June 6, 2014

To: Division Officers:
Jennifer Hughes (History), Vice Chair
Piotr Gorecki (History), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Bahram Mobasher (Physics & Astronomy), Senior Assembly Representative
Ilhem Messaoudi Powers (SOM), Junior Assembly Representative

Standing Committee Chairs:
Mike Allen (Plant Pathology & Microbiology), Research (COR)
James Baldwin (Nematology), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Kenneth Barish (Physics), Planning and Budget (P&B)
Lynda Bell (History), Graduate Council (GC)
Ward Beyermann (Physics & Astronomy), Educational Policy (CEP)
Lucille Chia (History), Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Comm
Kathryn DeFea (Biomed), Undergraduate Admissions (UAC)
Erica Edwards (English), CHASS Executive Committee
George Haggerty (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
Mariam Lam (Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages), Committees (COC)
John Levin (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Joseph Morse (Entomology), Library, Info Technology & Scholarly Comm
Barry Mishra (SOBA), SOBA Executive Committee
Eugene Nothnagel (Botany & Plant Sciences), Preparatory Education (PRP)
Akula Venkatram (Mechanical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
Ameae Walker (School of Medicine), SOM Executive Committee
Georgia Warnke (Political Science), Faculty Welfare (FW)
Gillian Wilson (Physics & Astronomy), CNAS Executive Committee
Zhenbiao Yang (Botany & Plant Sciences), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)

Fr: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda ~ June 9, 2014

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, June 9, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in the University Office Building Room 220.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agenda</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>1:00 – 1:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent Calendar</td>
<td>pp. 2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Approval of the Agenda for June 9, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Approve Draft Minutes of May 12, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>1:05 – 1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Systemwide Review of President’s Policy on Copyright &amp; Fair Use</td>
<td>pp.6-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted Committees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad Freedom</td>
<td>BCOE Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Welfare (no resp)</td>
<td>CHASS Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>CNAS Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>1:10 – 1:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Campus Review of Riverside’s off-scale policy</td>
<td>pp.15-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted Committees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>BCOE Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoDEO</td>
<td>CHASS Exec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Welfare</td>
<td>CNAS Exec (no resp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>1:30 – 1:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Request to use working titles for Lecturers with Security of Employment</td>
<td>pp.27-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted Committees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>Rules &amp; Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>1:45 – 2:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Announcements by Chair Wudka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Discussion</td>
<td>2:15 – 3:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Discussion with Chancellor K. Wilcox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Council Meeting Minutes
May 12, 2014

Present:
Division Officers:
Piotr Gorecki, Secretary/Parliamentarian                Jennifer Hughes, Vice Chair
Ilhem Messaoudi Powers, Jr Assembly Rep                Jose Wudka, Division Chair

Standing Committee Chairs:
Michael Allen, Research                                 Kenneth Barish, Planning & Budget
Lynda Bell, Graduate Council                            Ward Beyermann, Educational Policy
Kathryn DeFea, Undergraduate Admissions                 Erica Edwards, CHASS Exec Committee
George Haggerty, Academic Personnel                     Mariam Lam, Committees
John Levin, GSOE Exec Committee                        Barry Mishra, SOBA Exec Committee
Joseph Morse, LITSCC                                    Eugene Nothnagel, Preparatory Education
Akula Venkatram, BCOE Exec Committee                   Ameae Walker, SOM Exec Committee
Georgia Warnke, Faculty Welfare

Absent:
James Baldwin, Physical Resource Planning               Bahram Mobasher, Sr Assembly Rep
Gillian Wilson, CNAS Exec Committee                    Zhenbiao Yang, Diversity & Equal Opportunity

APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AGENDA AND MINUTES
The agenda for May 12 and the minutes from April 14 were approved as written

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO APM 190. APPENDIX A
Executive Council discussed the proposed changes to Appendix A-2 of section 190 of the Academic Personnel Manual. This was a straightforward policy change with unanimous support for the proposal.

