, and MIND. Clinical Teaching Support is not included as an “off-the-top” and remains part of the base budget subject to the weighting formula.

\(^7\) There are some discrepancies in the dollar figures for General Fund and “off-the-top” programs that need to be resolved between UCOP and campus budget offices.
• Establishing a method for determining and annually adjusting the appropriate allocations to “off-the-top” programs,
• Determining the appropriate set-aside for SAPEP funds, and
• Refining budgeted enrollment numbers by level.

While the University will need to work out the exact funding scenario through the allocations process, the committee recommends a “waterfall” of funding sources, in which new state funding would be the first source of rebenching funds, followed by savings generated from cuts to central programs, and, in a worst-case scenario in which no new funds are available for rebenching and cuts to campus budgets are necessary, distributing cuts in alignment with the goals of rebenching. However, the group acknowledged the President’s authority to alter this recommended solution in any given year in which circumstances warranted different action.

In the event of new funding from the State, funds would be distributed as follows:

• UC Merced – for enrollment funding according to its Memorandum of Understanding, which currently ends after 2013-14.
• Agreed-upon cost-adjustments to the “off-the-top programs” excluded from the rebenching base.
• To the campuses according to the rebenching targets based on the six-year implementation schedule. Under one state growth scenario, this would account for approximately 20% of any remaining new state funding after the above two categories are funded.
• Any remaining funds would be distributed according to the target General Fund percentages in the rebenching model\(^8\) in order to increase the dollar amount of state support per weighted student equally across the campuses. This would include UCSF’s distribution (proposal for UCSF described above).

These are the recommendations of the Rebenching Task Force. The President has the authority to take some, all, or none of these recommendations.

Calculations. Attachment A is the spreadsheet representing the latest version of the calculations that show a six-year path to implement the above recommendations. The spreadsheet shows the total amount of new funds that would be necessary to implement rebenching over six years\(^9\) and how those dollars would flow to each campus under that scenario. Note that it excludes the funding that would be needed for UC Merced and UC San Francisco and assumes no enrollment growth beyond the additional graduate students discussed above. Attachment B is a graph showing dollars per weighted student by campus, the system average, and the rebenching target.\(^10\)

---

\(^8\) Line S on the 5/4/12 version of the model (Attachment A)
\(^9\) Assuming no state General Fund cuts
\(^10\) The figures in the attachments will change as the various data elements are verified with the campuses and as implementation decisions are made.
### Results will change when data is verified with campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Irvine</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Merced</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Santa Barbara</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
<th>Systemwide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Budget Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - State Funds</td>
<td>$282,858,000</td>
<td>$312,560,000</td>
<td>$193,953,000</td>
<td>$398,800,000</td>
<td>$72,800,000</td>
<td>$154,405,000</td>
<td>$236,714,000</td>
<td>$186,936,000</td>
<td>$122,797,000</td>
<td>$116,751,000</td>
<td>$2,078,574,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - General Campus Off-the-top</td>
<td>$(24,418,471)</td>
<td>$(46,927,717)</td>
<td>$(894,000)</td>
<td>$(1,068,000)</td>
<td>$(725,000)</td>
<td>$(26,551,516)</td>
<td>$(15,911,660)</td>
<td>$(242,000)</td>
<td>$(675,000)</td>
<td>$(1,790,000)</td>
<td>$(122,773,368)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Health Science non-CTS Off-the-top</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(3,557,727)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(30,762,764)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(44,209,042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Clinical Teaching Support Off-the-top</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Fixed Cost Set-aside</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
<td>$(15,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - Subtotal (RF)</td>
<td>$243,449,525</td>
<td>$247,274,556</td>
<td>$178,259,009</td>
<td>$351,969,234</td>
<td>$57,075,000</td>
<td>$112,853,484</td>
<td>$202,022,140</td>
<td>$316,605,450</td>
<td>$107,122,000</td>
<td>$99,961,000</td>
<td>$1,761,591,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H - Health Science Budget</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
<td>Available to redistribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I - Adjusted campus base budget (G + H)</td>
<td>$243,449,525</td>
<td>$247,274,556</td>
<td>$178,259,009</td>
<td>$351,969,234</td>
<td>$57,075,000</td>
<td>$112,853,484</td>
<td>$202,022,140</td>
<td>$316,605,450</td>
<td>$107,122,000</td>
<td>$99,961,000</td>
<td>$1,761,591,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrollment Options**

| O - Graduate Growth to UC average | 12.0% |
| P - Population to weight | All-State-portable |
| Q - Weighting Scheme* | Custom |
| R - Weighted Enrollment | 42,348 | 40,144 | 35,832 | 54,883 | N/A | 20,895 | 36,741 | N/A | 25,055 | 19,168 | 275,266 |
| S - % of Systemwide Total (Campus R / System R) | 15.4% | 14.7% | 13.0% | 19.9% | N/A | 7.6% | 13.3% | N/A | 9.1% | 7.0% | 100.0% |
| T - Campus funds on equal per-student distr. | $237,663,495 | $236,124,746 | $200,844,246 | $307,624,229 | N/A | $112,119,907 | $205,099,339 | N/A | $140,437,390 | $107,439,788 | $1,542,911,140 |
| U - Change in State Funds: Dollars (F - I) | $(6,002,000) | $(219,319,810) | $22,585,245 | $(44,314,059) | N/A | $4,266,423 | $9,316,999 | N/A | $33,315,390 | $7,478,788 | 0 |
| V - Change in State Funds: Percentage (UI) | -2.5% | -8.5% | 12.3% | -12.6% | N/A | 3.8% | 1.9% | N/A | 31.1% | 7.5% |
| W - Dollars per weighted student (I/IR) | $5,605 | $5,605 | $5,605 | $5,605 | N/A | $5,605 | $5,605 | N/A | $5,605 | $5,605 |

| X - New Funds Needed (W, or if W-negative, 0) | - | - | $22,585,245 | - | N/A | $4,266,423 | $9,316,999 | N/A | $33,315,390 | $7,478,788 | 0 |

| Y - Resultant Dollars on Campus (the greater of N or T) | $243,449,525 | $247,274,556 | $200,844,246 | $351,969,234 | N/A | $117,119,907 | $205,099,339 | N/A | $140,437,390 | $107,439,788 | $1,614,473,985 |

