October 21, 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 25, 2010

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, October 25, 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 1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>Approval of the October 25, 2010 Agenda and October 11, 2010 minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

1. Senate Review Flow Chart
2. Issues under review – list of what is currently out for review

III. ATHLETICS AND DANCE:
Discuss the naming request from Stan Morrison, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics and Stephen Cullenberg, Dean, College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences.

IV. REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW – POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS – Formal response due at Council on 11-8-10
Action – discuss and prepare a response to systemwide Academic Council

V. REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY Formal response due at Council on – 11-10-10
Action – discuss and prepare a response to systemwide Academic Council

VI. OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL & COMMITTEE BUSINESS
PRESENT:
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
Peter Chung (AGSM), Planning and Budget (P&B)
Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare
Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council/CCGA Representative
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
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)

ABSENT:
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
Christine Gailey (Women’s Studies), Committee on Committees (COC)
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education
David Herzberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)

AGENDA:
The agenda and the minutes were unanimously approved as written.

The Conflict of Interest Statements were noted as received.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:
Chair Mary Gauvain reported that she attended two meetings at the Office of the President in Oakland. The first meeting was held on September 28, 2010 and was hosted by Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs Lawrence Pitts. Senior officials from the Office of the President made presentations on cost cutting efforts that have been made by
the Office of the President and the efficiencies that have been achieved. There were also presentations on Post-Employment Benefits (PEB).

The Academic Council met on September 29, 2010. The meeting focused on transfer issues and what UC will be doing to facilitate transfers from community colleges. Chair Gauvain mentioned that there will be a committee composed of 2 department chairs from 5 disciplines (Computer Science, Mathematics, History, Psychology and the Biological Sciences) who will try to identify common course requirements and syllabi. They will discuss ways that the UC can improve the process of transferring from community colleges, including closer alignment of lower division major requirements across campuses.

Council also had a discussion about salary increases for faculty. This issue will be the focus of the next Council meeting scheduled for October 27, 2010. Council will be meeting with all the EVCs and Chair Gauvain will report back on this discussion at the November EC meeting.

Chair Gauvain indicated that Council spent a large amount of time discussing PEB issues. Chair Gauvain reminded the EC members of the faculty forum scheduled for Thursday, October 14, 2010 from 10:00 to 12:00 to discuss PEB. She encouraged the EC members to attend the faculty forum and to invite other faculty members to attend. Chair Gauvain reminded the EC members that on Friday, October 15, 2010, Gary Schlimgen, Director of Pension and Retirement Programs at the Office of the President, will review the key elements of the recommended changes, including the three proposed options discussed in the Final Report of the President’s Task Force on PEB at a Town Hall meeting from 10:00 to 11:30 in the Highlander Union Building Rm. 302 North.

Finally, Chair Gauvain indicated that one of the things that is important for people understand is that although the changes to PEB are often cast as only impacting individuals who are hired after 2013, the changes to PEB will affect everyone on the campus.

**Systemwide Reviews:**
Chair Gauvain indicated that there are currently two Systemwide items being circulated for committee review: (1) the review of the Report of Senate Membership Task Force and (2) the review of proposed revisions to APM 010 and 015.

**Off-Scale Salary Policy:**
The EC members discussed the policy proposed by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs regarding the criteria for satisfactory academic progress for maintaining an off/scale salary. The policy had been sent out for review to the Committee on Planning and Budget, Committee on Academic Personnel, and Committee on Faculty Welfare, and their comments were discussed. EC members expressed concern that the Senate was not included in the review of off-scale procedures for the campus as stipulated by APM 620, as well as the fact that this policy only applied to faculty who received off-scales effective July 1, 2010.
After some discussion, EC members agreed that the points below will be added to the response letter drafted by Chair Gauvain. The revised letter will then be sent out one more time to all EC members before finally being transmitted to the VPAP.

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

1. The EC endorses the notion that a faculty member with an O/S salary needs to maintain satisfactory academic progress for the O/S to continue.

2. The EC is concerned that the proposed scheduling of reviews could be potentially problematic and lend itself to the possibility of someone “gaming the system.” For example, as currently described a faculty member may have a satisfactory quinquennial review followed by a qualified satisfactory quinquennial review, which would result in the maintenance of the O/S for 5 to 10 years beyond the reward of the O/S.

3. The EC is concerned that the proposed scheduling of reviews could have different implications across diverse disciplines. For example, in the sciences where evidence of regular progress is the norm, an unsatisfactory review in a single cycle may have a very different meaning than in the humanities where the usual products (e.g., books) may take longer to produce.

4. The EC is seriously concerned that the O/S policy, even with this change, undermines efforts at the campus and systemwide levels to restore a competitive faculty salary scale. The continued use of O/S salaries to make ad hoc adjustments to compensate for the noncompetitiveness of the salary scale undermines the ability of the campus to address the salary scale issue financially, while also lowering the morale of faculty who are unable to regularly seek outside offers to obtain and maintain salaries.

5. The EC would welcome the opportunity to engage in examination and consultation regarding the O/S procedures and policies on the campus. We note that APM 620-80 states that

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

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

**OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL & COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
Chair Gauvain mentioned that the Committee on Committees had provided her with a slate of
names for the Strategic Plan Implementation Advisory Committee. She brought the list to
the attention of the EC members to see if they had other names they would like to propose.
The members were concerned with the lack of a representative from the Physical Sciences
as well as the fact that one of the names included was that of an Associate Dean. Prof. Jose
Wudka agreed he would send some suggestions via email to Chair Gauvain. There was also
concern about faculty representation from the Humanities. The EC members unanimously
agreed that a recommendation be made to EVCP Rabenstein that the Chair of the Riverside
Division and the Chair of Planning Budget be made permanent ex-officio members of the
Strategic Plan Implementation Advisory Committee.

