October 7, 2010

TO: Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
Peter Chung (AGSM), Planning and Budget (P&B)
Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
Christine Gailey (Women’s Studies), Committee on Committees (COC)
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education
J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare (FW)
David Herzberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council/CCGA Representative
Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences) CNAS Executive Committee
David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)
Erik Rolland (AGSM), AGSM Executive Committee
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative
Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy (CEP)

FR: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, October 11, 2010

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, October 11, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 220 2nd Floor University Office Building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>Approval of the October 11, 2010 Agenda and September 27, 2010 minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conflict of Interest Statement – Academic Personnel, CEP, CHASS Executive Committee, CNAS Executive Committee, Committee on Committees, Distinguished Campus Service, Distinguished Teaching, General Education Advisory Board, Faculty Research Lecturer, Faculty Welfare, Rules and Jurisdiction and Undergraduate Admissions

Information 1:15 – 1:45

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- Update on Council meeting with Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs Lawrence Pitts held on 9/28/10
- Update on Council Meeting held on 9/29/10
- Update on Faculty Forum planned for 10/14/10
- Reminder that PEB comments are due on 10/18/10

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS - The following items are currently out for review:

- Request for Systemwide review of proposed revisions to APM 010 and 015 – due 1/15/11

Action/Information 1:45 – 2:05

III. OFF-SCALE SALARY POLICY - Review off-scale request from VPAP Bocian. Also included are the responses from P&B, CAP, R&J and FW as well as off-scale policies from UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCSD, UCSB and UCSC

Action/Information 2:05 – 2:30

IV. OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL & COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2 (pp. 10 - 22)

3 (pp. 23 - 40)
PRESENT:
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)
Peter Chung (AGSM) Planning and Budget (P&B)
Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
Christine Gailey (Women’s Studies), Committee on Committees (COC)
Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education
J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare
David Herzberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council/CCGA Representative
Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative
Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy (CEP)

ABSENT:
Paulo Chagas (Music) Academic Computing & Information Technology
Steven Clark (Psychology) Undergraduate Admissions
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Erik Rolland (AGSM), AGSM Executive Committee

GUESTS:
Registrar Bracken Dailey
Assistant VC LaRae Lundgren

AGENDA:
The agenda was unanimously approved as written. The minutes from the July 12, 2010 meeting were corrected as follows:

Page 7, Paragraph 4 was modified to read as follows:
- The Secretary Parliamentarian indicated that the Dean did not need an exception to the regulation in order to proceed as requested.

{New paragraph}
EC members agreed that procedures might be made clearer and more transparent and the following changes to the procedure were suggested:

Page 8, the last paragraph was modified to read as follows:

This policy might then be promulgated widely in the UCR catalog, college websites, and advising offices, and with other information for the course(s) to which it applies.

With these corrections, the minutes were approved unanimously.

The Conflict of Interest Statements for Planning and Budget and the Division of Biomedical Sciences were accepted as written.

Announcements by the Chair:
Chair Gauvain informed the members that as part of the regular meetings of the EC, each committee chair will be asked to present a 2-minute report in an effort to keep each other informed of current issues in their committees. This announcement was followed by introductions.

Chair Gauvain described what the term “Action item” means regarding the business of the EC. This information is based on the Bylaws, which specifies the types of situations in which the EC can take an Action or Vote. Chair Gauvain noted that these procedures put authority in the hands of the committees.

According to the Bylaws, an Action from the Executive Council (EC vote) may be one of only these types:

1. To advise the Chancellor: That is the EC may vote to inform the Chancellor that some policy or procedure should or should not be pursued.

2. To advise the Divisional Chair.

3. To advise the Divisional representatives to systemwide committees, including the Assembly.

4. To act, in lieu of the full Division, on courses, curricula, and legislation providing certain conditions are met.

5. To act on strictly internal matters of procedure, e.g., to approve a conflict of interest statement for itself.

Note that #1-3 are advisory actions: None of the advisees need to heed that advice; whereas #4 enables the EC to substitute its authority in place of the Division’s.
Absent from this list is "advise the Division", and because the Bylaws state that "The Executive Council has only the powers enumerated in these Bylaws", advice to the Division is not an action that the EC is entitled to take.

Finally, EC “approval” is not required to place or remove items from the Division agenda that have been brought forward by appropriate committees. The EC can choose to endorse or not endorse items, but it does not have the authority to vet items before they are placed on the Division agenda.

The Executive Council Conflict of Interest statement was adopted as written unanimously.

**Systemwide Reviews:**
Chair Gauvain indicated that there were currently three Systemwide items being circulated for committee review. The first item concerns the renaming of UC “Fees” to “Tuition.” This proposal is being reviewed by P&B, Graduate Council, and CEP.

The second item is the *Report of the Post-Employment Benefits (PEB) Task Force.* The Chair discussed the various ways that the Senate will help inform UCR faculty about the impending changes. She informed the members that the Senate had a Faculty Forum on September 21, 2010, during which Systemwide Senate Chair Daniel Simmons and Vice Chair Robert Anderson made a presentation. Another Faculty Forum is planned for October 14, 2010, at which time Prof. Helen Henry and Prof. Dan Hare will make a presentation to the faculty. All the documents pertaining to this matter have been posted on the Senate website at [senate.ucr.edu](http://senate.ucr.edu). As more documents are made available, there will be regular updates to the faculty.

As a point of information, Chair Gauvain described a meeting she attended earlier that day in which staff members from UCOP described the PEB proposed changes to the senior leadership of the campus. She informed the EC about the timetable for deciding on these changes, including that the Regents are expected to decide on them at a special December meeting. After the Regental decision, there will be discussions regarding PEB between UCOP and the various labor unions on the campuses.

The third item out for committee review is the *Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University*, also referred to as the Downsizing document. The Chair pointed out that while it is possible that all 10 campuses might come to a united decision regarding PEB, it is likely there will be different views across the campuses on the recommendation about downsizing the university. Therefore, the committees are urged to come up with very clear recommendations pertaining to UCR in their responses to this item.

A decision was made to send an email to the faculty that indicated that there are two major issues facing us this fall, PEB and the Council Recommendation on the Future of the University; that documents pertaining to these issues are on the Senate website; and announcing the forthcoming Faculty Forum on PEB.
**IMPACTED MAJORS PRESENTATION:**
The Chair invited the Registrar, Bracken Dailey, and Assistant Vice Chancellor LaRae Lundgren to discuss with the EC members the undergraduate majors that are currently impacted on the campus. They were also asked to inform the EC of the current status of these majors, plans for dealing with this issue, and what the Senate could do to help the situation.