CAMPUS REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO DIVISION BYLAW 8.1.1
Chair Wudka submitted a proposal to revise Division Bylaw 8.1.1 so that Senate members holding administrative positions higher than department chair may not serve as chairs of divisional committees or serve as divisional representatives in systemwide committees. There was considerable discussion about what constitutes an administrative position and the lack of clarity in the proposal. Chair Wudka is going to revise the proposal and re-submit at a later date.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE UC POLICY ON SUPPLEMENT TO MILITARY PAY
There was little discussion by Executive Council due to its general agreement with continuation of the policy which provides salary supplements to UC faculty and staff serving on active military duty. There was, however, one point concerning personnel whose salary, fully or partially, is covered by an extramural source that the members of Executive Council felt should be addressed in our campus response. In this case, Executive Council suggests the policy should clarify that the supplementary salary will be provided by the campus.

In addition there were two questions that merit clarification: wherefore came the time limit of 2 years on the supplementary salary, and the rationale for including a limiting date of June 30, 2018. Neither of these limitations has an obvious justification, and may be interpreted as a lack of full support for the affected personnel.
SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COMPENDIUM
There was prolonged discussion and serious concerns about some of the proposed changes to the Compendium, and general dissatisfaction with the manner in which the proposed changes were presented. In particular, Executive Council urged for any future revisions to be accompanied by a concise justification.

The main concerns related to the proposed revisions to the MRU policies and the new MRP policy:

- The contents of the request for proposals for multi-campus research programs (section V.C) is solely the job of the VPRGS, with no Senate consultation at any level required; in fact no consultation at all is apparently required. Given the controversies that have surrounded the VPRGS office in the past this does not seem prudent.
- The requirements on the VPRGS in consulting with the divisions when determining the overall research goals are weak in the extreme (section V.C.1). Though in the past the VPRGS convened an advisory group (the Portfolio Review Group - PRG), there is no requirement for him/her to do so in the future; even the PRG is only mentioned in a footnote (presumably as an example of a mechanism the VPRGS might use to elicit input), and its role is qualified as only 'likely to have an effect'. This lack of specificity can lead to the disenfranchisement of one or more of the divisions depending on the whims of the VPRGS, or for the consultation with the Senate to devolve into a pro-forma exchange.
- UCORP is (appropriately) singled out as the lead committee in most MRU/MRP actions, but there is no explicit requirement that this Committee elicit input from Council. And while this might be implicit, a specific requirement to this effect would be useful, providing an alternative avenue for the divisions to provide input.
- It is doubtful that a blanket sunset policy is either sensible or wise.

In addition, there was general confusion about the interrelation between the MRU, MRP and MRPI programs, as well as their differences; Executive Council suggests that a comparison table be included to clarify these issues.

NEW BUSINESS
Chair Wudka introduced the de-accessioning of books by the Library as a new item of business. Chair Wudka has received concerns by individual faculty members about the de-accessioning process allegedly being enacted by the University Librarian. Chair Wudka asked Executive Council for guidance on how to move forward and for information and input in their recent experiences with the Library. The CHASS Executive Committee raised concerns about the library strategic plan and its lack of any information about efforts to enlarge our print collection. It was determined that the LITSC Committee would draft a letter for Chair Wudka to forward to University Librarian Mandeville-Gamble and suggest the following:

1. The subject of the purchase of Specialty books and other materials needed by campus faculty and students in the conduct of their research as well as any that might be listed for deaccession should be discussed with the LITSC subcommittee.
2. A list of what books or other materials have been deaccessioned by year, be compiled for the past 3 years and provided to Dr. Chia who will share it with the Executive Council and the LITSC subcommittee. Both groups might be asked for feedback.
3. Until 2 and 3 occur (including feedback), no books be deaccessioned.
4. That meetings continue to be held with affected and/or concerned faculty and that as needed the LITSC Committee be involved in these discussion.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR
Chair Wudka provided an update of Academic Council, and advised:
- That BOARS and UCOP published a statement on the importance of Writing as an Admission requirement in response to the changes to the SAT.
- The Academic Planning Council will soon issue a self-supporting program policy.
• The Legislative Analyst would like to have uniform performance measures for all segments of higher education in California.