| Z - Resultant Dollars per Weighted Student (Y/R) | $5,749 | $6,129 | $5,605 | $4,113 | N/A | $5,401 | $5,499 | N/A | $4,275 | $5,215 |

| AA - Difference from Mean (Campus Z - System-Z) | $(116) | $264 | $(260) | 548 | N/A | $(260) | $(260) | N/A | $(260) | $(260) |

| AB - Resultant Dollars per Weighted Student (rank of Z) | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

| AC - Bring Those below or up to 1 | 1 |

| AB - Redistribution target (per weighted student) | **$6,413** | **$6,413** | **$6,413** | **$6,413** | N/A | **$6,413** | **$6,413** | N/A | **$6,413** | **$6,413** |

| AE - Resultant campus budget (F + AD) | $271,181,239 | $258,709,420 | $229,793,590 | $351,969,234 | N/A | $134,001,389 | $235,825,082 | N/A | $160,879,794 | $122,025,979 | $1,765,303,704 |

| AF - Resultant dollars needed (AE - N) | **$28,131,714** | **$11,454,864** | **$51,534,590** | - | N/A | **$21,147,885** | **$33,600,742** | N/A | **$53,557,794** | **$22,964,975** | **$222,392,564** |

### University of California
Budget and Capital Resources
Rebunching Model
Appendix B:
Rebenching Model Results: dollars per "weighted" student

These values are State General Funds per "weighted" student based on the formula in the rebenching model. The values are not related to the actual costs or expenditures for instruction since the model only accounts for a portion of one revenue source. It does not take into account other State General Funds, other revenue sources, actual expenditures, budget cuts, or over-enrollment.
November 19, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
   Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Thomas Morton, Chair  
   Committee on Academic Freedom

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

On November 14, 2012, the Committee on Academic Freedom considered whether rebenching will have an effect on academic freedom, especially with regard to other campus’s taking a larger enrollment of out-of-state undergraduates, thereby increasing the necessity for UCR to accept a greater portion of in-state students. The sense of the committee was that the rebenching proposal does not explicitly affect academic freedom.
November 14, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

Fr: Greg Beran, Chair
    Academic Computing & Information Technology

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

The Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology reviewed the Systemwide report on Rebenching and had no significant comments.
To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Sarjeet Gill, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

On October 15, 2012, CAP voted unanimously to approve the proposal and sees it as a solid basis for rebenching throughout University of California. (+9-0-0).
November 20, 2012

TO: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: WARD BEYERMANN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: REVIEW OF THE REBENCHING POLICY

The Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the document referenced above and has no comments.
October 3, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Timothy Close, Chair
      Committee on Charges

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

The matter addressed in the forwarded documents is outside of the Committee on Charges' purview. As such, the Chair of the Committee on Charges opted not to put the matter before the members of this Committee. Consequently, no comments are provided from the Committee on Charges.
November 9, 2012

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

FROM: Byron Adams, Chair
    CODEO

Re: Recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee

The members of CODEO have no fundamental objection to these; indeed, increased transparency can only assist in maintaining and, indeed, improving, the recruitment and retention of a diverse campus community at the University of California, Riverside. Of course, CODEO is concerned that even in the wake of the passing of Proposition 30 and the sudden presence of a “supermajority” by Democrats in Sacramento, that our impressive achievements in this regard must not be compromised throughout the period of retrenchment that will now follow. One member of the committee noted that just because these seemingly positive developments have occurred does not mean that our vigilance toward increasing diversity on our campus should be taken for granted.

CODEO especially applauds this portion of the report’s emphasis on greater transparency in the statewide budget process.
November 15, 2012

TO: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: RICHARD SMITH, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON COURSES

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF “REBENCHING” REPORT

Members of the Committee on Courses reviewed the report in question and had no comments regarding the matter.
November 16, 2012

To: Jose Wudka
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Irving G. Hendrick
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Committee on Faculty Welfare Comments on Rebenching

Happily, the present report from the Rebenching Budget Committee begins from the premise that the University of California is a single institution, and thus must employ a consistently excellent faculty and offer excellent programs at all of its locations. Even with this commendable starting point, the Committee on Faculty Welfare appreciates the inherent difficulty of devising an equitable system for distributing state funds. The matter has been studied, argued, debated, and discussed some more by virtually all stakeholders in the University community for several years. At last, we are at a point where the key complaints are coming from campuses that have enjoyed privileged positions, not from those that have something to gain. The Riverside Campus is one that stands to gain from rebenching. While we might wish greater protection in case, for example, our graduate enrollment targets are not met, it is difficult to see how UCR would have the internal political capital to force an improvement in the near term.

Given present realities, we support the Rebenching Budget Committee’s proposal.
November 13, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division  

From: Connie Nugent, Chair  
Graduate Council  

Re: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF “REBENCHING” REPORT  

The Graduate Council discussed the proposed rebenching policy at their meeting October 18, 2012. The policy was considered as a positive step forward in spreading funds across the campuses more equally.
October 11, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: David Glidden, Chair
Committee on Preparatory Education

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

The Committee on preparatory Education reviewed the Report and Recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee and noted the following:

The proposed weighting factors,

"Per-student funding is to be distributed on a weighted basis in which undergraduate, post baccalaureate, graduate professional, and graduate academic master’s students are weighted at 1, doctoral students at 2.5, and health sciences students at 5 (except health sciences undergraduate students are at 1 and health sciences academic doctoral students are at 2.5)."

Certainly encourage an emphasis on enrollment of doctoral and health sciences postgraduate students over undergraduates.

Another provision

"At the undergraduate level, only California resident students will enter into the formula for determining the allocation of state funding in the model. At the graduate level, all students are included."

Discourages enrollment of nonresident undergraduates versus nonresident graduates.

Still other provisions,

"Only enrolled students up to a targeted number established in a systemwide enrollment
planning process will be included. Students above targets will not be included in the weighting formula."

And

"There will be a penalty if a campus falls below its undergraduate California resident targets by more than a particular percentage over a particular time frame. For each student below the target, a campus will lose its per-student funding times a multiplier. The tolerance, time frame, and multiplier for assessing the penalty will be determined in implementation. For example, it has been proposed that the penalty be assessed if a campus falls below its target by more than one percent calculated using a three-year rolling average and that the multiplier be 1.5."