Chair Gauvain introduced Prof. Steve Clark, Chair Undergraduate Admissions. She then
invited the committee to briefly discuss any issues that they might have.

Prof. Erik Rolland, Chair, AGSM Executive Committee indicated that the members of his
College would like to know the status of the meeting that occurred between his College and
the Chancellor in June. The uncertainty regarding the future of AGSM is hurting his college
because faculty are not participating. Chair Gauvain indicated that she would mention this
to the EVCP at her next biweekly meeting scheduled for October 14, 2010. Prof. Rolland
also mentioned that AGSM will be cutting their undergraduate program from 1300 to about
700 students.

Prof. David Parker, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee, had a question regarding the two
documents that were submitted for review regarding the future of the University. In
particular, he wanted to know the origin of the UCLA Statement. The EC was informed that
the UCLA statement was made in response to the Council recommendation and was more a
tactical statement while the Council report was more of a strategic statement. Prof. Parker
also gave an update on the repeat policy issue that was discussed at the EC meeting on
September 27, 2010. He discussed Council’s concerns about the priority wait-list plan and
described the difficulty in implementing this plan. He also mentioned that CNAS has
reached an agreement with Vice Chancellor Sandoval's office that they will reduce
admission to the college for next year. They will be accepting about 1100 students and they
will be using AIS scores to accept students.

Prof. Morris Maduro, Chair, Graduate Council, indicated that the Graduate Council is
working with the Committee on Educational Policy at creating a policy for online programs.
They currently have a proposal from Engineering for an Online Masters program. The
Committee is working to create a policy that can be used by the campus and they will be
working closely with the Systemwide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs.
Meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sellyna Ehlers*
*Executive Director*
*Office of the Academic Senate*
October 13, 2010

TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: Piotr Gorecki, Chair
Committee on Academic Freedom

The Committee on Academic Freedom has readopted the Conflict of Interest statement originally adopted in 1994-95, which is as follows:

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

If the chair is the individual in question, he/she will appoint an acting chair to consider the matter. The committee may ask the person in question to testify, but the person would not be present at other parts of the discussion or at the vote.
October 14, 2010

TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: Darleen DeMason, Chair
Committee on Charges

RE: 10-11 Conflict of Interest Statement

The Committee on Charges has adopted the following conflict of interest statement to be placed on file for the 2010-11 academic year:

No member of the Committee on Charges shall consider a charge that involves (as a complainant or accused person) (a) a member of his/her department or equivalent unit; (b) an individual with whom he/she has a relationship that might be interpreted as a source of bias; or (c) an individual with whom he/she has a relationship that is believed by a majority of the Committee to be a source of bias.
October 11, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAINE, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: EUGENE NOTHNAGEL, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON COURSES

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Courses approved the following statement at their meeting today.

If an issue comes before the Committee on Courses that emanates from the department or program of a committee member, he/she will provide information, but will not vote on the issue.
October 1, 2010

TO:     MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
        RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:     MORRIS MARDUO, CHAIR
        GRADUATE COUNCIL

RE:     CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 2010-2011

The Graduate Council approved the following Conflict of Interest Statement:

Purpose

The Graduate Council should conduct itself in such a manner that neither the reality nor the appearance of a conflict of interest should be present in any action taken by the Council.

Terms

1. Whenever any matter that affects a member of the Council as an Individual or as a member of a department or program is to be decided, that member should absent himself/herself before the vote is taken. If the member does not leave voluntarily, the Chair should excuse the member.

   a. The Chair of the Council may ask the member to provide information on the matter before the member's departure.

   b. When confidential information is being provided to the Council, the affected member will be excused by the Chair before the information is provided.

   c. When student petitions are considered, Council members should consider a student matter in their department/program as a conflict of interest for themselves.
d. When routine matters (e.g., course approvals) are being considered, the Chair may elect to allow all members to participate in the discussion and vote. This section is not meant to include program revisions, review committee reports on a specific department or individual student matters.

2. Subcommittee operations are subject to the same rules as the Council as a whole. The Chair may name a replacement from the Council membership for an individual serving on a subcommittee who has a conflict of interest when necessary.

3. Students are not permitted to be present in Council meetings when matters pertaining to individual students are discussed.

4. In unforeseen cases, the Chair may rule that any member should be excused if the Chair foresees conflict of interest in the matter under discussion. The affected member may appeal to the Council. The member or the chair may appeal to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure if the results of the Council vote are not satisfactory; the matter to be discussed will be held without action pending the decision of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

5. Members with possible conflicts of interest should discuss the matter with the Council Chair before the pertinent Council meeting. If the Chair foresees a conflict of interest on the part of a Council member, he/she should discuss the matter with the affected member. It is to be hoped that a course of action satisfactory to the member and the Chair can be achieved. If this is not possible the Chair should determine the proper course of action. The member may appeal to the Council and/or the Committee on Privilege and Tenure as indicated in Section 4 above.
OCTOBER 14, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: J. GANIM, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL RESOURCES PLANNING

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 2010-2011

The Physical Resources Planning Committee re-adopted, by unanimous vote, the following conflict of interest statement for 2010-2011.