Registrar Dailey indicated that there have been no changes in impacted majors since her last presentation to the Executive Council on July 12, 2010. To date, only Psychology has closed its major to students wanting to change into the major. The Registrar stated that UCR departments restrict admission using a variety of mechanisms including implementation of pre-majors, increasing the minimum grade requirements in prerequisite courses, increasing the GPA to enter a major, special application deadlines, admission essays, or a combination of these various mechanisms. The Registrar has investigated who oversees impacted majors on UC campuses and in most cases it is CEP. On some campuses, the issue is overseen by special enrollment councils, College Executive Committees, and undergraduate councils. The Registrar indicated that there was a need to develop a UCR policy to deal with impacted majors, and that she would like the Senate to work on developing such as policy a well as the timeline for implementation.

**Repeat Policy Discussion:**
The Chair also asked the Registrar to discuss the Course Repeat Policy. Registrar Dailey indicated that in planning for fall 2010 enrollment, CNAS requested an exception to UCR Senate Regulations R1.6, R1.6.1, R1.6.2, and R1.6.3 related to a student’s opportunity to repeat a course. The current repeat policy states that a student can attempt a course twice and that approval from the Associate Dean is needed to repeat a course a third time. The Executive Council discussed a priority plan for repeat enrollment that would involve 4 Waitlists for courses: 1) Waitlist 1 would include first time enrollees who were put on a wait list the prior quarter; 2) Waitlist 2 would include first time enrollees who were not able to enroll in the current quarter, 3) Waitlist 3 would include students attempting to retake the course but who were unable to enroll the prior quarter, and 4) Waitlist 4 would include students attempting to retake the course for the first time. Currently, SIS is designed with only one waitlist and when the waitlist closes for the current quarter it is not retained in SIS. During the summer, the Registrar had a discussion with Senate Chair Norman and incoming Chair Gauvain. The Registrar indicated that her office would have great difficulty implementing the 4 waitlists on their computer system and, therefore, the departments would need to manage the lists manually.

It was agreed that CEP would develop a policy regarding impacted majors on the campus for presentation to the Division, and that the Course Repeat Policy would be sent for discussion in the College Executive Committees.

**OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL & COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
Chair Gauvain invited each Committee Chair present to give a brief summary of what their committees will be tackling this fall and over the coming year.

**Prof. Daniel Hare – Chair, Faculty Welfare**
Prof. Hare indicated that other than the PEB issue, Faculty Welfare will be dealing with changes occurring in EH&S. Prof. Hare indicated that EH&S no longer has funds to hire staff to inspect
laboratories and the responsibility has been shifted to departments, some of which are using graduate students, paid by GSR funds, to conduct laboratory inspections. This arrangement raises conflict of interest issues. Prof. Hare stated that his committee will investigate this issue and work on how to convince the administration to rehire EH&S staff for these inspections.

Prof. Gerhard Gierz – Chair, Preparatory Education
Preparatory Education will continue to study issues pertaining to the Writing Program as well as requirements for mathematics and other issues that come up for their review.

Prof. Manuela Martins-Green – Chair, CODEO
CODEO had not met yet but they are planning a meeting to discuss issues that they want to handle during the year. They will also review issues that come to their committee.

Prof. Melanie Sperling – Chair, GSOE
The GSOE Executive Committee has not met yet this year. Ongoing issues include the number of faculty in the School and the graduate curriculum. She announced that they have a new Dean, Prof. John Levin, who is an expert in post-secondary education.

Prof. Rise Axelrod – Chair, CAP
CAP had its first meeting on 9/27/10. They are dealing with PEB issues, correspondences that have been sent to them for review and the off-scale policy.

Prof. David Herzberger – Chair, CHASS Executive Committee
Prof. Herzberger indicated that for the coming months, his committee will be dealing with the issue of impacted majors/courses and will be looking to the Executive Council for advice.

Prof. Thomas Morton – Jr. Rep to the Assembly
Prof. Morton mentioned to the EC the issue that arose in the wake of recent court decisions that have narrowed the scope of academic freedom to teaching and research, leaving faculty vulnerable to punishment for opinions they express at faculty meetings. He suggested that the best way to safeguard the rights of the UC faculty will be to amend APM 010 and 015 and that the EC members should expect to see these amendments in the coming year.

Prof. Peter Chung – Chair, Planning and Budget
P&B has met twice and is discussing PEB, the off-scale salary policy, and FTE transfers. Other issues they will be discussing this year are the implementation of the strategic plan and the budget for the medical school.

Prof. Dan Straus – Chair, Biomed Executive Committee
The Division of Biomedical Sciences is occupied with the accreditation of the medical school. The preliminary preview of accreditation material will take place on October 15, 2010.

Prof. David Parker – Chair, CNAS Executive Committee
The CNAS Executive Committee is focusing on enrollment management, impacted classes, repeat exception policies, and other issues that arise.
Prof. Jay Farrell – Chair, BCOE Executive Committee
The BCOE Executive Committee is examining breadth requirements, enrollment issues, and combining the Educational Policy and the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) accreditations.

Prof. Albert Wang – Sr. Rep to the Assembly
Prof. Wang indicated that there are four Assembly meetings scheduled for this academic year, with the first meeting planned for December 1, 2010. He will have more to report after that meeting.

Prof. Morris Maduro – Chair, Graduate Council/CCGA representative
Prof. Maduro informed the EC of the staffing changes associated with the move of graduate reviews from the Graduate Division to the Academic Senate Office. He also mentioned that with this change, the Associate Deans in the Graduate Division will no longer handle some matters as they did in the past, which will increase the workload of the Graduate Council. He said that the Graduate Council was planning to move the evaluation of graduate courses to the Executive Committees of the Colleges and that this will require a change to the Bylaws. He also stated that the Graduate Council is going to review the graduate programs and study ways to expand the graduate programs on the campus. Finally, he mentioned that the Graduate Council will be reviewing a proposal from BCOE for an online Master's degree.

Prof. David S. Pion-Berlin – Chair, Research
Prof. Pion-Berlin informed the EC that he will be meeting with the former Chair of COR and they will be discussing the procedure for the campus omnibus and research grants. He also stated that COR hopes that in the coming year the funds available for these awards can be increased. Also, COR is interested in the implementation of the strategic plan and the implications of the plan on the research priorities of the campus.

Prof. Christine Gailey – Chair, Committees
Prof. Gailey indicated that the COC was planning its first meeting on Tuesday 9/28/10 to discuss committee staffing issues left over from the past academic year. COC will discuss with EVC/Provost Rabenstein the importance for appointing faculty members recommended by COC to the Strategic Plan Implementation Advisory Committee and other related implementation task forces. COC will also consider whether any changes to the Bylaws are needed given the growth of different colleges/schools on campus. COC will also examine PEB and other issues that come up for review.