Strongly encourage adherence to targeted enrollment goals, especially for undergraduates.

All of these factors have the potential to influence policies for the admission of undergraduates, although not their preparation.

The document does not speak directly to some other issues that have been important relative to funding of undergraduate students, namely reduced or no funding for students taking less than full unit load or taking longer than 4 years to graduate. Should UCR assume that these issues will be handled as in the past? Preparation of undergraduates is certainly important here.

The Rebenching Budget committee states that they hope that adjustments in funding in this new model will be accomplished by increased state funding to bring the per student funding for all campuses up to the level of the currently highest funded campus (UCLA). This hope seems unrealistic in the current state budget situation, which begs the question what will the real implementation actually look like?

The current UC emphasis in seeking foreign undergraduates to boost tuition revenue (e.g. students from China) runs counter to the rebenching emphasis on California residents. Medical school students seem singled out for favorable emphasis over other graduate professional schools, such as veterinary schools, law schools, business schools. That rationale does not seem to be defended. To that end, the faith in increased state funding seems wistful. Furthermore, the definition of full-time student status is assumed, not defended here.

In other words, the proposed rebenching policy may run counter to the University policy of seeking a larger cohort of international students. Moreover, it lacks a clear justification for favoring one group of graduate students over others. And if the rebenching proposal is based on the dubious assumption of increased student funding, it may have deleterious effects on undergraduate funding, especially at a campus like ours where students are often less than full-time due to financial necessity.
November 8, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Ziv Ran, Chair
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

The committee does not wish to opine.
November 13, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division

Fr: Len Nunney, Chair
    Research

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

The Committee on Research discussed the Systemwide report on Rebenching and had no significant comments.
November 20, 2012

TO: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION
FR: GUANSHUA XU, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY EXTENSION
RE: REVIEW OF THE REBENCHING POLICY

The Committee on University Extension reviewed the document referenced above and felt more information of the implications of the policy changes needs to be elaborated on before making further comments.
November 15, 2012

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair of the Academic Senate  
University of California, Riverside

From: Bahman Anvari  
Chair of the Faculty  
Bourns College of Engineering  
University of California, Riverside

RE: Report and Recommendation of the Rebenching Budget Committees

The BCOE Executive Committee discussed the Report and Recommendation of the Rebenching Budget Committees on October 22, 2012. The committee is very supportive of the rebenching project as it provides a formula for allocating state equitability across campuses, and the funds to reach the 12% ratio of doctoral to undergraduate students.
TO: Jose Wudka, Chair,  
    Academic Senate, Riverside Division

FROM: Gillian Wilson, Chair, Executive Committee  
      College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

DATE: November 1st, 2012

RE: Report and Recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee

Dear Jose,

The CNAS Executive Committee discussed the Report and Recommendation from the Rebenching Budget Committee during its meeting on October 30th 2012.

The CNAS Executive Committee strongly supports the University’s efforts to achieve a more transparent and equitable process for allocating funds received from the State of California to its ten campuses. In particular, the committee endorses the view that state support per student should not depend on the campus a student attends.

The committee were in favor of allocations to “off-the-top” programs including the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES), but would have appreciated more details of how these allocations were to be determined and annually adjusted. The committee assumed that the new UC Riverside School of Medicine would qualify as an “off-the-top” program, but would have appreciated explicit confirmation of this (presumably the Medical School had not been granted accreditation at the time of writing of the report).

Whilst generally supportive of per-student funding being distributed on a weighted basis, more discussion of the relative weighting of different categories of student would have been appreciated i.e, how were the weighting factors of 2.5 for doctoral students and 5 for health sciences students determined?

The committee had a number of questions about the funding model for graduate students. Firstly, why was 12 percent determined to be the ideal target ratio of Ph.D. to undergraduates? Secondly, it was unclear how graduate students were to be weighted. Will the total number of students enrolled in graduate school count towards a campus’s
total, or is there a cut-off time e.g., in years since student entered the Ph.D. program (if the latter, one complication that the committee noted is that different programs have markedly different average times to completion of Ph.D.).

Sincerely,

Gillian Wilson
Chair, Executive Committee
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
November 6, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Melanie Sperling, Professor and Chair
    GSOE Executive Committee

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

In response to the report of the Rebenching Budget Committee, the Graduate School of Education supports the committee’s recommendations and urges their rapid implementation.
To: Jose Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division

From: Ameae Walker, Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, School of Medicine

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

The Committee applauds the core principles of the report since they aim to rectify historical inequities that by their existence do not grant equal opportunity to all students enrolled at the University of California. However, since the recommendations require an influx of new funding for implementation and none is likely in the near future, the report tacitly accepts the status quo as inevitable until such funds are forthcoming. This is unacceptable since it supports continued inequities. While the committee understands that the proposed solution is the least controversial to implement, political expediency should not stand in the way of righting an historical wrong.

Further, given the purpose of the policy, it seems anomalous that normalizing the amount of funding per student be third on the list of fund allocation upon receipt of additional state funds.

Finally, a minor point concerns clarity of terminology at the bottom of page 2. The sentence describes “health sciences students at 5 (except health sciences undergraduate students at 1 ....)” Medical students are often referred to as undergraduates since graduate medical education refers to physicians participating in residency training. Some alternate wording is needed so that this does not lead to any dispute about the appropriate per-student funding for medical students.
October 2, 2012

To: Byron Adams, Chair
    Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity

    Jan Blacher, Chair
    Committee on Planning and Budget

    Sarjeet Gill, Chair
    Committee on Academic Personnel

    Irving Hendrick, Chair
    Committee on Faculty Welfare

    Ziv Ran, Chair
    Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

Re: Report from Taskforce on a negotiated salary plan for the general campus

The attached task force report outlines a four-year negotiated salary trial program to begin July 1, 2013 on the LA, San Diego and Irvine campuses. The trial program is in response to the systemwide review of proposed changes to APM 668.

Please discuss with your committee and submit your response by Friday, November 9, 2012.

Enclosure
June 25, 2012

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR ANDERSON
EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLORS

Re: Report from Taskforce on a negotiated salary plan for the general campus

Dear Colleagues:

Attached is the report from the Taskforce on a negotiated salary plan for the general campus. This joint Senate-Administration Taskforce has forwarded a set of recommendations, suggesting further review by the COVC and the Academic Council before final approval. They recommend that all review needs to be completed no later than December 1, 2012 so that implementation can begin on July 1, 2013. To assist the new Provost in her review of the plan, I am asking that any responses reach her even earlier than this December date, since campus templates can only be finalized after the plan is accepted.