If any Committee member has a personal affiliation with departments, programs, or individuals that are part of ordinary deliberations of the Committee, that member may have a conflict of interest. If any member does have such a conflict of interest, it is their responsibility to bring it to the attention of the Chair. Upon consultation with other Committee members, the Committee Chair may ask that member to leave the room during substantive discussions, motions or votes.
September 27, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: GERHARD GIERZ, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Preparatory Education adopted the following conflict of interest statement:

In any situation, as determined by the Chair in consultation with other Committee on Preparatory Education members, wherein the personal affiliation of a committee member could be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, that member will be expected to exclude him/herself from making, seconding, or voting on any motion, made in the course of the deliberation. This exclusion will be noted in any report issued by the Committee on Preparatory Education.
October 13, 2010

TO: Mary Gauvain  
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate  

FROM: Victor Lippit, Chair  
Committee on Privilege and Tenure  

RE: 10-11 Conflict of Interest Statement  

In accordance with Bylaw 8.2.5 of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure places on file for 2010-11 the procedures it will follow in order to mitigate possible conflicts of interest:

1. Bylaws 335.D.1, 336.D.1, and 337.B.1 of the Academic Senate establish that, in formal hearings, no Committee member (either of Privilege and Tenure itself or of a Hearing Committee appointed by it) may participate in the hearing of a case brought by a member of his or her department or equivalent unit.

2. By standing practice, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure has always extended this principle to apply also to its "Prehearing Procedures," as defined in Bylaw 335.B, and will follow such practice during the current academic year.

3. Further, in accordance with the mandate of Divisional Bylaw 8.2.5, the Committee will expect each of its members to call to the attention of the Chair any "personal affiliation" with a party to any case brought before the Committee, if that Committee member has reason to believe that the relationship "might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations." Such a member may voluntarily abstain from participation in the case or may request that a decision as to participation or abstention be determined by a majority vote of the remaining members of the Committee.
October 7, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: CAROLE-ANNE TYLER, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIPS AND HONORS

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST 2010-2011

The committee on Scholarships and Honors adopted the following conflict of interest statement.

The Committee on Scholarships and Honors has adopted the following policy for 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. The committee member will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair will ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions or votes.
October 11, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: ERIK ROLLAND, CHAIR, Executive Committee
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION/AGSM

RE: Conflict of Interest Statement

During its October 1 meeting of the Fall Quarter 2010, the Executive Committee of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management/School of Business Administration 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 member may be asked to provide information on this issue where appropriate, but will be excluded from any motion or vote on the issue.

Erik Rolland
October 20, 2010

TO:      M. GAUVAIN, CHAIR
         RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:      D. PION-BERLIN, CHAIR
         COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

RE:      2010-2011 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Research re-adopted the following Conflict of Interest statement:

If a member of the Committee on research submits an application for funds from this committee, he/she will not participate in the evaluation discussion or decision concerning that particular application. Further, each application for Intramural Research funding will be reviewed and evaluated individually by two members of this committee, before final discussion by the entire committee, in order to ensure a fair and impartial review of each application. Finally, if any member of this committee believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call the possible conflict of interest to the attention of the chair. The chair will convene the committee, and those present will decide by majority vote if a conflict exists. If their decision is affirmative, the individual with the conflict will leave the room during discussion of the conflicted matter and will not vote on that matter.
Divisional Issues*  
Examples:  
New Graduate Program Proposals  
New Undergraduate Program Proposals  
Combined BS/MS Degree proposals  
Admission Requirements*  

Which includes freshmen and transfer students. This list is not inclusive of everything. If you have a question, please contact the Senate Office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Executive Council - (A/I or I)</th>
<th>Division Due Date</th>
<th>Systemwide Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Chair Gauvain  
Academic Senate  

RE: Campus Naming Committee  

Dear Mary:  

As Chair Designee of the UCR Committee on Naming Campus Properties, Programs and Facilities, I am requesting the review and approval by the Academic Senate Executive Council for this naming opportunity.  

- *Athletics & Dance* is the proposed name for the Physical Education Building. This naming has been requested by Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, Stan Morrison and Dean, College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, Stephen Cullenberg.  

Please review the attached request and summary details. This proposed name needs approval by the Academic Senate before it is endorsed by the Campus Naming Committee. Please respond with your recommendation by Friday October 29th, 2010.  

Sincerely,  

Gretchen Bolar  
Vice Chancellor  

Attachments  

xc: Dean Cullenberg  
   Director Morrison  
   Executive Director Ehlers  
   Campus Space Manager Pippert
SUMMARY INFORMATION

UCR: NAMING CAMPUS PROPERTIES, ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, AND FACILITIES

Proposed Name: Athletics & Dance

Building Background:
- Current Building Name: Physical Education Building
- Official Building Name: Athletics and Dance Building
- Building Name (12-byte): ATHL DANCE
- Capital Asset Account Numbers: P5334
- Building Assignable Square Feet: 41,337 asf
- Building Basic Gross Square Feet: 66,335 gsf
- Location: UCR Core Campus

Description: Athletics & Dance is recommended as the new name for the Physical Education Building. The Physical Education department was “disestablished” in 2003 and no longer represents the occupants or usage of the building.

See attached Background Information.

Site Map:
BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR ATHLETICS & DANCE BUILDING

August 25, 2010

Gretchen Bolar, Vice Chancellor
Academic Planning and Budget
Chair, Campus Naming Committee
University of California, Riverside
Hinderaker Hall 4118
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Vice Chancellor Bolar,

The purpose of this communication is to solicit the support of the Campus Naming Committee in moving ahead with a request to change the name of the Physical Education Building, here at UC Riverside, to ATHLETICS & DANCE.