Prof. Jose Wudka – Chair, Educational Policy
Prof. Wudka indicated that CEP will be examining policies related to impacted majors on the campus and mechanisms for evaluating learning outcomes for general education courses. CEP will also conduct a self-review of the undergraduate program review process and discuss issues related to online education.

Finally, Chair Gauvain indicated that over the year when she drafts documents that summarize and integrate committee reports on systemwide and campus issues, that she will circulate the drafts to the members of the Executive Council for feedback. Her aim is to ensure that the reports
that go out from the Senate represent as best as possible the views of the EC and the Committees. It was suggested that the Senate use iLearn as a way of posting drafts for review and this suggestion will be looked into further.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sellyna Ehlers
Executive Director
Office of the Academic Senate
September 27, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain  
   Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Rise Axelrod  
   Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Conflict of Interest Statement for 2010-2011

In accordance with Division Bylaw 8.2.5, the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel has adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement for 2010-2011 by a vote of +10-0-0.

There is an expectation that Committee members will neither participate nor vote in departmental meetings when formal discussions and votes are held for merit, promotion, quinquenial or appraisal actions. Individual exceptions to this understanding will be reviewed by the Committee, and exception statements will be filed with a copy of this statement and maintained in the Academic Senate Office. In these exceptions, the Committee member will not participate in related discussions or votes taken by the Committee on Academic Personnel.

In addition, Committee members will notify the Chair of the Committee whenever they believe a conflict-of-interest exists regarding their own participation or the participation of any other Committee member in any action under consideration by the Committee. If the matter concerns the Chair of the Committee, members will notify the Chair of the Academic Senate.

Faculty members who are members of departmental search committees, or those voting on appointments in their home departments, will not participate in related discussions or votes taken by the Committee on Academic Personnel.

The Vice Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel will assume the duties of the Committee Chair for the review of personnel files from the Chair’s home department.

A standing committee (Shadow CAP) of six members will exist to review personnel actions that involve current CAP members or their spouses/partners. This committee will consist of faculty who have previously served on CAP. The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees.

CAP recognizes its responsibility to maintain the utmost confidentiality and fairness in its deliberations. Accordingly, it is the duty of members of CAP to refrain from discussion of any personnel actions with anyone outside CAP either before or after CAP considers a file.
October 1, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: CEP 2010-11 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Educational Policy adopted the following conflict of interest statement at its September 30, 2010 meeting:

In situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with a department, program, or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. It is the obligation of the committee member involved and any committee member aware of a potential conflict of interest of another member to bring the potential conflict to the attention of the Chair. 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 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 28, 2010

TO:        MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
            RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:        C. W. GAILEY, CHAIR
            COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

RE:        CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Committee on Committees adopted the following Conflict of Interest statement:

If any member of the Committee on Committees (hereafter referred to as the Committee) has a concern about a potential conflict of interest in the discussion of possible appointments, they should refrain from participating in those Committee discussions.

The Committee does not regard as a conflict of interest departmental affiliation as the Committee considers departmental colleagues to be a useful and necessary source of information regarding suitability for committee appointment.

Members of the Committee on Committees are committed to avoiding conflicts of interest and the appearance of conflict involving the appointment of those with whom they have a familial relationship or intimate partnership. At the first meeting of each academic year, committee members are responsible for identifying the names of any university employee with whom they are so connected and who might be considered by the Committee for future appointment. The member shall recuse her/himself from any discussion involving the appointment of said person and leave the room when the relevant discussion begins to ensure that all other Committee members can engage in open and honest discussion.

The Committee will refrain from making appointments from its current membership, with the exception of appointing out-going members for service after their term on the Committee on Committees has expired and when a Committee member is clearly and uniquely the most qualified Senate member to fill the assignment.

Any conflict-of-interest situations not covered here that arise will be dealt with by
the Committee on an ad hoc basis, according to the following procedure:

Should any member of the Committee feel that a conflict of interest exists, that member should, in confidence, discuss the matter with the Chair of the Committee (or, if the alleged conflict of interest involves the Chair, with one of the "third-year" members of the Committee). The Chair (or other member as specified above) shall attempt to resolve the matter by discussing it with the individual alleged to have a conflict. Should informal efforts to resolve the issue fail, the Chair (or other member as specified above) shall call a meeting of the Committee to consider the matter. The member alleged to have a conflict of interest shall not participate in the meeting, though he/she may attend part of the meeting for the purpose of responding to the allegation. After considering the matter to the extent necessary to act in an informed manner, the Committee shall vote. If a majority of the Committee agrees that a conflict of interest exists, the member found to have such a conflict shall absent himself/herself from that portion of any Committee meeting when the subject matter creating the conflict is before the Committee.
September 29, 2010

SUBJECT:  2010/11 Conflict of Interest Statement

MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
Academic Senate

The Executive Committee of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences met on September 29, 2010 and discussed the issue of Conflict of Interest. The Committee decided that if a member of the Executive Committee sees a conflict arise, he/she will bring it to the attention of the Committee, and the Committee will deal with it at that time.

David Herzberger, Chair
Executive Committee, CHASS
Date: September 28, 2010

TO: M. Gauvain
Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: David Parker
Chair, Executive Committee
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

RE: Conflict of Interest

At its first meeting of Fall Quarter 2010, the Executive Committee of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences decided that if a member of the Committee perceives that a conflict of interest is present, he or she will bring it to the attention of the Committee. The Committee will then decide how the conflict of interest, if it is agreed that one exists, will be handled.

The committee added a provision that, during the hearing of any student petitions, the student representative to the Committee will be excused from the meeting.