• SB520 (which would have required the UC to contract out to private companies to develop instruction online material) has died in legislature.

• There is a push by in California Legislature to revise A-G admission requirements.

• There was an attempt for a constitutional amendment to modify Prop 209 to give more support to Latin communities to entry into the UC. The amendment was opposed by a conservative Asian group in the Bay Area.

• After much discussion, the proposal to revise bylaw 55 did not pass at Council. In lieu of the change, OP is going to send a reminder memo to each campus reminding them of the option of allowing advisory votes from non-senate faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Cindy Palmer, Executive Director
Office of the Academic Senate
May 22, 2014

William Jacob, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: Review of Revisions to the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

Dear Bill:

Various committees of the Riverside Division were asked to review the Revisions to the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use (due to scheduling constraints the UCR Executive Council was unable to discuss this item). The reviewers were generally supportive of the revisions. The only concern (Library, Information Technology, and Scholarly Communication Committee) was the absence of a person who can provide balanced advice to the faculty concerning copyright matters.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely yours,

Jose Wudka
Professor of Physics & Astronomy and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
    Cynthia Palmer, Director of UCR Academic Senate office
May 15, 2014

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

From: Kathleen Montgomery, Chair
Committee on Academic Freedom

Re: Revisions to the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

The Committee on Academic Freedom has considered but has no comments to offer on the numerous editorial and organizational changes found in the proposed revisions to the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use.
13 May 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
    Riverside Division, Academic Senate

Fr: Lucille Chia, Chair  
    Library, Information Technology, and Scholarly Communication (LITSC) Committee

Re: Revisions to the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

The LITSC Committee reviewed the proposed policy revision via email after some discussion at our meeting 25 April (based on discussion of this topic at the systemwide UCOLASC meeting).

The “fair use” part of the revised Copyright policy is fairly vague and will likely evolve over time. Faculty need advice on what is appropriate fair use. When UC lawyers are consulted, they normally are cautious regarding the advice they give so that the University is not put at risk. On the other hand, if faculty are not aggressive in exerting appropriate fair use in their teaching, research, and extension of information to the public and other clientele, their rights may be “lost”.

Thus, LITSC believes a mechanism is needed whereby faculty can be provided balanced advice on what is appropriate fair use. One wants to protect the University from litigation resulting from inappropriate fair use but at the same time, be fairly aggressive in helping faculty to exert appropriate fair use.

This might start with a list of FAQ (frequently asked questions) but should probably also involve a contact that faculty might consult. This person would have to be well informed and have the talent to wisely advice faculty on appropriate fair use.
May 16, 2014

To: J. Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

Fr: M. Allen, Chair  
Committee on Research

Re: Presidential Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

The Committee on Research has reviewed the proposed changes to the Presidential Policy on Copyright and Fair Use. The Committee has no concerns with the proposed changes.
May 16, 2014

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

FR: Akula Venkatram, Chair  
Executive Committee, Bourns College of Engineering

RE: Proposed Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

The revised policy was prepared by the Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy of the System-wide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC), which has already approved the policy.

The proposed policy on copyright and fair use revises the outdated policy from 1986 to make it compatible with current reproduction technology and practices. The 1992 UC policy on copyright ownership remains intact.

The new policy is a brief document that lays out the main principles and goals, which remain unchanged from the previous version. The detailed, specific guidelines contained in the old version have been removed from the new policy document. Instead, revised guidelines are now available on the dedicated website at http://copyright.universityofcalifornia.edu, and these will be monitored and updated, if needed, by the SLASIAC Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policy.

Overall, these changes will make it easier for UC faculty to access and stay informed about UC policy on copyright and fair use. The BCOE supports this revision.
May 16, 2014

TO: José Wudka, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Erica Edwards, Chair
      CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Revisions to the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

The CHASS Executive Committee discussed the proposed revised version of the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use via email and the iLearn discussion board. There were no objections. The committee approved the revisions.