As you know, the Department of Physical Education was “disestablished” by the Academic Senate as noted in an email by then EVC David Warren to then VC C. Michael Webster on 6/4/2003. The sponsors for that disestablishment were former Chancellor France Cordova and former CHASS Dean, Patricia O’Brien. As a result, Physical Education has not existed on the UCR campus for the past 7 years. During that period of time, two major programs have utilized the facility, Intercollegiate Athletics and the Dance Department.

With the growth of the campus and the evolution of our Division I Athletics program, as well as the growth of our outstanding Dance program, it would seem that their daily headquarters for operations should be so designated. Further, the current Physical Education Building name sends a message to faculty, staff, students and visitors that such a program exists when, in fact, it does not. Renaming the building ATHLETICS & DANCE will assist anyone on campus in both finding and identifying the locale of those two programs.

We recognize that such a name change entails many necessary changes on campus maps, mailing addresses, and in campus catalogues. We would like to encourage that process to take place during the 2010-2011 academic year. We trust we can receive the support of the Campus Naming Committee in advancing this request to the Academic Senate for review and recommendation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Stan Morrison
Director of Intercollegiate Athletics

Stephen Cullenberg, Ph.D
Dean, College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
Committee on Privilege and Tenure

October 13, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Victor Lippit  
Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Re: P&T Statement on Post Employment Benefits

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) is in strong agreement with the conclusions of the "Dissenting Statement by Staff and Academic Senate Members of the Work Groups of the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits" (August 25, 2010): we find Option A completely unacceptable, Option B unsatisfactory and Option C most desirable. There are two respects in particular in which the charge of P&T may be involved in the forthcoming decisions on PEB.

First, The Task Force Final Report--Executive Summary (July 2010) proposes that current employees be given an option to remain in UCRP by paying at least 7% of their salaries. This is tantamount to a salary reduction; in the past, UC employees were never asked to pay more than 3% of salary (5% for that amount above the maximum salary taxation for social security). One or more faculty members may file a grievance claiming that this is improper. It is likely that such a grievance ultimately would have to be settled outside the University under the California Vested Rights Doctrine (see Dissenting Statement, p. 4, fn 8 for case reference). Prior to that, however, a more or less lengthy period of time and effort may be required by P&T while the issues are debated on campus.

Second, Option A and Option B propose a two-tier retirement program for the University. The inherent injustice of such systems (differing compensation--based simply on the year of hiring for individuals making the same contribution to the University and holding equal rank) may be a source of faculty grievances in the future.

In view of these considerations, we find Option C to be the most desirable. It avoids, for the most part, a two-tier system. Moreover, if the Dissenting Statement's recommendation that employee contributions be limited to a 7 percent of salary maximum, and phased in only when salaries are increased significantly, then the chances for faculty and staff grievances would be minimized.
Date: October 14, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain
Chair of the Academic Senate
University of California, Riverside

From: Jay A. Farrell
Chair of the Faculty
Bourns College of Engineering
University of California, Riverside

RE: Post-employment benefits

The current UCRP funding situation is untenable, not because the current UCRP system is unsustainable, but because it was unfunded for 20 years. If the system had been normally funded, it would currently be 120% funded (as shown on page 26 of the Final Report of the President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits, July 2010). The proposed new approaches attempt to fix the present situation by Faculty/Staff paying more at present and receiving less in the future with the state contributing more at present, but does not ask the state to redress adequately the 20 years of non-payment.

Option A is not acceptable. Under Options B and C the quality of UC is at risk because the total remuneration diminishes from already subpar levels.

Faculty choosing to stay in the existing UCRP must have a known maximum contribution percentage.
October 18, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: DAN HARE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE: FINAL RESPONSE ON POST EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) met on September 28, 2010 to consider your request of September 15 to review the proposed changes to post-employment benefits. CFW found itself largely to be in agreement with the analysis conducted by the Systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) that was approved for distribution by the Systemwide Academic Council on September 29. Accordingly, CFW recommends that the UCR Executive Council adopt the following positions:

1. CFW strongly opposes Option A on the grounds that it is uncompetitive across essentially all employee groups.

2. CFW supports Option C over Option B, on the grounds that Option C is simpler for employees to understand and for UC to administer than Option B, and Option B has the same employer normal cost as Option C. However, CFW would be willing to support Option B instead of Option C if staff preferred it. Option C provides a higher pension benefit than Option B for lower- and middle-income employees, paid for by a higher employee contribution by those employees.

3. If current employees are offered the choice to continue under the current UCRP plan terms for their future service, CFW strongly opposes requiring an employee contribution in excess of 7% for those who choose to remain under the current plan terms.

4. CFW’s support for Options B and C is contingent on the creation of a credible plan to raise faculty and staff salaries to competitive levels over the next three years – before the implementation of the new tier.
October 5, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: CHRISTINE GAILEY, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF THE REPORT OF THE POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS TASK FORCE

Committee on Committee members met on September 28, 2010 and discussed the Post-Employment Benefits report. The members noted that all three options were seriously uncompetitive across all employee groups. They rejected Option A outright as too detrimental to staff and faculty and obviously favoring the highest paid employees. However, they endorsed Option C as having the least negative impact on staff and faculty. Committee on Committee also felt very strongly that salaries will have to be addressed no matter which option is chosen. The CoC members felt that faculty retention would be least harmed with Option C, rejecting the argument that cut-backs in other universities’ benefit packages would keep UC competitive. The CoC members rejected this “race to the bottom” approach to staff and faculty benefits that is embraced in Option A and still evident in Option B. The members also noted that Option C is the easiest to comprehend and implement.