DP:cp
TO: M. GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: C. CRANOR, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON DISTINGUISHED CAMPUS SERVICE

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Distinguished Campus Service approved the adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2010-11:

The Committee on Distinguished Service has adopted the following policy for situations in which 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. A member whom the Committee deems to be subject to a conflict of interest 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.
September 29, 2010

TO: M. GAUVAIN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: C. AMRHEIN, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON DISTINGUISHED TEACHING

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching unanimously approved the re-adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2010-11:

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching has adopted the following policy for situations in which 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. A member whom the Committee deems to be subject to a conflict of interest 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.
October 6, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: GEORGE HAGGERTY, CHAIR  
GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY BOARD

RE: 2010-11 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The General Education Advisory Board met today and adopted the following statement on Conflict of Interest:

In situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with a department, program, or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. It is the obligation of the committee member involved and any committee member aware of a potential conflict of interest of another member to bring the potential conflict to the attention of the Chair. 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 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.
October 5, 2010

TO: M. GAUVAIN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: N. RAIKHEL, CHAIR
   COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURER

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer approved the re-adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2010-11:

If a member of the Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call that possibility to the attention of the Chair. The Chair will then convene the committee, in the absence of the putative conflictee and those present will decide by a majority vote if a conflict exists. If the decision is affirmative, the individual with the conflict will leave the room during discussion of the conflicting matter and will not vote on that issue.
September 28, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

FR: D. HARE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 2010-2011

The Committee on Faculty Welfare approved the following Conflict of Interest Statement:

The following policy has been adopted for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the Committee on Faculty Welfare might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. Members of the Committee on Faculty Welfare are asked to identify when they may have a potential conflict of interest on any items before any discussion. 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 on Faculty Welfare Chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes. This exclusion will be noted in any report issued by the Committee on Faculty Welfare.
SEPTEMBER 24, 2010

TO:   M. GAUVAIN, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:   D. J. OZER
       K. VAFAI
       COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION

RE:   CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT FOR 2010-2011

In accordance with Bylaw 8.2.5, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction re-adopted the following statement for handling potential conflicts of interest in the 2010-2011 academic year:

In cases where a committee member's affiliation with a department or program, or with an individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a potential conflict of interest, that committee member will identify himself/herself and the potential nature of the conflict. The other members of the committee will decide if a potential conflict does indeed exist. If so, the committee member may subsequently be asked to provide information on the business under consideration but will be excluded from participating in any consideration of said business. The committee member may be excluded from participation in substantive discussions, communications and deliberations concerning the matter, the making of motions, and/or voting.
September 29, 2010

TO:     M. GAUVAIN, CHAIR
         RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:     S. CLARK, CHAIR
         UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

RE:     2010-2011 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee adopted, by unanimous vote, the conflict-of-interest statement below. The adoption was enacted for the 2010-2011 academic year at the meeting of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee on September 29, 2010. The conflict of interest statement is the same one under which the Council has been operating since April 17th, 2001.

“If a member of the Undergraduate Council has personal affiliation with a department or a program or an individual bringing business before the committee, this should be brought to the attention of the committee. The Undergraduate Council at that time will vote (1) to allow or disallow the member from participating in the discussion of the item of business in question or (2) to allow or disallow the member from voting on a motion(s) related to the item of business in question.”
August 19, 2010

TO:    Anthony Norman
Chair, Academic Senate

FROM:   David Bocian
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

CC:    Mary Gauvain
Chair-Elect, Academic Senate

Dallas Rabenstein
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE:          Off-Scale (O/S) Salary Policy

Effective July 1, 2010, all new and additional off-scale salaries were awarded under the condition that “this O/S will be maintained as long as satisfactory academic progress is made.” This language has been added to the CALL for the 2010-11 academic year.

The EVCP is soliciting the Academic Senate’s input on the proposed policy regarding the criteria for satisfactory academic progress. Attached is a copy of the policy for your review and input.

Enclosure:  Off-Scale Salary Policy (7/1/2010)
Policy on Off-Scale Salaries Effective July 1, 2010
Governing Document: APM 620
Related Campus Policy: UCR Call; Resource Planning, and Budget Faculty Salary Funding Policy
Policy Effective Date: July 1, 2010

In accordance with APM 620, Off-Scale Salaries (O/S) 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. (3) An assessment of unsatisfactory on a quinquennial review.

The following actions are not considered unsatisfactory academic progress: (1) Negative outcomes on accelerated merit/promotion/advancement actions. (2) 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. (3) Negative outcomes on advancements to Prof. VI, Prof. Above Scale, or Within Prof. 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. (4) Negative outcomes on Career Reviews. (5) 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 in consultation with the Committee on Academic Personnel.

**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 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.
September 7, 2010

TO: RISE AXELROD, CHAIR
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

PETER CHUNG, CHAIR
PLANNING AND BUDGET

DAN HARE, CHAIR
FACULTY WELFARE

KAMBIZ VAFAI, CHAIR,
RULES AND JURISDICTION

FM: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: OFF-SCALE (O/S) SALARY POLICY

The attached is a request from VP Bocian to review and provide input to the proposed policy regarding the criteria for satisfactory academic progress.

Please review and forward your response to me by Friday, September 24, 2010

Attached
September 27, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: Y. PETER CHUNG, CHAIR
PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: Request to review Off-scale Salary Policy

P&B members discussed the off-scale salary policy. The members objected to the policy because they felt it interfered directly with any effort to re-establish the salary scale for UC in order to be competitive. They were also concerned about the lack of a restoration process.

Of the 7 members available 3 voted yes to approve it and 4 voted against implementing the policy.
October 6, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Rise Axelrod
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Off-scale salary policy

CAP has reviewed and supports the new policy on off-scale salaries for the Riverside campus. However, we disagree with the VPAP proposal that the timing of an off-scale salary adjustment should be considered at “the first assessment of unsatisfactory academic progress.” Instead, CAP feels that it would be fairer to give candidates a one-time chance following a negative assessment (a period to readjust) before an off-scale salary adjustment is made. Therefore, CAP proposes that the off-scale be reconsidered not at “the first assessment of unsatisfactory academic progress,” but at the next normal review (for the rank and step). For example, if an Associate Professor Step III is denied a merit (normal, on-time, or decelerated) his/her next mandatory review would be in two years (three years for an Associate IV and above). At that time, if the review continues to be negative, the off-scale will be reduced per the policy.

Regarding criteria for "satisfactory academic progress," the committee reasserts the importance that merit in all three categories -- research, teaching, and service -- be considered.

Finally, CAP does have questions about the specific procedures used to review files for off-scale consideration and assumes a draft of procedures will be forthcoming once the policy is approved/finalized.
October 7, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: DAN HARE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE: OFF-SCALE (O/S) SALARY POLICY

It has been a long-standing position of the Academic Senate to restore the competitiveness of the Salary Scales and to utilize off-scale salaries only in exceptional circumstances (APM 620). The most recent statement of this position was in the 2009 "Choices" report written by the Systemwide Committee on Planning and Budget and approved by Academic Council:

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/ucpb.choices.pdf

Quoting from that report, "The salary scales provide the foundation for UC’s system of peer-review, and are therefore a cornerstone of UC’s excellence. By allowing the scales to become obsolete, UC has put at risk the very character of the University. The receipt of a competitive salary must never devolve to a mere political concept, rather than one based on scholarship and merit. In the 25th David Dodds Henry Lecture at UIC Chicago, UC President Emeritus David Gardner explicitly emphasized the 'steady and diligent commitment to the concept of UC as a single university operating on ten campuses' including 'a single set of personnel policies, salary schedules and policies'. Surely we can agree that this is a crucial contributing factor of UC’s rise to eminence, and the demise of such scales is undermining that eminence." In the absence of competitive salary scales, faculty must plan on periodically using outside offers to improve compensation. Rewarding such actions undermines loyalty, or even creates a "loyalty penalty," for those individuals whose family circumstances may preclude their making credible threats to leave UC, and does nothing but undermine the integrity of the merit and review process.