Erica Edwards, Chair
UCR CHASS Executive Committee
TO: Jose Wudka, Chair,  
Riverside Division

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

DATE: May 19th 2014

RE: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to UC Policy on Copyright and Fair Use.

The CNAS Executive Committee did not have a meeting scheduled prior to the due date for comments so these were solicited by email. Three sets of comments were received.

1) “I have no comments on the copyright guideline revision. The revised document seems fine to me and is very clear.”

2) “seemed reasonable to me.”

3) “Overall, it seems like a smart change to me. Rather than having rigid policy that may or may not correspond to law, the document refers us to a web site with guidelines. Thus the change does not constrain faculty. Nevertheless, I am not happy about the elimination of the statement from the current policy that states “The University will defend an employee who photocopies in the course and scope of his or her employment duties.”
May 7, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division

From: John S. Levin, Chair, Executive Committee, Graduate School of Education

Subject: Review of “Revisions to the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use”

Members of The Graduate School of Education Executive Committee have reviewed and discussed the above policy and have no comment beyond noting that it looks to be acceptable.
To: Jose Wudka, Chair Riverside Division  
From: Ameae Walker, Chair SOM executive committee  
Re: President’s updated policy on copyright and fair use

The School of Medicine Executive Committee discussed the President’s updated policy on copyright and fair use at its meeting 5/13/14.  
The committee had no concerns

SOM Executive Committee  
Ameae Walker, Chair  
Paul Lyons, Vice Chair  
Devin Binder  
Monica Carson  
Iryna Ethell  
David Lo  
Christian Lytle  
Ihem Messaoudi  
Neal Schiller  
Emma Wilson  
Mahendra Kocher (clinical)  
Emma Simmons (clinical)  
Richard Olds (ex officio)  
Phyllis Guze (ex officio)
April 22, 2014

To:        George Haggerty, Chair Committee on Academic Personnel
            Georgia Warnke, Chair Committee on Faculty Welfare
            Zhenbiao Yang, Chair Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity

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

From:      Jose Wudka, Chair Riverside Division

Re:        Review of Campus Off-Scale Policy

As you know the campus adopted a Policy on Off-Scale Salaries which was adopted July 1, 2010 and revised on July 1, 2013 (attached). This is a controversial policy that I believe the Senate should revisit. I am therefore asking your committees to review this policy, to compare with similar regulations in our sister campuses and to provide recommendations that will be discussed by the Senate. In case a consensus is reached the Senate will write a recommendation to the Chancellor.

Please provide your comments and recommendations before June 2, 2014.
Policy on Off-Scale Salaries for Appointees and Merit/Promotion/Retention Actions
Policy Reference: APM 620
Related Campus Policy: UCR Call; Resource Planning and Budget Faculty Salary Funding Policy
Policy Revision Date: July 1, 2013
Policy Effective Date: July 1, 2010

In accordance with APM 620, Off-Scale (O/S) Salaries for Appointments and Advancements, O/S salaries are to be approved in exceptional situations as the significance and value of the UC salary scales are to be preserved. O/S is typically awarded only at appointment or retention. Departments or Deans should not propose O/S for existing faculty unless this action is supported by extraordinary circumstances or extraordinary accomplishment of the candidate. The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, as the Chancellor’s designee, has responsibility for providing campus policy regarding O/S.

O/S salaries for appointees and additional O/S salaries for current faculty given during merit/promotion/retention actions that were effective July 1, 2010, were awarded under the condition that “this O/S will be maintained as long as satisfactory academic progress is made.” The policy for establishing whether these criteria have been achieved is as follows:

Satisfactory Academic Progress: (1) A positive outcome on a reappointment, merit, promotion, or advancement action. (2) An assessment of positive (or qualified positive) on an appraisal. (3) An assessment of satisfactory (or satisfactory with qualifications) on a quinquennial review.

