April 25, 2011

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)
    Richard L. Smith (SoBA), SoBA 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, April 25, 2011

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, April 25, 2011 at 1:10 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in 220 University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>I. Approval of the <em>April 25, 2011</em> Agenda and April 11, 2011 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>II. <strong>TOM PERRING AND LEN TAYLOR</strong> – Enrollment cap and summer sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 1:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>III. <strong>EVC AND PROVOST DALLAS RABENSTEIN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 2:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Action/Discussion** | IV. **ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**  
*Issues under review – no new items* | 2 (pp. 7-45) |
| 2:15 – 2:25        |            |  |
| **Action/Discussion** | V. **UCR HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN**  
Review and endorse | 2 (pp. 46-60) |
| 2:25 – 2:45        |            |  |
| **Discussion**     | VI. **PROPOSAL TO DIESTABLISH/CONSOLIDATE DEPARTMENTS WITHIN THE UCR SCHOOL OF BUSINESS - SoBA**  
Review for onward submission to Division for approval | 2 (pp. 46-60) |
| 2:45 – 3:00        |            |  |
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
APRIL 11, 2011

PRESENT:
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
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
J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare
Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)
Richard L. Smith (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy (CEP)

ABSENT:
Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
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), CODEO
Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative

GUESTS:
Prof. Chris Chase-Dunn

AGENDA:
The agenda for April 11, 2011 as well as the minutes of the March 14, 2011 were approved as written.

Prof. Chris Chase-Dunn:
Prof. Chase-Dunn indicated that he was at the meeting to first, talk about the Riverside Faculty Association and two, inform the Executive Council about the upcoming independent audit of the UCR budget commissioned by the UCR Faculty Association. He indicated that the Riverside Faculty Association (RFA) is a voluntary, dues-supported organization of UCR faculty and is affiliated with the American Association of University
Professors. It was formed in 1975 to safeguard the welfare of the faculty, to support principles of shared governance and to further the scholarly and professional values held by the faculty. He indicated that the Senate is restricted by its bylaws to matters of academic issues and shared governance and thus, an independent association has a better chance of representing faculty interest as a group.

With regards the audit of the UCR budget, Prof. Chase-Dunn indicated that the RFA has hired an outside consultant, Prof. Rudy Fichtenbaum, Professor of Economics, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio. He will be paid with money collected from dues and some of the issues he will be reporting on include finding out the main sources of income for the university and how these funds are allocated to departments. Prof. Chase-Dunn indicated that Prof. Fichtenbaum will not be addressing this year’s budget. The goal of the audit is to educate the faculty on the UC budget. He indicated that Prof. Fichtenbaum will write a report based on the audited financial statements of the university, and to this effect, any assistance that can be provided to him will be appreciated.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:
Chair Gauvain indicated that on Friday April 15, all units will be presenting the budgets for their units to the administration. A two-day planning and budget meeting has been scheduled for the week of April 25th where each organization will be asked to present their budget plan. Chair Gauvain indicated that cuts will not be across the board although the letter sent out to the units mentioned an 8.3% cut as a figure to work from in planning.

Vice Chair Ameae Walker attended the March 30th Academic Council meeting on behalf of Chair Gauvain. The following issues were discussed:

- President Yudof indicated that fees would go up 8% every year for several years. President Yudof commented that it would help him politically if he could demonstrate that faculty are volunteering to teach more classes.
- CCGA has produced a series of guidelines for the development of self-supporting programs. The major part of the review will be done on campus and CCGA will be expediting their review to assist in a quick turnaround. There was discussion of how to convert existing programs into self-supporting entities.

Campus Naming:
The EC members unanimously endorsed the proposal by Dean Stephen Cullenberg to name room 300 located on the third floor of the Arts Building as the MaryLu Clayton Rosenthal Dance Studio.

Undergraduate Review:
Prof. Jose Wudka, Chair of Committee on Educational Policy indicated that his committee was seeking the EC’s advice on how to handle departments that refuse to implement recommendations that come out of an undergraduate program external review. Prof. Ozer, the Secretary/Parliamentarian indicated that Senate bylaw 8.12.2 gives CEP the authority to initiate studies of curriculum and that CEP has the authority to do such studies without permission from anyone. After some discussion, it was noted that CEP has the authority to
enforce sanctions on the program. It was also made clear that CEP can initiate the process to discontinue programs.