Additionally, there is a Systemwide Academic Senate task force from the Systemwide Standing Committees of Academic Personnel, Planning and Budget, and Faculty Welfare to address not only the question of noncompetitive faculty salaries but also restoring the salary scales. This task force is expected to deliver their recommendations near the end of the current academic year.
In view of the Academic Senate's long-standing interest in restoring the salary scales, and in view of the activities of the Systemwide task force described above, CFW is concerned that our local campus appears to have instituted nearly permanent off-scale salaries starting last July 1 with no consultation with the Division Senate, as far as any members know. CFW now is being asked to comment on the criteria that might justify removing those off-scales and it seems ironic that the administration has made more effort toward seeking the Senate's input to identify the criteria to return one to scale than they did to identify the criteria that might have justified these exceptional actions. CFW therefore respectfully declines to opine on the criteria to remove a faculty member's off-scale appointment until the Systemwide task force completes its mission and until clear criteria are developed locally to justify the exceptional nature of awarding near-permanent off-scale awards in the first place.
Davis Off-Scale Policy

620-0 Policy
Off-scale salaries may be approved to allow increased flexibility in salary administration for the purpose of recruiting or retaining faculty, while maintaining the integrity of the University of California salary scales. This document is a statement of campus policies and procedures governing the approval and administration of off-scale salaries.

620-2 Rationale
As stated in APM-620, salaries should be on-scale to the greatest extent possible. However, it is recognized that certain conditions may justify salaries that depart from the standard salary scales. These include market conditions that command a higher salary than permitted by the University of California salary scales for a given rank and step, and retention situations where an individual has received an offer of a faculty position at a higher salary at a comparable academic institution. Off-scale salaries are granted under the condition that recipients will meet or exceed the normal standards for academic advancement, and are subject to review and regularization or renewal as outlined in Section UCD-620-18, below. An off-scale salary may also be used in the very limited number of cases of exceptional merit that cannot be adequately recognized through merit advances or accelerations. Off-scale increments granted on the basis of exceptional merit are governed by Section UCD-620-12, below.

620-4 Definitions
a. Base salary--the annual salary specified in the UC salary scales (see Section UCD-690) for an academic appointee at a particular rank and step.
b. Off-scale salary--the total annual salary received by an academic appointee whose salary exceeds that specified in the UC salary scale for individuals at the same rank and step.
c. Off-scale increment--the difference between the off-scale salary and the base salary.
d. Regularization--the process of merging an off-scale salary with the UC salary scale via gradual reduction in the size of the off-scale increment.

620-6 Responsibility
a. Responsibility for recommending an off-scale salary or an increase in an existing off-scale salary for a particular faculty member rests with the department chair. Such recommendations are submitted to the dean of the school or college and must be accompanied by full documentation of the conditions that support the action. The dean has the authority to approve off-scale increments up to $100 less than one step in recruitment and retention cases, for faculty up to and including the rank of Professor, Step V, or equivalent eligible title. These actions must be reported to the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel. Recommendations for all other off-scale salary increments or increases in off-scale increments must be submitted through the dean, who will comment as appropriate, to the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel. Section UCD-620-12 governs off-scales for merit.
b. Responsibility for coordinating the review of recommendations for off-scale salaries and for making decisions regarding such recommendations (except as delegated to the dean as noted in Section UCD-620-6-a) rests with the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel. Requests for off-scale salaries or increases in off-scale salaries involving a salary increment of two steps or more and all off-scale salaries involving exceptional merit must be reviewed by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) or equivalent review body. The Vice Provost--Academic Personnel is also responsible for the administration of the campus off-scale salary policy including apprising deans and department chairs of policies and procedures governing off-scale salaries, monitoring campus record-keeping
and reporting practices on academic personnel with off-scale salaries, and informing deans of decisions in particular cases involving off-scale salaries.

c. Responsibility for funding the first-year increment when an off-scale salary is approved for recruitment or retention as outlined in Sections UCD-620-10-a(2) and 620-10-b rests with the dean/department. This responsibility for funding a given off-scale increment expires after a single year. In subsequent years, funding is provided from the central upgrading fund.

620-10 Criteria
The criteria for judging the appropriateness of an off-scale salary for an individual faculty member include the following:

a. Market considerations
   (1) Selected disciplines may, due to market considerations, command salaries in excess of those permitted by the UC salary scales for a given rank and step. The Vice Provost–Academic Personnel will be responsible for obtaining data on faculty salaries in selected disciplines at peer institutions. These data will provide the basis for reviewing off-scale salary recommendations based on discipline-based market considerations.
   
   (2) Independent of discipline, some individuals may, due to market considerations, command salaries in excess of those permitted by the UC salary scales for a given rank and step. Review of recommendations for off-scale salaries in such cases will be based on the comprehensive documentation provided in those individual cases.

b. Retention
   A faculty member may receive an offer of a position with a higher salary at a comparable academic institution. To retain the faculty member at UC Davis, it may be necessary to adjust the individual's salary through the off-scale salary mechanism. Documentation of the competing offer and its terms must be provided along with the recommendation.

620-12 Policy for off-scale salaries based on exceptional merit
Merit is normally recognized through the advancement process, including accelerated merit actions where appropriate. In a very limited number of cases, the advancement process may not provide sufficient recognition of particularly outstanding achievements. In such cases, a temporary off-scale increment of up to $100 less than one step may be approved by the Vice Provost–Academic Personnel. A recommendation for a merit-related off-scale salary is initiated by the chair, who consults with the department, then forwards the recommendation to the dean, who submits the recommendation to the Vice Provost–Academic Personnel. All off-scale salaries based on exceptional merit must be reviewed by CAP or an equivalent review body. The off-scale increment shall be in effect for a single merit cycle (two or three years), at which time the off-scale increment shall be removed. If an accelerated merit action is approved, the temporary off-scale increment shall be removed at the time the accelerated merit is put into effect.