Unsatisfactory Academic Progress: (1) A negative outcome on a reappointment. (2) A negative outcome on an on-time or decelerated merit action. (3) An assessment of negative on an appraisal. (4) An assessment of unsatisfactory on a quinquennial review.

The following actions are not considered unsatisfactory academic progress: (1) Negative outcomes on the first review of a first merit action for an Assistant Professor. (2) Negative outcomes on accelerated merit/promotion/advancement actions for faculty at any rank. (3) Negative outcomes on on-time or decelerated promotions where the candidate is assessed as demonstrating performance that is deemed satisfactory (or satisfactory with qualifications) using the criteria of a quinquennial review. (4) Negative outcomes on advancements to Professor VI, Professor Above Scale, or Professor Within Above Scale where the candidate is assessed as demonstrating performance that is deemed satisfactory (or satisfactory with qualifications) using the criteria of a quinquennial review. (5) Negative outcomes on Career Reviews. (6) Deferral of a merit action. The final decision whether a candidate is demonstrating performance that is deemed satisfactory (or satisfactory with qualifications) using the criteria of a quinquennial review will be made by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

Actions Required for Unsatisfactory Academic Progress: (1) The first assessment of unsatisfactory academic progress will result in the loss of one half of the O/S salary subject to this policy up to a maximum of $20,000 (whichever is the lesser). (2) The second consecutive assessment of unsatisfactory academic progress will result in loss of the remaining amount of the O/S salary subject to this policy up to a maximum of $20,000 (whichever is the lesser). (3) In cases where an O/S salary increment remains after two consecutive assessments of unsatisfactory academic progress, the reductions in O/S salary subject to this policy will continue as outlined in
points 1 and 2 for subsequent consecutive assessments of unsatisfactory academic performance. (4) In cases of nonconsecutive assessments of unsatisfactory academic performance, the policy outlined in points 1-3 will be applied to the remaining (current) O/S salary. All decreases in O/S will be effective July 1st, the same date as the negative outcome.

Off-Scale Salary Reduction Methodology
Off-Scale salaries effective July 1, 2010 and later will be adjusted per the paragraph above including the range adjusted and market adjusted amounts.

Example:
$10,000 O/S effective July 1, 2010, receives a 2% increase bringing O/S up to $10,200; (1) Initial negative outcome, $10,200 O/S reduced by half to $5,100, (2) Second negative outcome results in loss of remaining O/S amount $5,100.
May 30, 2014

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

From: George Haggerty, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Campus Off-Scale Policy

CAP discussed the current off-scale policy, and although some members of the committee object to the policy, no one could propose a better one. Certainly the policies at other UC’s were no guidance.
June 3, 2014

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

From: Zhenbiao Yang, Chair  
Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity

Re: Campus Review of Off-Scale Policy

At its meeting on April 25, 2014, the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity discussed the Campus Off-Scale Policy and finds that this revised version provides some protection to new Assistant Professors and is a good tool for retaining and recruiting diverse faculty.
May 5, 2014

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Georgia Warnke  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Campus Review of Off-Scale Policy

At its meeting on April 29, 2014, the Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the Campus Off-Scale Policy. The Committee remains unclear about the goals of the policy. Because, in most cases, it decreases a faculty member’s off-scale salary if he or she fails to meet a merit, it encourages him or her to sacrifice longer projects such as books for shorter projects that the policy can accommodate. This result is detrimental not only to the faculty member’s scholarship and/or creativity but also to the research prestige of the university. The policy also hinders recruitment and retention efforts and seems out of step with the policies of our sister campuses.

The Committee recommends substituting the following policy:

A faculty member receiving a negative five-year review may be subject to a reduction in his or her off-scale.
May 30, 2014

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

FR: Akula Venkatram, Chair
Executive Committee, Bourns College of Engineering

RE: BCOE Comments on Campus Off-Scale Policy

Each campus has its own policy governing off-scale salaries. While the various campus policies differ, the common theme is that OS salary recommendations are recommended by department chairs or deans most often at the time of appointment or for retention purposes. OS salaries may also be proposed at the time of promotion or advancement and, in exceptional cases, within step/rank. The basis for OS scales is generally market conditions and/or competing offers. OS salary can also be awarded for exceptional service within step/rank.