Please contact Vice Provost Susan Carlson at (510) 987-9479 or susan.carlson@ucop.edu if you have any questions about the recommendations.

Sincerely,

Lawrence H. Pitts
Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs

Attachments

cc: Provost Designate Dorr
Academic Council Vice Chair Powell
Vice Provost Carlson
Executive Director Tanaka
Executive Director Winnacker
Interim Chief of Staff Greenspan
To: Executive Vice President and Provost Lawrence Pitts

From: Susan Carlson, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (UCOP) (convener)
Elizabeth Deakin, UCPB representative (UCB)
Harry Green, UCAP representative (UCR)
Dan Hare, UCFW representative (UCR)
Kristi Larsen, Assistant Vice Chancellor (UCSD)
Gene Lucas, Executive Vice President and Provost (UCSB)
Bob Powell, Vice Chair, Academic Senate (UCD)
Victoria Sork, Dean of Life Sciences (UCLA)
Scott Waugh, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (UCLA)

Subject: Report from Taskforce on a negotiated salary plan for the general campus

In February 2012, you convened a Taskforce on a faculty negotiated salary plan for the general campus. You took this action after systemwide review of proposed APM – 668, a review which generated a mixed response to the possibility of a negotiated salary program for the general campus.

The Taskforce charge was as follows:

To explore and recommend possible paths forward in consideration of a negotiated salary plan in the light of the serious shortfall in UC salary competitiveness and the concerns about the proposed APM – 668 raised by the Academic Council. The Taskforce may explore possible mechanisms for quantifying the risks and benefits in such a plan. The Taskforce may define parameters of such a salary plan, i.e. should the plan be limited to specific units or disciplines or campuses? Taskforce members should confer with their constituencies during plan development as may be appropriate. The Taskforce will meet in person once and by phone at least twice per month until its final report is complete. Final report due to Provost by June 15, 2012.

The Taskforce met by teleconference five times (February 28, March 14, April 2, and 26, and June 4) and in person on May 14 in Oakland.
Recommendation

We are recommending adoption of a “General Campus Negotiated Salary Trial Program” as outlined in the attached document. We have come to consensus that a four-year Trial Program on three campuses meets a pressing recruitment and retention need while putting in place data collection to allow for a full assessment of the program during its third year. We recommend the Trial Program take effect on July 1, 2013. In order for this to occur, final review, endorsement and approval needs to occur no later than December 1, 2012 in order to give campuses enough time to plan, train personnel, and put in place reporting metrics.

Background

The Taskforce began its work with a review of nearly two decades of effort to put a negotiated salary policy in place on the general campus. Taskforce members compiled a matrix of key issues that had come up in the systemwide review of APM – 668 and matched concerns with currently available evidence (or lack of evidence) to address the concerns and proposed evidence to collect in a Trial. With the help of campus partners, staff in Academic Personnel collected available data on cognate salary processes at UC. Most useful were data on the following: HSCP (particularly faculty in the basic sciences and those general campus faculty on split appointments in HSCP), UCR Division of Biomedical Sciences salary program (2007-2011), UCLA Public Health salary processes, and faculty drawing summer salary. The Taskforce collected and reviewed a large body of materials, and these can be made available to aid you in your review of the Trial Program. Minutes for the meetings are also available.

Taskforce discussion revealed a range of opinion about the advisability of a Trial Program. We believe open discussion led to development of Trial Program details that will allow the University to address a particular set of salary challenges while collecting data on the Trial Program’s effectiveness.

Next Steps

The COVC has endorsed instituting a General Campus Negotiated Salary Trial Program, although they should be provided these final documents for review and final endorsement. Senate members of the Taskforce have asked that the Academic Council review and comment on this Trial Program before a final decision is made.

In addition to the “Trial Program” document that is attached, we have also included a template for campus-level Implementation Procedures. If a Trial Program goes forward, each of the participating campuses would use this template to develop campus-based practices; these would be developed in partnership between faculty and administration. While each campus will need to design details of implementation that align with current campus practices, our recommendation is that departures from the Implementation Procedures template would be reviewed and endorsed by the local Senate and EVC and approved by the systemwide Provost, who would consult with the systemwide Senate Chair. Program consistency across campuses is essential to ensure that
the collected data are useful in assessing the program. This assessment process is core to the Taskforce recommendations.

Members of the Taskforce would be pleased to discuss these recommendations with you.

cenc:  General Campus Negotiated Salary Trial Program
       DRAFT Implementation Procedures for Trial Negotiated Salary Program
General Campus Negotiated Salary Trial Program  
June 15, 2012

Since at least 1995, UC faculty and administrators have been working to design a negotiated salary plan for faculty on the general campus. Given the concerns about proposed APM – 668 (“Negotiated Salary Program”), a Taskforce of campus administrators and faculty met in the spring of 2012 to design a Trial Program to test the effectiveness of the concept on a few UC campuses. The Trial outlined below will respond to an immediate recruitment and retention need on three campuses (UC San Diego, UCLA, and UC Irvine) and will allow the University to collect valuable data on the use and effectiveness of the program. Subsequently and with the data generated and collected through the Trial, parties can have a more informed discussion of the need for a systemwide policy. This Trial would be operational on July 1, 2013.

A. Program Components

Overview: The four-year Negotiated Salary Trial Program (Trial) will allow up to three UC campuses to test a negotiated salary process for general campus faculty. Eligible faculty will be able to voluntarily contribute external fund sources toward their total salary, with the negotiated salary amount funded through external sources. The amount of negotiated salary will have a cap of 30% of the base salary (academic or fiscal, including off-scale); and the Dean or designee will have responsibility for managing funding of the negotiated salary program. Merit review will continue according to campus policy, and each participating campus will determine the appropriate role for its Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) or equivalent committee.

Scope: Administrators and Divisional Senates on three campuses (UCI, UCLA, and UCSD) will consult on potential participation. Once a Trial Program has been approved, the EVC on each campus, with Senate input, will coordinate with divisions/schools/departments that will take part.