620-18 Review of off-scale salaries
a. Policy
   All off-scale salaries other than those governed by Section UCD-620-12 are granted and continued until the recipient reaches Professor, Step III, or the equivalent eligible title (see Section APM-620 for titles eligible for off-scale salary). An off-scale increment is limited to appointees continuing on the Davis campus and continuing in the academic series they occupied when the off-scale salary was approved. Recipients of an off-scale salary will meet or exceed the standards for normal academic advancement. Individuals who have either (1) elected to be placed on the Davis Professorial Salary Scale (DPSS) or (2) who have been newly appointed to an eligible position covered by
the DPSS or (3) are current appointees who have been placed on the DPSS because they did not hold an off-scale salary and meet the eligibility criteria for DPSS are not subject to the off-scale recovery provisions set forth in this section. For a complete description of the DPSS program, individuals should consult the following portion of the Academic Personnel website: http://academicpersonnel.ucdavis.edu/DPSS.cfm.

In addition, individuals whose off-scale is covered by a mutually agreed-upon MOU or who have agreed to other recovery terms are not subject to the off-scale recovery provisions set forth in this section.

b. Review mechanism
   (1) Deferrals and denials--Continuation of an off-scale salary until an individual reaches Professor, Step III, or equivalent eligible title is contingent upon normal academic progress. Should an individual with an off-scale salary increment defer a merit review for one year at any time before advancement to Professor, Step III, or equivalent eligible title or be denied a regularly scheduled merit, the off-scale salary increment shall be reduced by 25% on the subsequent July 1. At the time of a second, consecutive deferral or denial of a merit review, the off-scale salary shall be reduced an additional 25% from the initial amount on the subsequent July 1. A third, consecutive deferral or denial shall result in a review and recommendation by CAP or an equivalent review body regarding regularization of the remaining off-scale increment.

   (2) Subsequent to Professor, Step III, or equivalent eligible title--All new or renewed off-scale salaries for those at Professor, Step III and above, and equivalent eligible titles, are subject to the standard of normal academic progress. Individuals with regularly scheduled merit actions that are deferred or denied subsequent to Step III will have their off-scale increments adjusted according to Section UCD-620-18-b(1). Deans/departments bear responsibility for funding the first year of a renewed off-scale salary increment as outlined in Section UCD-620-6-c.

c. Off-scale salary limitations
   University policy dictates that normally no off-scale salary may exceed 10% above the on-scale salary of an academic appointee in the same series at the highest rank and step. In cases of individuals at senior ranks with large off-scale increments, this limitation may result in restriction of the salary growth that normally results from merit increases. Where appropriate and fully justified on the basis of the academic record, such individuals may be put forward for advancement to Professor Above-Scale.

d. Exceptions
   In the event that a new salary scale is approved for a given academic series within a department, division, school, or college, individuals with off-scale salaries prior to the adoption of the new scale will receive a total salary equal to: (a) the salary associated with their rank and step on the new scale or (b) their original off-scale salary, whichever is larger. The off-scale increment is then redefined as the difference between their total salary and that on the new scale.

620-24 Authority
   Authority to approve and to set off-scale salaries rests with the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel, except as delegated under Section UCD-620-6.

620-80 Campus procedures
   a. Base salary and the off-scale increment shall be recorded and reported separately in the Payroll System of each academic appointee with an off-scale salary.
   b. Both annually and in each individual pay period, the base salary and the off-scale increment will be displayed separately wherever income and deductions are itemized.
c. Range adjustment of academic salaries shall also be applied to the off-scale increment. Based on rank and step, the percentage of increase will be applied to the off-scale increment as it is applied to the base salary, rounded to the nearest $100.

d. Dossiers submitted in support of a personnel action should contain no reference whatever to an off-scale salary. No "+" notation shall be added to the rank/step designation for individuals with off-scale salaries during merit or promotion reviews. Correspondence regarding off-scale salaries will be kept separate and apart from the academic review process, except as noted under Sections UCD-620-6-b and 620-18-b.

e. The Vice Provost--Academic Personnel will provide CAP with an annual summary of approved off-scale salaries.

f. The campus will keep the Office of the President informed on campus coding and reporting practices so as to facilitate and ensure accurate corporate reporting.
Irvine Off-Scale Policy

A. GENERAL POLICY

Off-scale salaries may be approved for academic appointees in the Professor series or comparable titles when necessary to meet competitive conditions (see Policy APM 620-14 for a complete list of eligible titles).

1. Range Adjustment

At the time of a general range adjustment, off-scale salaries for the general campus will receive the percentage of general range adjustment applicable to their academic series. For Health Compensation Plan faculty, the base (as defined by the Health Compensation Plan) off-scale salary will receive the percentage of general range adjustment.

In addition, when a person is appointed or initially advanced to an off-scale salary, the Chancellor may specify that the salary is to be unaffected by the first range adjustment. In such a case, the appointee will be notified in writing of this stipulation by the Chancellor, and the stipulation must be noted on the Personnel Action Form (see APM Policy 620-18-b).

2. Return to Scale Process at Advancement

The amount of merit and promotion increases on off-scale salaries will be 75 percent of the increment (in even hundreds of dollars) for on-scale salaries for the action in question. Thus, if a faculty member is an Associate Professor, Step II, off-scale, and is awarded a merit increase to Associate Professor, Step III, off-scale, the amount of increase would be calculated as follows:

a. Subtract the salary for Associate Professor, Step II, on the appropriate salary scale from Associate Professor, Step III, on that scale. The difference is the increment.

b. Take 75 percent of the increment (calculated in a. above) and round to the nearest hundred dollars. This is the amount of the off-scale merit increase.

c. Add this amount (from b. above) to the Associate Professor, Step II, off-scale salary to determine the new Associate Professor, Step III, off-scale salary.

These calculations apply only as long as the individual's salary is above the salary on the salary scale for his or her assigned step. Salaries never fall below the scale for the assigned step.

NOTE: This policy replaces a policy that off-scale salaries must return to step within two merit increases, a policy which applied through 1983.

B. LIMITATIONS

1. An off-scale salary may not be the same as any salary on the published scale for the particular title or series.

2. An off-scale salary may not be less than the salary associated with the rank and step in the UC system-wide salary scales.

3. Salaries above the thresholds require Presidential or Regental approval.

Reference - University Policy

- APM 620, Off-Scale Salaries for Appointments and Advancements
UC San Diego Off-Scale Policy

Off-scale salary dispositions
It is very important that the dispositions of off-scale salaries be specified in departmental letters of recommendation for academic reviews. Off-scale policies and terminology have changed and evolved over the last few years, leading to confusion and inconsistency in their application and use. Following is a list of off-scale terms and descriptions of the situations in which they normally apply. If you encounter a unique situation, please contact the appropriate dean’s office for help in determining the correct disposition.