Finally, CoC members also wanted it to go on record that they will attend the Division meeting scheduled for November 30, 2010 and vote for Option C.
October 18, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: MANUELA MARTINS-GREEN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

RE: POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

CODEO has reviewed the document you sent us on the Post-Employment Benefits. We find this to be a very complicated issue with enormous variables that can be changed with time and therefore extremely difficult to evaluate. The presentation on Wednesday by Hare and Henry made it clear that this is a very complex issue that in fact not only will impact the faculty hiring and retention in general but will particularly affect our ability to attract and retain diversity, given that the competition for these faculty is steeper than normal. Having said that, if pressed to make a choice, we would opt for option C.
October 18, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: EUGENE A. NOTHNAGEL, CHAIR
   COMMITTEE ON COURSES

RE: REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW -- POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

At its meeting of October 11, 2010, the Committee on Courses briefly discussed the issue of post-employment benefits but decided that the issue fell outside of its jurisdiction. Thus, the Committee on Courses decided not to opine on this issue.
At its October 1, 2010 meeting, the Graduate Council discussed the Options of the Post Employment Benefits and felt that there no significant issues pertaining to Graduate Business and therefore had no significant comment on the proposal.

Members discussed the options and commented that Option A was not acceptable due to a lack of a cap on employee contributions to keep with the existing plan; option B or C have a cap. No strong preference was given for either option, though C may help certain staff categories with less income.

The Council also expressed concern that a less competitive post-employment benefits plan will almost certainly decrease the ability of the UC system to attract the best faculty, and hence weaken Graduate programs over time.
October 7, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: Y. PETER CHUNG, CHAIR
PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: Request for Systemwide review of report of the Post-Employment Benefits Taskforce

Planning and Budget members met on September 23, 2010 and discussed the Post-Employment Benefits report. The members noted that while option A provides the largest savings to the University, this option ultimately cuts total remuneration so much that it will be very difficult to hire new high quality faculty and staff or to retain existing ones, ultimately contributing to a significant erosion in quality of the UC system. Thus, Option A was ultimately not a good choice for both faculty and staff even if the salary gap is closed. P&B members noted that Option B and C both have the same cost to the employer, but that Option C was not attached to social security.

P&B members agreed that of the three choices offered, Option C is the one most likely to be accepted by both faculty and staff; however, P&B members were concerned that because option C requires a larger employee contribution, it might cause a hardship for some staff members. Ultimately, P&B members noted that in order to implement this new package, there needs to be a long-term salary restoration plan for staff and faculty. P&B members noted the urgent need to increase State subsidy, but since this is unlikely, then the only two options left are to either raise student fees or shrink the size of the University.

Planning and Budget unanimously voted for Option C with the stipulations indicated above.
October 13, 2010

TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Riverside Division Academic Senate

FR: Piotr Gorecki, Chair
    Committee on Academic Freedom

RE: Proposed Post Employment Benefits

The Committee on Academic Freedom does not find any specific aspects of the proposed changes to post employment benefits that impinge upon academic freedom and APM 010. In their capacities as colleagues, that is to say, personally, the members of CAF find themselves in agreement with the positions of the Systemwide Committee on Faculty Welfare described in their letters to Chair Simmons on September 15 and 22:

OCTOBER 14, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: J. GANIM, CHAIR
       COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL RESOURCES PLANNING

RE: REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW -- POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The Physical Resources Planning Committee reviewed the Post-Employment Benefits and did not find significant issues pertaining to Physical Resources Planning issues. As members of the faculty, we second the concerns of other committees pertaining to equity, fairness, the competitive standing of UC and the message we are sending to future younger faculty regarding the commitment of the University to their future.
October 13, 2010

TO:     M. GAUVAIN, CHAIR
        RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:     C-A. TYLER, CHAIR
        COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIPS AND HONORS

RE:     Post Employment Benefits

The Committee on Scholarships and Honors met October 7 to discuss whether to make a formal response to the Post Employment Benefits Report, as all Division committees have been invited to do by the Division Chair. The Committee unanimously voted not to submit a detailed formal response because the most significant impacts of implementation of any of the changes outlined in the Report is not within our charge except in the very general way the campus and system would be affected by the likely difficulty in attracting and retaining the best faculty that could result. As, in varying degrees, the proposed changes reduce the total compensation package for faculty and/or create a lack of trust in the compensation outlined in job offers, they could cause faculty to choose another institution over U.C. Riverside, and that could mean fewer cutting-edge faculty researchers to mentor undergraduates and receive the award for mentoring we oversee, as well as more difficulty attracting the most academically competitive students to U.C. Riverside through the scholarships the committee oversees.
October 18, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair  
Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Rise Axelrod  
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Post Employment Benefits

The Committee on Academic Personnel has carefully reviewed the Task Force Report on Post-Employment Benefits, the Dissenting Statement, and the other supporting documents.

CAP’s primary concern is that the proposed changes in retirement benefits will reduce the competitiveness of the University of California and damage our ability to attract and retain the highest caliber of faculty.

Therefore, CAP endorses the UCFW response to the Task Force Report on Post-Employment Benefits:

- CAP opposes Option A  
  Because, as Hewitt and Mercer found, Option A “would be uncompetitive, even if the gap between UC salaries and market comparators’ salaries were closed.”
- CAP opposes Option B  
  Because Option B would only be potentially competitive after UC’s salary lag was closed. Moreover, the integration of Option B with Social Security adds an element of uncertainty, as Social Security is a program that itself is vulnerable and may very well be diminished or privatized in coming years.
- CAP supports Option C, but only after faculty salaries have been raised to competitive levels
- CAP opposes an employee contribution in excess of 7% for those who choose to remain under the current plan
Date: October 14, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain
   Chair of the Academic Senate
   University of California, Riverside

From: Jay A. Farrell
   Chair of the Faculty
   Bourns College of Engineering
   University of California, Riverside

RE: UCLA statement

We agree with the spirit of the document; except that we disagree with 3c. Restrictions on growth make sense at certain campuses, and perhaps planning should be more conservative. A blanket policy for all campuses does not make sense for UC. UC must make strategic decisions for the future, which may include shutting down non-productive programs at any campus and allowing for growth in other strategic areas.