Eligibility: Ladder-rank and in-residence faculty who have advanced in rank or step in their last academic review (or equivalent satisfactory review) are eligible, provided the faculty member’s campus and division/school/department has opted to participate. HSCP members and full-time deans and faculty administrators (as defined in APM – 240 & 246) are not eligible.

Faculty responsibilities: Participating faculty are expected to meet all teaching, research and service obligations and to be in compliance with all applicable University policies, procedures, and training requirements. The campus will ensure that policies about the buy-out of teaching are maintained.
Fund management: Only external funds will be used to support this program. “External funds” refers to any non-state-appropriated funds, such as (but not limited to) endowment or gift income, professional degree fees, self-supporting degree fees, and contract and grant support. The Dean or his/her designee will have responsibility for managing program funds, reviewing the availability of F&A, and for covering any unforeseen shortfalls. General Funds cannot be substituted for external funds in support of the program.

Salary: The total negotiated salary will be comprised of the salary covered under the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) (scale base plus off-scale components) and a negotiated salary component. Negotiations will be conducted annually to determine an individual’s total negotiated salary for the following year. The total negotiated salary must be effective for one full year, corresponding with the University fiscal cycle of July 1 – June 30 and may not be changed during that year. The faculty member’s salary (scale plus off-scale) will not be permanently affected (neither increased nor decreased) as a result of participating in this program.

Process: As outlined in the Implementation Procedures, eligible faculty will work with the department chair and department business officer to develop a proposal for a negotiated salary, with proposals approved by the dean.

Reporting/Review: At the end of each fiscal year, the systemwide Provost will gather (from each EVC whose campus is participating) data on the program, compile it, and share with the COVC and the Academic Senate. A comprehensive review will be undertaken during year three. Trend data will be provided in year two and after. Details of the report elements are listed below in section B. An interim report on participation will be submitted as soon as possible after the Trial begins on July 1, 2013.

Implementation: This document will serve as the Program Policy document with all items outlined here to be constant among all participating campuses. The systemwide Provost will also develop “Implementation Procedures for a Trial Negotiated Salary Program” with details about the procedural details of running the program on campus. Each campus will adapt this template to its own approval and review structures. Departures from this Program document and the “Implementation Procedures” must be approved by the systemwide Provost with input from the Chair of the Senate.

---

1 Faculty will remain on pre-existing appointments (either academic or fiscal); those on academic year appointments remain eligible for summer ninths which will continue to be processed under pre-existing guidelines.
Compliance: When Federal projects are involved, the program must be compliant with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-21. Participating faculty retain their obligation to abide by University policy including Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, the Faculty Code of Conduct, and the policy on the requirement to submit proposals and receive awards for grants and contracts through the University.

Duration and termination: The program will run for four years, beginning July 1, 2013, with a full review during the third year. At that time, the Provost and Academic Senate will determine the advisability of adding policy language to the APM, continuing the Trial, or terminating the Trial. The systemwide Provost may suspend the Trial effective June 30 of any year should the program be deemed to put the University at risk; an individual campus EVC may suspend the campus participation effective June 30 of any year.

B. Metrics, Reporting, and Assessment

An interim report on participation will be submitted as soon as possible after the Trial begins on July 1, 2013, including prospective information provided in the faculty applications for 2013-14. In addition, annually at the end of the fiscal year, the Office of the President will collect information on the operation of the program from each participating campus. The goal of the data collection will be to identify any positive or negative impacts of the Trial Program; i.e., was faculty retention positively/negatively impacted? was teaching positively/negatively impacted? was graduate student and postdoc support adequate? etc. The systemwide Provost will distribute a combined report to COVC and the Academic Council for review and feedback. The following information will be collected:

Funding

- Information on external funding utilized in connection with Trial: track funding by type (endowment funds, contracts and grants [by agency], gifts, fees, etc.).
- Development and use of the program funds.

Demographic information on faculty, teaching, and research support in participating units

- Collection of information on all faculty in participating departments: a) department and school or division, rank and step, gender, race/ethnicity, b) salary, including off-scale, summer ninths, negotiated amount, c) teaching loads, including those who bought out a teaching assignment during the year (data both before and during Trial period) and indication of teaching done on-load or as overload.
- Data on graduate student and post-doc support by department and individual (data both before and during Trial period).
Surveys

Faculty and administrators with expertise in survey design and administration will develop surveys for faculty and administrators involved to assess effectiveness of the program on Trial campuses. The surveys will allow for assessments of conflicts of interest and commitment as well as morale. They will be used to ascertain the extent to which this program has successfully helped with hiring and retention and has not been detrimental.

In addition, each annual report by the campus EVC will include an administrative assessment of relevant issues, including a review of the personnel process at various stages: CAP, department chairs, and deans.

A comprehensive three-year review will assess whether the Trial Program has helped UC meet University goals effectively. After the three-year reports are reviewed by the Academic Council and the COVC, the systemwide Provost will recommend to the President whether the Trial Program should be 1) reviewed for inclusion in the APM, 2) maintained for an additional trial period, perhaps on additional campuses, or 3) terminated.
The “Negotiated Salary Trial Program” (hereafter referred to as “Trial”) is outlined in a Program Document approved by the Provost, after consultation with the Faculty Senate in fall 2012; the Program Document will be appended to each Campus Implementation Procedures document.

All General Campus Academic Divisions (College A, School B, School C, etc.) will have the option to participate in the Trial program. Deans will inform the EVC on or before March 1 which departments will participate in the Trial.

For departments participating in the Trial, all eligible members of the department faculty may participate in the negotiated salary program. All members would receive a copy of the implementation procedures and any other related documents (i.e. Trial Program document).

Proposal Submission Process

For departments who are participating in the Trial:

- Eligible faculty members as provided for in the “General Campus Negotiated Salary Trial Program” (Program document) may participate in the negotiation process.
- Faculty members must have the allowable and appropriate funding resources available to support the total negotiated salary.

No later than March 1 of each year a call will be issued to eligible faculty by their respective home departments regarding the annual negotiation for the coming fiscal year.

Interested and eligible faculty shall submit a Trial Plan Proposal Form for the following year. A common proposal form will allow for a consistent collection of data on the Trial (see “Metrics, Reporting, and Assessment” section of the Program Document).

Negotiations are for one fiscal year effective July 1 and ending on June 30. Retroactive participation is not permitted.