Market off-scale salaries

New: A department may propose a “new” market off-scale salary award in the following circumstances:

1) a market off-scale salary is being requested for the first time for a new or existing academic employee;

2) a market off-scale salary is being proposed for an existing academic employee who has had a market off-scale in the past but currently has an on-scale salary; or

3) a new academic employee is coming to UCSD from another UC campus where he or she has a market off-scale salary. The proposed market off-scale salary at UCSD is considered new.

A new off-scale salary must be thoroughly justified in the departmental recommendation letter.

Maintained: If an appointee has a market off-scale salary that will be less than six years old on the effective date of the proposed action, and the department wants the appointee to continue to receive the same market off-scale increment, the department need only indicate that the off-scale salary will be maintained in accordance with policy.

Reset: If an appointee will have had a market off-scale salary for six years on the effective date of the proposed action, and the department wants the appointee to continue to receive the same market off-scale increment, the department should propose a “reset” market off-scale salary. Like a new market off-scale, a reset market off-scale must be thoroughly justified in the departmental recommendation letter. Criteria for rejustification include market conditions in the field, a sustained career trajectory, maintenance of stature in the field, and, in some instances, the importance of retaining the appointee at UCSD.

Reset with increase: With appropriate justification, a department may propose an increase in the amount of a market off-scale salary, even if the market off-scale is less than six years old. If approved, the market off-scale is reset at the higher level for a new six-year period. For example, resetting of a market off-scale with an increase may be proposed when there is a documented offer of employment from another institution.

Tapered: 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,” meaning that it will be reduced (normally by one-half) on the effective date of the proposed action. The salary usually will be returned to scale at the following review. 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.
If a department judges that a market off-scale salary is no longer justified, but the market off-scale increment cannot be tapered on the effective date of the proposed action without causing a reduction in the total salary (as when the final action results in no change in step), the department should propose that the market off-scale increment be “range-tapered” (reduced at the time of future range adjustments) until the salary is returned to scale. If no range adjustment occurs in a given year, the market off-scale increment will continue unchanged until the next range adjustment, or until the appointee’s next advancement, whichever takes place first.

**Bonus off-scale salaries**
A new policy regarding bonus off-scale salaries was announced in May 2003. As of July 1, 2003, bonus off-scale salary awards may only be one-half-step increments (i.e., one-half of the difference between the proposed step and the next higher step, rounded up to the next $100 if necessary), and they are paid over a single review period. The salary is normally returned to scale at the time of the next review, although it may be range-tapered if necessary to avoid a reduction in salary. For details, see the announcement archived on the Administrative Records Web page: [http://adminrecords.ucsd.edu/Notices/2003/2003-5-9-2.html](http://adminrecords.ucsd.edu/Notices/2003/2003-5-9-2.html)

**New**: Under the revised policy, whenever a department proposes a bonus off-scale salary award, it is “new.” If an appointee has an existing bonus off-scale salary and the department judges that he or she continues to deserve a bonus off-scale salary increment, the department must propose and justify a new bonus off-scale award at the next review. Thus bonus off-scales cannot be “maintained,” “reset,” or “increased.”

**Tapered**: Under the revised policy, there is no tapering of bonus off-scale salary awards. The bonus off-scale is paid over a single review period, and the salary is returned to scale at the next review. However, when the revised policy was announced, a number of appointees had existing bonus off-scale awards that were to be tapered by half and/or returned to scale at subsequent reviews. These faculty members were exempted from the new policy until their existing awards ended. In these cases only, departments may propose that bonus off-scale increments be tapered by half or that salaries be returned to scale on the effective date of the proposed action.

If an appointee is not advanced at the next review following the award of a bonus off-scale, the department should propose that the bonus be range-tapered (reduced at the time of future salary range adjustments) so that there is no reduction in salary. If no range adjustment occurs in a given year, the bonus off-scale will continue unchanged until the time of the next range adjustment, or until the appointee’s next advancement, whichever takes place first.

**Combination off-scale salaries**
If an appointee has both a market off-scale salary and a bonus off-scale award, the disposition of each off-scale salary increment must be specified in the departmental recommendation letter.
Los Angeles Off-Scale Policy

I. Policy
The Off-Scale Salary policy under Academic Personnel Manual Section 620 states:

"Salaries should be on-scale to the greatest extent feasible. When properly justified, Off-Scale salaries can be used in exceptional situations."

II. When an Off-Scale Salary may be used with an appointment, including a change from an acting title to a regular title; with a promotion from one rank to a higher rank in the same title series or in lieu of such a promotion; or with, or in lieu of, a within-scale merit increase.

III. Bases for Off-Scale Salaries
An Off-Scale salary may be used:

- to provide an appropriate competitive salary rate when a faculty member has received an outside offer;
- to provide an appropriate competitive salary rate in connection with the recruitment of a new appointee;
- to reward service when there are insufficient grounds to warrant advancement in step or rank;
- to compensate for added responsibilities in cases not covered by standard administrators’ stipends;
- to provide appropriate salary rates in order to remain competitive with other universities in specific disciplines; or
- to provide appropriate flexibility in circumstances not specified above but in which there is compelling reason to do so.

IV. Consultation with the Council on Academic Personnel
The Chancellor will periodically discuss with the Council on Academic Personnel the administration of Off-Scale policy on the campus.
Santa Barbara Off-Scale Policy

I. General Policies

The "special" steps (Red Binder I-37) should not be used in order to respond to market pressures in various academic areas. In instances of market pressures, efforts should be made to separate the issue of academically merited rank and step from the issue of the requisite salary needed to recruit or retain a member of the faculty. For those academic areas in which market pressures are a consideration, departmental recommendations for appointment should reflect

(a) a recommended rank and step appropriate to academic and professional achievement; and
(b) an appropriate off-scale together with documentation of the market conditions that justify it.

Salaries should be on-scale to the greatest extent feasible. Nevertheless, when properly justified, appointment or advancement to a position with an off-scale salary may be approved in exceptional situations which cannot properly be accommodated at the regular steps. For example:

- a) competitive market considerations in appointment and retention cases;
- b) recognition of special services or other achievements not normally recognized by on-schedule or accelerated step advancement;
- c) consideration of salary equity in cases of appointment in a different title series.

Off-scale salaries for Assistant Professors may be between $100 above the designated step and $100 below the equivalent step in the next rank. Off-scale salaries for Associate Professors may be between $100 above the designated step and $100 less than one step higher in the next rank. Off-scale salaries for Professors below Step VI may be between $100 above the designated step and $100 less than four steps above, with a maximum of $100 below Step VI. For Professors at Steps VI through IX, no off-scale salary in excess of 10 percent above Step IX will be approved. Exceptions to these limits may be granted in cases of recruitment or retention upon approval of the Chancellor. Off-scale supplements that exceed the stated limits may be carried forward in future advancements but no additional off-scale may be added.