Therefore, we cannot sign onto the document as written.
October 18, 2010

TO: MARY GAVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: DAN HARE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE: CFW RESPONSE TO COUNCIL AND UCLA POSITIONS ON THE FUTURE OF UC

CFW considered a number of previous documents addressing the size and shape of the University of California in formulating its response to the Council and UCLA memos. After careful consideration, CFW recognizes that downsizing, if done carefully, may be a necessary response to continued budgetary shortfalls and generally favors Council’s broad, strategic statement over the UCLA statement as described below.

CFW began its analysis using a document written by UCFW and released in the spring of 2009, "The Current Budget Crisis and UC's Long-term Future."

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/mcyudof.ucfuture.june09.pdf

This report observes that state support for students has been in decline for two decades, and the legislature no longer is willing to fund a University of the size and quality as envisioned in the Master Plan. This report states that "Since there simply is no prospect that the State will provide sufficient funds to maintain the University of California at the size and quality envisaged in the Master Plan, it is essential that the University begin discussion of the alternative futures that now face us." This document then outlined three broad classes of options:

A: Maintain quality and reduce size throughout the system (relative to the Master Plan).
B: Move to a high fee/high aid model.
C: Maintain size (relative to the Master Plan) but reduce quality.

UCFW then called upon the University's leadership to work towards the articulation of a vision of the institution that makes a clear choice of which pathway we are taking and why. That report was followed by the Gould Commission recommendations released last spring. It is generally agreed that the Gould Commission failed notably to address the fundamental problem that the revenue streams available to UC are insufficient to support UC's mission. (See the Academic Senate's response to the first and second round of the Gould Commission's recommendations – pp. 1 – 3 of the response to the first round and p. 2 of the response to the second round of recommendations, links are below.)
The Council statement was written in response to the lack of any vision for UC in any of the recommendations of the Gould Commission, and the UCLA derives from and is in response to the Council statement. Simultaneously, the "Choices" report was released by UCPB last spring and advances a number of trade-offs that the campuses may need to consider when the three principles of the Master Plan -- quality, affordability, and access -- are put into conflict by budgetary decisions made by the state legislature.

CFW quickly rejected Option C of the "Future of UC" report, (maintain size but reduce quality). We do believe, however, that this is the option that UC is following by default, what with the increases of student / faculty ratios to nearly 30 in some colleges on campus and the continued admission of students for which State funding is still not available. CFW also rejected the high fee / high aid model (Option B), although we recognized that some fee increases would be necessary to cover the shortfalls of funding provided by the State legislature. CFW favored the general principle of maintaining quality of undergraduate instruction as much as possible, by operating at a size that is affordable by downsizing the faculty and staff. There were diverse views among the committee members on the process governing the amount of downsizing that would be necessary to maintain quality, however.

In general, the Council and UCLA documents advocate for the same strategic goals. Some members questioned whether the UCLA statement deserved Systemwide review, for it seems mainly to advance the interests of that campus in the process rather than to develop alternatives to the Council Statement. CFW noted for example, that UCLA would like to see "affordable housing" added in some way to competitive remuneration. UCLA also would like to see an exemption to the building moratorium for projects that might be "leveraged" by external resources. On the other hand, there was support within CFW of the UCLA positions for campuses to develop their own realistic plans to downsize faculty and staff, to look at the need and number of administrative positions, and to improve the efficiency of allocation of resources to more critical courses. Although CFW can support some of those tactical options, not all are as beneficial to UCR as they may be to UCLA, and CFW recommends caution in wholly adopting the tactical views of one campus for the entire system.

Considerable discussion occurred within CFW as to how the downsizing might be accomplished. We might expect each and every Division Chair to adopt the attitude that it is perfectly appropriate for the other campuses to downsize but not the Chair's campus because of its special needs. CFW strongly recommends that objective criteria be adopted to govern the downsizing that do not by design favor one campus over another. The decisions likely will need to be made among departments within campuses and recognize not only the need to maintain the quality of undergraduate instruction, but also to support the stronger and rising departments over others. The process to select the criteria must be thoughtful, and not expedient. Those of us who were on campus in the early 1990's are well aware that a previous downsizing utilized the simple-minded approach of voluntary early retirements coupled with campus-wide hiring freezes. This combination affected some departments more than others purely due to differences in the demographics of their faculty and not due to anything related to the quality or academic mission of those departments. Similar expedient approaches to future downsizing must be avoided.
DATE: October 13, 2010

TO: Mary Gauvain
Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: David Parker
Chair, CNAS Executive Committee

RE: Systemwide Review of Academic Council and UCLA Reports

I am writing in response to the request for systemwide review of the Academic Council’s recommendation and the UCLA statement concerning the future of the University. The CNAS Executive Committee discussed both documents at some length on October 12, 2010, and the following is a synopsis of our views.

First, the Committee views the UCLA document as a superfluous, and only slightly nuanced, alternative to the Council’s recommendation. It is unclear to us why an individual campus’ “take” on the issues should enjoy Council’s approval, and potentially detract from a single, unified response from the Council concerning the CFT report. If Council cannot come to a consensus view on the report, then it seems to us that they should so stipulate, and simply allow the 10 campuses to respond individually, as they may indeed have diverse needs and perspectives.