Participation must be renegotiated each year. Renewals are not automatic. The systemwide Provost may suspend the Trial Program on June 30 of any year; an individual campus EVC may suspend the campus participation effective June 30 of any year.

Eligibility and Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty eligibility and responsibilities are outlined in the Program document, and include the following:

- Advancement in rank or step in last academic review (or equivalent satisfactory review)
- Fulfillment of faculty member’s approved teaching load
- University service commensurate with rank and step
- All research contracts and grants in good standing, (e.g. no outstanding agency reports or accounts in deficit)
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- Research support obligations fulfilled, including current students, incoming students, tuition, benefits, research support, post-docs, etc. Faculty have a responsibility to support such costs.
- Compliance with relevant reporting and training requirements.

Evaluation of Proposals

Prior to submission of a proposal, the faculty member must meet with the appropriate campus Fund Manager/Department Business Officer to verify the proposed funding source(s). The Fund Manager/Department Business Officer will confirm that the funding source(s) is allowable and that it will remain in place for the entire fiscal year.

Once the funding has been verified by the Fund Manager/Department Business Officer, the participating faculty member should submit the Proposal Form to her/his department Chair no later than April 1. The Department Chair and department business office will review the proposal to ensure that:

- The requestor has met or will meet all teaching, research and service obligations; and is in compliance with all applicable University policies, procedures and training requirements
- The amount requested is consistent with these implementation procedures
- Allowable and appropriate resources are available to support the proposal including benefits costs and (if applicable) reserve funds requirement.

The Department Chair will review the proposals and forward endorsed proposals to the Dean no later than April 15. The Dean will review proposals and will forward all endorsed proposals to the EVC on or before May 1.

Each participating campus will review appropriate participation for CAP, so that the review of negotiated salary proposals is in line with other responsibilities of the CAP (or equivalent committee) for that particular campus.

Under Option A, The EVC will forward endorsed proposals to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). CAP will review the proposals in the same manner it currently reviews salary and/or retention recommendations. The EVC will review and inform the dean of approved proposals no later than June 1.

Under Option B, the EVC will review and inform the dean of approved proposals no later than June 1. CAP will receive a report of the actions.

If a proposal is approved by the Chair, Dean and EVC, a salary confirmation letter will be sent to the faculty member confirming the faculty member’s total salary for the coming fiscal year. Notification of approved participation will be sent to the faculty member, Chair, MSO, and AP Office.

If the Chair does not endorse and forward a faculty member’s proposal, the Chair should meet with the faculty member and if an agreeable change to the proposal is reached, any modification should be documented and the proposal forwarded as outlined above.
If the Chair does not endorse because a faculty member does not have sufficient funding, the Chair will inform the Dean and the Dean will review. If the Dean concurs with the chair, s/he will communicate the finding to the faculty member and provide the faculty member a summary of review findings.

If the proposal is not endorsed by the Chair because the faculty member does not meet the minimum eligibility criteria, the Chair will inform the Dean and the Dean will review. If the Dean concurs with the chair, s/he will forward the proposal, the chair’s assessment and the Dean’s assessment to the EVC. These eligibility cases will be reviewed by CAP, who will provide a recommendation to the EVC. The EVC will issue a final resolution within 7 days of CAP review.

Approval Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Initial Response</th>
<th>Next Step/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Authorization</td>
<td>Dept business officer</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Resolve any issues with faculty member then forward to chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Negotiation</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>Negotiate with faculty member and forward endorsement to Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Review</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Review proposal and forward endorsement to EVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP Review</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVC Endorsement</td>
<td>EVC</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>Endorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Appeals</td>
<td>EVC</td>
<td>7 days of CAP review</td>
<td>Review case and issue final resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compensation Components

Negotiations between the faculty member and Department Chair will be conducted annually to determine the total UC salary for the year. Total compensation will be established as follows:

**Scale-Based Salary**
Participating faculty will receive their scale-based salary in addition to an optional negotiated component. The scale-based salary refers to an individual’s regular scale salary rate plus any off-scale as approved at the time of hire or as a result of a retention offer or regular academic review. The scale-based salary (scale and off-scale) is considered covered compensation under the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) up to the amount permissible by Internal Revenue Code provisions and in accordance with UCRP policy and provisions.

**Negotiated Salary Component**
A negotiated salary component beyond scale-based salary may be negotiated annually and has a cap of 30% of the scale based salary.

**Participation Effective Dates**

---

1 This Program does not change the faculty member’s basic appointment base: academic or fiscal. Those on academic year appointments remain eligible for summer ninths which will continue to be processed under pre-existing guidelines.
The total UC salary rate will be effective July 1 through June 30. Newly hired faculty with mid-year start dates may participate from the appointment begin date through June 30. Increases negotiated as a result of a formal retention will be effective on July 1 of the next year. Early withdrawal from the program is allowed only upon separation from the University or as a result of an official disciplinary action (as described in APM 015 and 016 and Senate Bylaw 230).

**Salary Attributes**

The following chart defines the normal funding source for each salary component and whether the salary component is considered covered compensation for UCRP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Component</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Covered Comp?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale-Based Rate (rank/step + off-scale, if applicable)</td>
<td>State general funds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated Salary Component</td>
<td>External funds</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Salary</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Not covered comp under UCRP but special Defined Contribution benefit applies (matching 3.5% contributions from employee and employer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Stipend (if applicable)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fund sources may come from any combination of external funding sources as defined in the Trial Program document.

Funding must be awarded and in hand prior to June 30 of the current fiscal year to be considered for that year’s negotiation. The fund source must cover the entire year of the proposal. There are no exceptions. Funds awarded after the salary rate for the year is established may be considered eligible compensation for the following fiscal year.

Effort for salaries charged to sponsored projects funded by federal sources must be accurately and appropriately calculated and certified.

The total UC salary—scale-based salary plus negotiated component—may not be changed for any reason, including but not limited to: mid-year salary scale adjustments (e.g. general range/ COLA), retroactive merit increases, or the receipt of additional contract and grant funds. If a faculty member’s salary is raised effective October 1 (or any other date other than July 1) due to a general range/COLA, the negotiated salary component will be adjusted downward while the covered compensation goes up so that the total UC salary remains unchanged for the fiscal year.