Normal merit increases may be proposed at the full dollar increment between the on-scale salary at the current step and the on-scale salary at the prospective step. The off-scale supplement can be increased or decreased at each merit review, based on performance.

Further guidelines for off-scale salaries are spelled out in APM Sections 620-16 and 620-18. In addition, when a person is appointed or advanced to an off-scale salary, the Chancellor may specify that the salary is to be unaffected by the first and/or any subsequent range adjustment.

II. Merit Or Appointment To An Off-Scale Salary Above Step IX

To be eligible for an off-scale salary above the top of the salary scale, a faculty member must be appointed or advanced to Professor, Step VI or greater. For faculty already at Step IX, consideration for further merit increase within Step IX is reserved for cases of highly meritorious contributions to teaching, research, and service, which fully meet the performance expectations for faculty at the top step of the professorial ladder and which demonstrate progress towards eventual advancement to Above Scale status. No salary in excess of 10 percent above Step IX will be approved except in conjunction with advancement to Above Scale status. Exceptions to this limit may be granted in cases of recruitment or retention upon approval of the Chancellor. Off-scale supplements that exceed the stated limit may be carried forward in future advancements but no additional off-scale may be added.
Santa Cruz Off-Scale Policy

A. Policy Reference
APM 620, Off-Scale Salaries for Appointments and Advancements

B. Use of Off-Scale Salaries
In order to preserve the significance and values of the salary scales, salaries should be on-scale to the greatest extent feasible. Nevertheless, when properly justified, appointment or advancement to a position with an off-scale salary may be approved in exceptional situations such as:
1. when necessary to meet competitive conditions;
2. upon appointment, including upon regularization (i.e., a change from an Acting title to the corresponding regular title);
3. with or in lieu of a within-scale merit increase in salary; or
4. as the consequence of a general range adjustment applied to an off-scale salary.

C. Limitations on Off-Scale Salaries
1. Assistant Professor and other eligible titles at the Assistant level
   The off-scale salary for Assistant Professors, Steps 1 through 4, shall not be higher than $100 less than the published salary for the equivalent step at the Associate Professor rank. The salary limit for Assistant Professor, Steps 5 and 6, shall be no more than $100 less than the published salary of Associate Professor, Step 4, barring exceptional circumstances.

2. Associate Professor and other eligible titles at the Associate level
   The off-scale salary for Associate Professors, Steps 1 through 3, shall not be higher than $100 less than the published salary for one step higher at the Professor rank. The salary limit for Associate Professor, Steps 4 and 5 shall not be higher than $100 less than the published salary of Professor, Step 4, barring exceptional circumstances.

3. Professor, Steps 1 through 5, and other eligible titles at this level
   The off-scale salary of a Professor, Steps 1 through 5, shall not be higher than $100 less than the published salary of a Professor, Step 6, barring exceptional circumstances. Professor, Step 5, is an indefinite step. Advancement to Professor Step 6 involves an overall career review and will be granted on evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in each of the following three categories:
   (1) scholarship or creative achievement,
   (2) University teaching, and
   (3) service. Above and beyond that, great academic distinction, recognized nationally, will be required in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching.

   It is not appropriate for a faculty member to receive a Step 6 salary without a rigorous review. A candidate with an excellent record who chooses not to proceed with such a review, but requests review for a salary increase, may be considered for a modest off-scale increase, such as a quarter or a half step. If the faculty member’s performance continues to be excellent, the department may wish to recommend a further modest salary increase in recognition of the faculty member’s overall performance over the preceding years.

4. Professor, Steps 6-9, and other eligible titles at this level
The off-scale salary of a Professor, Steps 6-9, shall not be higher than $100 less than the published salary scale for Professor, Step 9, plus 8.5%, barring exceptional circumstances.

D. Future Advancement for those with Off-Scale Salaries
Off-scale salaries are awarded for a variety of reasons including recruitment and retention, as well as to reward extraordinary performance during a particular review period. In addition, off-scale salaries are also awarded in lieu of a step advancement or promotion. In subsequent actions, reviewers should consider the merits of the file during the review period to determine the appropriate salary recommendation. A reduction, or increase, in an off-scale increment or an alignment to an on-scale salary may be the appropriate action at the time of next advancement.

E. Range Adjustment
1. Except as noted below, anyone with an off-scale salary at the time of a general range adjustment will receive the same dollar increase in salary as those of the same title, rank and step on the regular salary scale in question. The off-scale portion of the salary is not subject to range adjustment.
2. When a faculty member is appointed or advanced to an off-scale salary, the deciding authority may specify that the salary is to be unaffected by the first concurrent or subsequent range adjustment.

F. Authority
In addition to this section on authority, please review the June 25, 2009 continuation of the Delegation of Authority for Greater-than-Normal Merits for Appointees in the Ladder Rank Professor Series; Astronomer Series; and Professional Research Series.

1. The Dean has authority to approve:
   a. Off-scale salaries for delegated actions up to the salary limits outlined in C above.
   b. Off-scale salaries for delegated appointments at Assistant Professor, Steps 1 through 3, up to the campus off-scale salary limit for the Assistant Professor rank. (Delegation of Authority Memo, March 16, 2007)
   c. Off-scale salaries for delegated actions in excess of the campus off-scale salary limits once the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor has approved the initial exception for that offscale amount (except as outlined in F.2.b,c,and d).

2. The Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor has authority to approve other exceptional salary actions, including:
   a. Initial exceptions to an off-scale salary in excess of the campus off-scale salary limits (except as outlined in F.1.b).
   b. Any increase in the amount of the off-scale increment.
   c. Off-scale salaries for Professor, Steps 1 through 5, if salary is higher than $100 less than Step 6.
   d. Off-scale salaries for Professor, Steps 6 through 9, if salary is higher than $100 less than Step 9 plus 8.5 percent.
   e. Off-scale salaries up to the annually indexed Regental Threshold. Salaries above this threshold require Presidential approval. (Refer to UC Academic Salary Scales, Appendix – Thresholds for Approval of Academic Salaries.)

3. The Chancellor has authority to approve:
   Merit increases of 10 percent or less that exceed the Regental Threshold. Presidential approval is still required for new appointment and retention salaries above this threshold (regardless of the amount), and for proposed merit increases greater than 10 percent that exceed the threshold. (Delegation of Authority Memo, December, 1, 2004)