Second, both documents strike us as being more palatable at “mature” campuses who are at capacity with respect to enrollments, and who have all (or almost all) of their desired academic programs already in place. That is certainly not the case at Riverside (or at Merced), which is in the middle of major period of growth. This growth is driven by several factors, including the general population increases in the Inland Empire, as well as continued growth in the population of UC-eligible high school graduates. A “one size fits all” recommendation to downsize the faculty (and staff) is contrary to Riverside’s growth trajectory. Moreover, at least in CNAS, it would require us to dramatically downsize the student body (we are presently at >30:1 student:FTE), a move with potentially undesirable political consequences for a campus that stresses both access and diversity.
Third, both downsizing and cessation of all programmatic expansion is antithetical to Riverside’s need to expand in a number of STEM fields, including biomedicine. Such growth, including substantial growth of the graduate student population, is essential if UCR is to even come close to achieving the profile of an AAU campus.

Finally, we view a widespread call to shrink the UC and to curtail growth as shortsighted. As President Yudoff’s email of this morning indicates, there are positive signs that State funding is being (and will continue to be) restored, and he specifically mentioned the desirability of hiring new faculty in the coming months. UC Riverside has been a designated “growth campus” for at least two decades, has made remarkable strides in a number of areas, and has the most diverse undergraduate population of any UC campus. We reject the premise that we need to make any draconian programmatic cuts at this time, or that we need to derail our long-term aspirations because of the current, temporary budgetary crisis.
TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION  

FM: MORRIS MADURO, CHAIR  
GRADUATE COUNCIL  

RE: REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF COUNCIL  
RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  

The Graduate Council met on October 1, 2010 and discussed the system-wide review of Council recommendation and UCLA statement on the future of the University.  

The Graduate Council endorses the basic idea that we continue to attract and retain the best faculty. As always, UC should try to find new sources of funding to keep our graduate programs strong, and try to resist cutting programs that are part of the educational mission of the university. Caution should be used with proposed fee increases as they impact affordability and access.
October 7, 2010

TO: MARY GAVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: Y. PETER CHUNG, CHAIR
PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: Request to review Council & UCLA Statements on UC Future

Planning and Budget members discussed the downsizing documents and unanimously agreed that the maintenance of the quality of the University of California research must be the University’s first priority. P&B members believe it is important that any solution developed should consider the needs of the entire UC system to ensure that it will not affect any of the 10 campuses negatively and thus erode the strength of the University of California. P&B members noted that both documents made sense for those campuses that were considered more mature and not growing. This, however, was not the case for Riverside, Santa Cruz or Merced. Riverside attracts the inland empire’s diverse students and downsizing might impact its ability to meet the ever growing needs of the community.

The following were issues they agreed with:

- New programs should be approved only if they are academically and fiscally sound.
- The University should take all possible steps to increase revenue even if this means higher tuition. However, for those campuses that have a high number of low-income students, financial aid must be available so that diversity can be maintained.
- P&B members agreed that there is definitely a need to look at different ways of teaching students which might include online education. However, P&B members had some reservations about this because it was arising in the context of fiscal rather than educational problem solving. Use of the internet for shrinking distances and distributing information has an exciting future,
but there is too much “cheap” online education out there already. It is important that quality and effectiveness of the online education be reviewed.

- With regards to the new funding model being discussed, P&B members believe that there should be a significant tax paid on revenues (e.g., NRT, professional school fees, etc) by individual campuses to UCOP for reallocation.

P&B members were concerned that the discussions in both the Council and UCLA statements do not lend themselves to the idea of one university – instead, it made a case for 10 UC campuses and not 1.
October 20, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: ACADEMIC COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

During its October 14 meeting, the CEP discussed the documents addressing the possible downsizing of the University. The response of the Committee was mixed. On the one hand, it was recognized that the current situation requires serious readjustment of priorities, and effecting reductions and cuts in various areas and activities of the institution. The CEP also applauds the adoption of maintaining quality as the main guiding principle in these trying times. On the other hand, the CEP opines that the document fails to provide a sensible plan of action that insures the University will not only weather the current storm, but also be in a position to benefit from any future improvement in the economic climate of the State and the country.

Some of the suggestions made in the documents read as a knee-jerk response to the dire UC budget, which, if implemented, would cripple the University. Specifically, the downsizing of the institution can easily result in the loss of prestige, and even critical mass in small departments or programs. This, as noted in these same documents would be irreversible. The CEP recognizes that the faculty body might need to contract, but allowing this to happen without a strategic plan for the institution would be disastrous. These issues should be investigated not only in light of the current crisis, but also as to their effects after the crisis is weathered.

There are also two glaring omissions from the documents. First, there is no mention of the importance of having well remunerated staff, without which most of the goals for the institutions cannot be achieved. Secondly, there is but indirect discussion of the effects of downsizing on the student population. It can certainly be inferred from the guiding principles that the student body will also contract, but the fact that the UC might need to abandon the 12.5% or 13% rule should be explicitly discussed.

The document also lacks a discussion of the benefits provided by the University, and a plan to insure the taxpayers are aware of them. Public outreach has often centered on the economic benefits that the UC provides to the State, emphasizing the technological advances that have resulted from research at the institution. But this provides an incomplete and inexact picture of
the University, completely missing the social advantages derived from the presence of the UC in California.