UCR must offer OS salaries to attract top faculty recruits and retain them. OS salaries represent the norms for faculty members at other top public universities and represent what on-scale salaries should be.

The current UCR policy has been in effect since July, 2010 with a revision established in July 2013. While similar to other UC campus policies in many aspects, one aspect that differs significantly is the policy related to removal of the OS salary portions based on merit review outcomes. Unlike other UC campuses where reductions may be considered, none of the campuses invoke a 50% OS salary reduction with each negative (normal) review.

There is no rationale for the July 2010 OS policy and its revision. A faculty member’s current OS salary increment is the result of past performance and does not represent a carrot for future performance. Thus, its partial or complete removal is unnecessarily punitive and heavy-handed. Further, the existing merit and promotion process already provides a mechanism for relating salary increases to performance. If a faculty member is not carrying out his or her duties in a satisfactory manner, then other disciplinary procedures are in place to address those instances.

The College of Engineering believes that the UCR Off-Scale Policy should be revised to remove the clauses regarding the prescribed 50% OS salary reduction with each negative merit review outcome.
June 2, 2014

TO: José Wudka, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Erica Edwards, Chair
      CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Review of Campus Off-Scale Policy

The CHASS Executive Committee met on May 21, 2014 to discuss Policy on Off-Scale Salaries for Appointees and Merit/Promotion/Retention Actions (Policy Reference: APM 620). The members of the committee are concerned that the policy is misguided and that it will limit our college’s ability to attract and retain talented faculty in humanities, arts, and social sciences.

We oppose the existing policy for the following reasons:

1) The UC salary scale is not competitive. The most current data on compensation shows that the pay scale for UC ladder-rank faculty lags behind the market by 17%,¹ and off-scale salaries are an essential tool for ensuring that UCR remains competitive with our peers.

2) We understand an off-scale salary to be an incentive for scholarly productivity, not a tool for punishment: a proverbial carrot rather than stick. The reduction-to-scale policy, which was adopted in July 2010 and revised in July 2013, incentivizes a tunnel-vision set of research-based commitments, a vision that lays bare what is already felt to be a general truth: that merit advances are based on publications alone rather than the 3 categories of labor (teaching, research, and service) by which we govern our professional activity. Given that research in CHASS fields at times moves slowly because of the nature of our fieldwork, we are concerned that our faculty will disproportionately suffer from this policy change, which came at a time in which we were taking on more and more non-research related work (because of staff clustering, overfilled classes, a decreased number of TAships, and an increased teaching load in our college).

3) **Our campus’s policy is not commensurate to that of the other UC campuses that we reviewed.** UC Davis’s policy states that “The Vice Provost – Academic Affairs has the discretion to reduce the off-scale, in the event of a second, consecutive five year review that is negative, regardless of the outcome of the previous five-year review;” and San Diego’s policy states that if “a department judges that a market off-scale salary is no longer justified, it should propose that the appointee’s market off-scale increment be ‘tapered,’” which places the responsibility for monitoring professional progress on the departments rather than on the merit system. We also note that UC San Diego’s policy protects faculty against a reduction in total salary: “A market off-scale salary is tapered by half only if the appointee receives a merit increase, so that the total salary is not reduced. If a faculty member has a very large market off-scale, the department may propose that the salary be tapered by less than half to avoid a reduction in total salary.”

4) **Our policy’s stringency is particularly puzzling given that we bear a heavier service and teaching load than some of the other campuses.** At 19:1, our campus’s student-teacher ratio is higher than that of most the other campuses, and we have the lowest number of classes with under 20 students (28.2%). In addition, our service load has steadily increased due to staff clustering since 2009. Given that we bear a disproportionate teaching and service load, this reduction-to-scale policy seems to portend the entrenchment of a two-tier UC system.