**Other Additional Compensation**

Additional compensation programs for faculty earning summer ninths remain intact. Faculty may earn up to three-ninths additional summer compensation for research, teaching, and/or administrative service. Summer ninths shall be paid at the total UC salary rate (scale-based plus the negotiated salary component) according to standard summer salary policies. Faculty will maximize summer ninth
opportunities before utilizing this Program. Any portion of a ninth paid for service in June shall be based upon the individual’s salary in effect on June 30.

If summer salary compensation is based on the academic year salary, Summer Session teaching compensation will be based upon the total UC salary rate (scale-based plus the negotiated salary component) in effect on June 30 of the calendar year in which the Summer Session begins.

All applicable Federal policies still apply. For example, a maximum of 2/9ths summer salary or the equivalent amount of academic year salary may be charged to NSF grants. Agency (e.g., NIH) salary caps must be observed and state funds may not be used to pay the cap gap.

**Administrative Compensation**

HSCP members, full-time Deans, and full-time faculty administrators (see APM – 240 and 246 for definitions) are not eligible for this program.

Stipends issued for official administrative roles may not be included in the negotiated salary component and must be recorded as separate payments. Classification of official administrative roles will be determined in accordance with campus practice.

**Leaves of Absence**

While leaves may not be common for Trial participants, sabbatical leave and other leaves with pay will be granted at the total UC salary rate in effect during the period of the leave. State funds may be used only for the portion of a sabbatical leave related to a faculty member’s scale-based salary. Plans for leave will be proposed to the department chair according to current procedures.

Medical leave will be granted at the total UC salary rate through June 30 of the year of the leave (see APM – 715). If external fund restrictions preclude payment of medical leave, the department must provide appropriate unrestricted funds to ensure full payment of the total negotiated salary (the negotiated component cannot be paid through state funds). The University is under no obligation to continue the negotiated salary component if the medical leave continues into the next salary negotiation cycle (7/1 - 6/30).

**Intercampus Transfers**

Temporary intercampus appointments, including Faculty Consultant payments, will be based on the total UC salary rate in effect during the temporary appointment. For permanent intercampus transfers, APM – 510 applies. The negotiated salary component may not be a factor in determining a competing UC offer (see Appendix A in APM – 510). If the new campus is participating in the Trial program, the faculty member must negotiate a new proposal with his/her new campus.

**Overload Teaching**

If any portion of the negotiated salary component is based on overload teaching in a self-supporting UC program, the appropriate number of consulting days must be forfeited in accordance with APM 025.

**Financial Responsibility**

The Dean or his/her designee is responsible for managing funding of the negotiated salary program and will cover a faculty member’s total UC salary for the entire fiscal year period (7/1 to 6/30). The Dean may establish a sufficient reserve fund to serve this purpose.
Funding obligations for the total UC salary including negotiated component—as well as other research responsibilities such as reserve fund requirement, NIH salary cap gap, graduate student support, salary threshold levels, research equipment, benefits, salary raises, etc.—must be met and therefore this must be determined during the negotiation process.

Where applicable, the reserve fund will be built via the accumulation of faculty released base-salary by supporting a portion of the base on non-state sources. A faculty member participating in the Trial is required to release base-salary equal to a percentage (to be determined by the campus) of the negotiated component. If a faculty member loses funding during the annual negotiated year period, the department must assure the faculty member receives his/her total negotiated UC salary for the year.

The reserve fund account minimum balance will be set by the Dean or his/her designee. If accumulations fall below this level, an increase in contribution rates or a transfer of non-state-appropriated general funds will be required to bring the balance to the required level. Use of any reserve fund surplus will be reviewed by faculty in the affected unit and approved by the Dean and the EVC.

It is expected that Deans will discuss with the faculty (a Faculty Executive Committee, for example) the usage of surplus funds. Additional input or practices may be developed by faculty in the decanal unit.

Reserve account accumulations and expenditures are to be reported annually to the EVC, including what faculty consultation occurred regarding the use of the funds.

**Reporting**

The EVC is responsible for reporting on campus participation to the Systemwide Provost annually.

**Notification, Documentation and Implementation**

Approved proposals will be documented in writing and signed by the faculty member, Department Chair, Dean, and EVC.

**Department Responsibilities**

- Forward the EVC’s the annual call to the departmental faculty
- Document the funding authorization process used for all proposals
- Document the methodology used to determine the negotiated salary component in each case
- Issue an annual salary confirmation letter to the faculty member
- Enter the negotiated salary in the payroll system
- Perform a post-audit of the salary implementation in payroll
- Provide annual documentation of teaching and service activities and extramural expenditures for graduate students for all participating faculty. Explain changes in student support levels.

**Dean’s Responsibilities**

- Notify the EVC by March 1 as to which departments will participate
- Ensure all participation criteria have been met and maintain documentation of reviews
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- Forward to EVC information on proposed faculty participation by May 1
- Ensure payroll action matches the approved negotiated salary amounts
- Report funding summary to the EVC.

EVC Responsibilities

- Issue annual call to participating units
- Submit proposals to CAP (Option A) or report negotiated salaries to CAP (Option B)
- Review faculty appeals of negative findings by the Dean and Department Chair
- Maintain appeal resolution documentation
- Notify the faculty member, Department Chair, and Dean of approved plans
- Maintain open communications with Academic Senate on implementation issues and concerns
- Serve as Office of Record for approved proposals
- Forward the Campus Implementation Procedure to the UC Provost for approval
- Provide annual report to the divisional Academic Senate by October 1
- Prepare data for Provost annually as required by Office of the President.

CAP Responsibilities

- Review proposals prior to approval. Provide input to EVC (Option A). Or, review list of negotiated salaries (Option B).
- Review faculty appeals of negative findings by the Dean and Department Chair where eligibility is at issue
- Review post audit annual reports on participation; provide feedback to EVC if there are issues or concerns.