Finally, while the CEP agrees that the salary scales at the UC are not currently competitive with those at other comparable institutions, the manner in which this is presented is insensitive. Even if the target audience of these documents is the UC faculty, we should not come across as petty or self serving.
Here is the response from CHASS Executive Committee.

CHASS Executive Committee voted to endorse the UCLA statement in principle, but for the most part found it to be boiler-plate pro-UC with little practical value. We oppose any attempt to preclude the initiation of new programs on campus, especially as related to the medical school at UCR, given the serious need for enhanced health care in the Inland Empire. The relevance and importance of new programs should be left largely to the discretion of each campus. Administrations/Faculties are in the best position to know if resources are available or can be found to begin new programs. This last part of our thinking (concerning new programs) is in direct response to number 9e in the UC Academic Senate Statement of Academic Senate values and recommendations, 2010.

David Herzberger, Chair
Executive Committee, CHASS
Committee on Academic Personnel

October 21, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Rise Axelrod
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Request for Systemwide Review of Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University

CAP strongly endorses recommendations one and two of the “Proposed Commission Recommendation from the Academic Council.” It is certainly indisputable that UC’s status as a world-class research university depends on the high quality research faculty at each of the ten campuses as well as on the excellence and diversity of UC’s undergraduate and graduate student population.

CAP, however, is concerned about recommendation numbers three a and b as follows:

- 3a: Steps to increase revenue. CAP opposes increasing student fees without taking into account the differential effects on those at different economic levels. The greatest negative effects, which are sometimes prohibitive, are on students from families at the lowest socio-economic levels, many of which also represent first-generation college students, the very population that UC should be serving as an institution based on “a model of education as a public good,” to borrow Robert B. Reich’s formulation.

- 3b: Downsizing the University. CAP is concerned that reducing faculty at a time when UC enrollment is rising dramatically would seriously undermine the quality of the institution. Resisting the impulse to downsize is particularly important at those campuses that have room to grow and that perform a special role in serving the public good. UCR is a case in point as the only federally-designated Hispanic Serving Institution in the UC system.

CAP agrees with the statements in the “Rationale” for the recommendations, and wants to emphasize the penultimate point: “If the quality of the faculty is lost, the prestige of the University, the quality of the University, and its continued research productivity will not be recoverable for decades, if ever.”

Finally, CAP endorses the recommendations “Next Steps for Implementation” — namely that recommendations should focus on the impact on retention and recruitment of the University’s research faculty, overall competitive faculty remuneration should be a first priority, and budgetary decisions should be jointly made by administration and the Academic Senate.
TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: MANUELA MARTINS-GREEN, CHAIR  
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

The CODEO discussed the contents of the two documents and agreed that the UCLA document expresses the issues in stronger, firmer and clearer ways than the document approved by Council. We were particularly concerned that issues that involve diversity are not voiced in the Council document. On the contrary, the UCLA document specifically mentions that (1) “To attract and retain extraordinary and diverse faculty, total remuneration (salary, post-employment benefits, access to affordable housing, family friendly policies) must be a top priority” and that (2) “to ensure student access and student diversity, we should aim to sustain current enrollments. If the state cannot support high quality education of those students, however, consideration must be given to reducing enrollments”. We strongly support this approach.

The CODEO also strongly supports the view that “The size of the University must be commensurate with its resources. In the short term, this means that the faculty and staff must shrink and academic programs must be reshaped. Even so, sustaining academic excellence and creating opportunities for innovation must remain top priorities”. We also agree that “Each campus should develop a realistic plan for reducing the size of its faculty and staff by attrition and hiring at a slower pace, while sustaining efforts to increase diversity”. This is no doubt important to ensure that current levels of diversity among faculty and students are maintained or augmented.
October 22, 2010

TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Riverside Division

FROM: Daniel Straus, Chair
Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee

RE: REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

The Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee considered the two documents and has the following comments.

1. The downsizing proposals would be most harmful to campuses that are still developing, including UCR, and least harmful to fully developed campuses. Downsizing will also disproportionately stress small campuses compared with large campuses. Small campuses have a smaller budget with a greater fraction of state funds, a smaller infrastructure, and are typically at or below critical mass in key areas. Across-the-board downsizing would be like putting everyone, overweight, normal weight and underweight, on the same severely reduced diet.

2. Proposed Council Recommendation 3c, “…the University should forego new building and capital projects that are not absolutely essential for safety”. This again would severely disadvantage developing campuses and have no significant effect on developed campuses.

3. UCR prides itself for its diverse student population, and major goal of our new strategic plan is to serve as “a national exemplar for diversity, inclusiveness and community” (Strategic Goal #3). UCR is located in a region that went successively through a period of exceptionally rapid growth followed by a severe recession with one of the highest unemployment rates in the state. In any downsizing exercise, it will be of vital importance to ensure that disadvantaged students are not excluded from the new “downsized” university.

4. UCLA Statement, item 9e, “Suspend commitments to creating new schools and institutes…” Our new strategic plan has as one of its cornerstones Strategy #2.A.1, “Growing Graduate and Professional Enrollment”. A suspension of commitments to creating new schools would kill the UCR School of Medicine, which is currently still on track to open in 2012. This school has a start-up appropriation from the state of $10 million that survived through a year of draconian budget cuts, and the substantial likelihood of soon obtaining an additional $20 million from non-
state sources. The proposed school will be community-based, will not own and operate a hospital, and should be a model for cost-effective education of physicians. In contrast, UCLA recently opened the Ronald Reagan Medical Center at the Westwood campus and a new hospital in Santa Monica at a reported cost $1.3 billion, with numerous cost overruns including a single overrun of $308 million in 2006.