Some members of our committee applaud the campus’s attempt to clarify what constitutes “unsatisfactory academic progress.” However, we would like to suggest that the definition of “unsatisfactory academic progress” be revisited. And we suggest the following:

1) **Assistant professors should be exempt from the return-to-scale policy altogether.** Given that the tenure review process already ensures that unsatisfactory academic progress will result in separation from the university, we feel that the policy’s inclusion of the assistant professor ranks is unnecessary.

2) **“Unsatisfactory academic process” might be signaled by two consecutive negative merits or quinquennials rather than a single negative merit.** The current policy defines unsatisfactory academic progress as: “(1) A negative outcome on a reappointment. (2) A negative outcome on an on-time or decelerated merit action. (3) An assessment of negative on an appraisal. (4) An assessment of unsatisfactory on a quinquennial review.” This may have the unintended effect of decreasing morale and discouraging faculty from going up for merit (because they may feel cautious about “gambling” on a single decision by CAP).

3) **The faculty member’s department should play a central role in determining the amount of reductions to off-scale salaries.** We suggest that in the event of a second negative consecutive merit or quinquennial, the department make a recommendation to the EVC/Provost about the reduction of the amount of the off-scale salary. Reductions in off-scale should take into account service and teaching load as factors that might explain low scholarly productivity in publishing, and reductions should be no more than 50% of the off-scale amount or $20,000 (whichever is the lesser).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
May 7, 2014

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division

From: John S. Levin  
Chair, Executive Committee, Graduate School of Education

Subject: Review of Campus Off-Scale Policy

Members of The Graduate School of Education Executive Committee received this document a week before their scheduled meeting, but received the campus comparison documents only a day before the meeting and thus did not have sufficient time to compare and contrast. It was clear to Executive Committee members that there were differences among campuses and that UCR’s Off-Scale policy appears to provide avenues for legitimate actions to be taken in the case of less than expected performance.
May 30, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair Riverside Division

From: Ameae Walker, Chair SOM executive Committee

Re: Off-scale policy

The School of Medicine Executive Committee discussed the campus off-scale policy at its meeting on 5/13/14 and chose to discuss the policy in its entirety so as to present the committee's opinion in context. There are really three rather different kinds of off-scale: discipline-related, recruitment/retention, and merit cycle-based.

**Discipline-related off-scales:**
These are important in order to attract faculty in certain disciplines, but can be a significant financial burden on the institution. It would seem reasonable therefore for there to be periodic assessment of the need and level based on market forces. Also, endowments or other mechanisms to cover the cost should be sought.

**Recruitment/retention:**
The flexibility to award off-scale salaries allows UCR to attract and retain faculty stars. This is important for the institution to grow in stature. However, the down side in this era when UC salaries lag behind comparison institutions is the potential for an anomalous situation where an incoming assistant professor is paid more than a full professor who has worked for, and been loyal to, the institution for many years. Assuming there have also been some retention off-scales, UCI’s policy of averaging salaries at rank and step each year ameliorates this problem and encourages support, cooperation, and collegiality in the promotion of success. The ideal would be for this to be applied systemwide. However, in the absence of sufficient funds to do this either systemwide or on the UCR campus, a return to scale policy ensures some level of eventual fairness. Importantly though, if an off-scale has been awarded to recruit or retain a faculty member, it is in the expectation that said faculty member will continue to perform at the level motivating the award. Thus, it is our opinion that the bar for continuation of the off-scale be set higher than is currently described in the UCR policy. The bar should be equivalent to expectations for a normal on time merit (basically what the UCD policy says). This varies with discipline and level, but is a measure that can be justified in the department letter, the dean’s letter and one that is very familiar to those who serve on CAP. If there are particular extenuating circumstances that prevent said faculty member from reaching this level of attainment (which could be driven by research, teaching or service), then these could be expounded upon by the department or dean. Even though the intention of a low bar is good, by setting the bar as low as “not a negative quinquennial” there are several unintended consequences:

1) Other faculty may see a less productive member being paid more than they are – not good for morale

2) Award of an off-scale becomes essentially a permanent commitment. As a consequence, off-scales become much more difficult to get. The EVCProvost would be more likely to award more if they were not effectively permanent. Paradoxically therefore, in the faculty’s desire to protect those with off-scales, they may be making it more difficult for other colleagues to obtain them.
3) They are a permanent drain on limited campus resources which could otherwise be used elsewhere

Merit off-scales:
As currently constituted, these are essentially a cash bonus paid out over 2-3 years. They reward superior effort in research, teaching or service. This is important for proactive retention and encouragement of future efforts.
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May 9, 2014

To: George Haggerty, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel  

Ziv Ran, Chair  
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

From: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

Re: Working Title for Lecturer with Security of Employment Series

Please find attached a request from Marylynn Yates, Dean of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS), to allow the College to use working titles for the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series. The proposal is endorsed by EVC&P Dallas Rabenstein and by VPAP David Bocian.

Use of working titles for Senate faculty is not formally addressed in the APM or other faculty governing documents, although general campus guidelines stipulate that working titles may be assigned in addition to a payroll title, provided the working title is not the same as an official University payroll title. Absent of senate faculty policy we look next to human resource policy.

Human Resources policy (UCOP) does allow the adoption of working titles: “Working or Business Titles are determined by the department with the exception of executive titles per Standing Order 100.1(a) and 100.3 (b)”¹

Given the above policy guidelines, the endorsement by campus administration and the precedent of the working title adoption at UC Davis, I ask that you consider approval of the enclosed request. In addition, I further propose the working title be offered for use at the campus level rather than solely by CNAS.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Committee on Academic Personnel
FROM: Marylynn V. Yates
RE: Request for a working title for the LSOE series
DATE: May 6, 2014

I request permission for CNAS to use the working title of Teaching Professor for those in the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series. At this time, CNAS has only two individuals who hold LSOE appointments; however, following on the success of the Chemistry LSOE hire, we are considering the role that LSOE appointments can play within the College and anticipate future hires in this series.

Though the LSOE title is defined by the APM, classification of individuals in this position as “Lecturers” is inconsistent with their membership in the Academic Senate and the University’s expectations for professional achievement and activity, and university and public service in their evaluation. The LSOE title is also confusing for students, faculty and staff who are familiar with the role of Unit 18 Lecturers in delivering curriculum. The use of the working title of “Teaching Professor” overcomes these limitations and more appropriately recognizes the contribution of LSOEs to their department and the campus. It is also analogous to the more familiar Research Professor title.

Finally, there is precedent for this working title within the UC system. In January 2014, UCSD adopted a working title of “Teaching Professor” for the approximately 50 individuals employed in this role on their campus. We propose to adopt the following working titles, consistent with what has already been approved at UCSD:

- Assistant Teaching Professor will replace Lecturer with Potential Security of Employment
- Associate Teaching Professor will replace Lecturer with Security of Employment
- Teaching Professor will replace Senior Lecture with Security of Employment
- Distinguished Teaching Professor will replace Above Scale Senior Lecture with Security of Employment

Please let me know if you have any questions about this request or would like to discuss it in person.

cc: David Bocian, Vice Provost Academic Personnel
    Dallas Rabenstein, Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost
May 30, 2014

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

From: George Haggerty, Chair
      Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Working Title for Lecturer with Security of Employment Series

CAP discussed the request for the campus to use the working title of Teaching Professor for those in the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series and finds that this title may not be the right title to designate to this group.
May 30, 2014

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

From: Ziv Ran, Chair  
Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Working Title for Lecturer with Security of Employment Series

The committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the proposed use of the terms 'Teaching Professor' etc. consistent with Senate rules and bylaws. At the same time, it finds the proposed use awkward and possibly misleading, and recommends that the University consider instead adopting other possible terms such as 'docent' or 'Senate lecturer'.