Academic Senate Council Responsibilities (both divisional and systemwide)

- Receive annual report on Trial participation and metrics. Forward to appropriate Divisional and Systemwide committees for analysis and input.
- Respond to third-year review of Trial program and its future status.
October 16, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Sarjeet Gill, Chair
       Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Report from Taskforce on a negotiated salary plan for the general campus

CAP has carefully reviewed the Task Force’s proposal concerning APM-668 and reaffirms its earlier support for this initiative (+9-0-0). Although this will benefit some units and faculty more than others, i.e., those who have access to outside funding, we see no reason to object. We do not feel, however, that CAP needs to or even should be in the position to approve or disapprove these arrangements. Neither should it be a rubber stamp. We believe that Option B is preferable, whereby CAP will receive a report of all such actions from the EVC. UCR CAP is not involved in salary negotiations and does not care to change that policy.
November 9, 2012

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

FROM: Byron Adams, Chair
      CODEO

Re: Report from Taskforce on The Negotiated Salary Plan

CODEO responded to these documents with an appropriately diverse range of opinions. Counteracting the criticisms voiced in other contexts, one member suggested, “I don't think there would be problem of ‘eroding the University's position as an independent institution in this state’ nor this would affect the research conclusions of those faculty. I believe the research of some faculty is already (partially) funded by non-state funds. I have to trust their scholarly ethics. I believe they chose the academic jobs (over the possibly much higher pay industrial jobs) because they like the academic freedom. It's great that we have their interaction with our students/faculty. I also think their connection with the industry may help students getting jobs after they graduate.” Another pointed out, “The Negotiated Salary Plan was discussed by last year's CODEO and as I recall, we raised concerns about the impact on recruitment and retention of diverse faculty.” Another member of the committee reiterated these concerns.

The committee noted, however, that the current Negotiated Salary Plan does say that demographic data will be collected and analyzed from the pilot program, so there will be some data to address this concern after the trial period. When this data becomes available, CODEO will reexamine this issue using these figures.
November 8, 2012

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Irving G. Hendrick  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Report from Taskforce on a negotiated salary plan for the general campus

As the file will show, last year our Divisional Committee on Faculty Welfare opposed the Negotiated Salary Plan for general campuses, believing that further deviations from the University’s already highly differentiated salary policy was not in the best interest of faculty generally.

Notwithstanding our previous comments from 2011-12, we understand that the matter before us now involves the efficacy of the new policy as it moves into a four year pilot period of implementation on three campuses, not including Riverside. Much of the Pilot Project document focuses on program administration. By its very nature there are numerous opportunities for the policy to be implemented in diverse ways, not only between the three campuses, but from department to department and college to college (or school/division) on the same campus.

Success of the program is to be evaluated as described under Section B of the report. Almost certainly some administrative forms of implementation will be better than others. Program success needs to be determined by how well the program serves participants, as measured by such things as success in faculty recruitment and retention, faculty satisfaction, and scholarly productivity. Equally important will be the credible measurement of the program’s impact on the morale of colleagues who are not able to participate, not because they are less meritorious, but because they do not have access to external funding sources which sanction expenditures on salary in this form. Additionally, we urge that careful attention be given to the potential for creating or exaggerating gender, racial and ethnic inequities among faculty. Because so much is at stake for the University and its faculty, we urge as well that great care be given to the selection of the most well qualified program evaluators, who in turn will undertake their work by producing a highly credible evaluation design.
November 8, 2012

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Ziv Ran, Chair
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Report from Taskforce on a negotiated salary plan for the general campus

Concern was expressed that the negotiated salary plan could erode the University's position as an independent institution in this state. For, given the constraints of human nature, a professor whose salary is paid in whole or part by an external entity is less likely to undertake research or scholarly work, and less likely to reach conclusions, that may be of no interest, much less unfavorable, to the entity in question. Furthermore, these effects are likely to occur only gradually over time, and may not be apparent at the conclusion of the contemplated test period.
October 19, 2012

To: Ziv Ran, Chair
    Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
      Riverside Division

RE: PROPOSED CHANGES TO COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH BYLAWS

Attached for your review are proposed changes to the Bylaws for the Committee on Research.

Please submit your response to me by Friday, November 2, 2012
To be adopted:

Present:

8.20.1 The committee consists of at least seven members, one of whom serves as representative to the University Committee on Research Policy. It considers matters pertaining to research policy on the UC Riverside campus. (Am 5 Feb 87) (Am 25 May 2010)

8.20.2 In addition to this general charge, it also has the following specific duties: (Am 25 May 2010)

8.20.2.1 Advise the Academic Senate on general policies and budgetary needs concerning research activities that are supported by the funds at the disposal of this committee. (Am 25 May 2010)

8.20.2.2 Cooperate with the Office of Research to advise on the pre-selection of campus nominees or applicants for research contracts/grants from foundations and other granting agencies that restrict the number of proposals submitted from the campus. (Am 25 May 2010)

8.20.2.3 Review and evaluate faculty applications for support from intramural research funds, research travel funds, or other research funds for which the committee may

Proposed:

8.20.1 The committee consists of at least ten members, one of whom serves as representative to the University Committee on Research Policy; and the Vice Chancellor for Research who will serve as a non-voting ex officio member. Five members shall be appointed from the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences; the Graduate School of Education; and/or the School of Business Administration. Five members shall be appointed from the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences; the School of Medicine; and/or the Bourns College of Engineering. The committee considers matters pertaining to research policy on the UC Riverside campus. (Am 5 Feb 87) (Am 25 May 2010) (Am 27 November 2012)

8.20.2 In addition to this general charge, it also has the following specific duties: (Am 25 May 2010)

8.20.2.1 Advise the Academic Senate on general policies and budgetary needs concerning research activities that are supported by the funds at the disposal of this committee. (Am 25 May 2010)

8.20.2.2 Cooperate with the Office of Research to advise on the pre-selection of campus nominees or applicants for research contracts/grants from foundations and other granting agencies that restrict the number of proposals submitted from the campus. (Am 25 May 2010)

8.20.2.3 Review and evaluate faculty applications for support from intramural research funds, research travel funds, or other research funds for which the committee may
committee may be made responsible, and to recommend allocation of these funds within the limits of University policy governing the grants. (Am 9 Oct 69) (Am 25 May 2010)

Justification: The Vice Chancellor for Research is added to the committee to facilitate communication and co-operation between the Senate and the Research Office. The number of voting members, split equally between two broad disciplinary groups, is increased from 7 to 10 to reflect current practice that recognizes the increased number of grant applications reviewed by the committee and the value of paired committee reviews (one from each group) that provide both a general and a more specialized perspective.

Effective: upon approval

Approved by the Committee on Research: 10/15/2012

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 11/2/2012

Received by Executive Council: 11/26/2012