**TA Availability:**
The EC discussed an issue that has emerged in two recent external reviews that noted problems associated with the small number of TAs available for a department. Prof. Wudka indicated that it would be appropriate to form a committee that would provide Deans with guidance on how to allocate TAs so that the allocations are not done on an ad hoc manner. The EC members agreed that a joint senate/administration should be formed to review the current policy and to consider what kinds of changes might be implemented. Chair Gauvain mentioned that she will talk to Prof. Wudka and come up with a way to formulate a committee to focus on this issue.

**Other Executive Council and Committee Business:**
Prof. Steve Clark, Chair of Undergraduate Admissions committee (UGA) informed the EC that UGA is still dealing with changing the admissions criteria for transfer students.

Prof. David Parker, Chair of CNAS Executive Committee, indicated that his committee is currently reviewing three items, namely the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline, the CEP Learning Outcomes on General Education, and the proposal to modify admissions criteria for transfer students to be implemented in fall 2013, which came from the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions. He did not think his committee would be able to respond to the learning outcomes before the agenda deadline.

Prof. Melanie Sperling, Chair of GSOE Executive indicated that they are searching for a Dean. They are also dealing with some minor catalog changes. Prof. Sperling indicated that they were also in midst of discussions to change their name to Education, Society and Culture.

Prof. Jay Farrell, Chair of BCOE Executive Committee, indicated that they were in the process of undergoing accreditation.

Prof. Morris Maduro, Chair of Graduate Council, indicated that the Hispanic Program will be undergoing an external review on April 10 and 11. Chair Maduro indicated that Graduate Council will be meeting on the 20th and one of the issues they will be discussing will pertain to the process used for the appointment of external reviewers. Currently the Council uses 3 external reviewers and Chair Maduro would like to initiate discussions of probably having 2 external reviews and 1 from UCR.

Prof Richard Smith, Chair of the SoBA Executive Committee indicated that the EVC/P has proposed the disestablishment of the SoBA departments to a single department.

Prof. Jose Wudka, Chair of Educational Policy indicated that his committee is dealing with the issue of measuring learning outcomes in general education courses as well as the policy on disestablshments which has gone out to Graduate Council for comments.
Prof. Tom Morton, Junior Representative to the Assembly initiated a discussion about the use of email and the fact that faculty emails can be disclosed in a freedom of information request. EC members felt that it was important that faculty know this and Chair Gauvain indicated that she will follow up on this issue with Chair Simmons, Academic Council and formulate some information to send out to the faculty.

Prof. Steve Clark, Chair of Undergraduate Admissions indicated that the Committee proposes to modify the criteria for admitting transfer students, specifically to: (1) use transfer college GPA as a factor for selective admission of transfer students in the same way that we now use the Academic Index Score (AIS) for freshman admissions, and (2) no longer admit lower-division transfer students. Discussions ensued on the wisdom of limiting lower-division transfer students, especially in circumstances when the student has a high GPA, but for whatever reasons, cannot continue at his/her university. The members agreed that the proposal be revised to include language that will not completely leave out those lower-division students with a high GPA.

Prof. Dan Hare, Chair of Faculty Welfare indicated that he had two issues to report on. The first was that discussions were ongoing to require part-time employees to pay half their health insurance premiums. Currently, the UC pays 100% premium for those employed at 50% time. The other issue is a proposal to establish a self-supporting 1st grade class at the Child Development Center.

Paulo Chagas, Chair, Academic Computing and Information Technology indicated his interest in reviewing the policy on technology fees for students.

Meeting adjourned at 3:02 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Sellyna Ehlers
Executive Director
Office of the Academic Senate
April 18, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Rise Axelrod  
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Request for Review of Health Sciences Compensation Plan

CAP reviewed the proposed compensation plan, and had no suggestions or comment to add.
April 4, 2011

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: D. HARE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE: HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN

The committee reviewed this complex issue on relatively short notice and benefited from the input of Prof. Ameae Walker, who was one of the negotiators of this plan. The committee found the implementation of UCR’s Health Sciences Compensation Plan was broadly consistent with the Systemwide plan and recommends approval with caution.

The Committee was concerned with the fact that the distribution of Senate and non-Senate members within the plan will change greatly in a relatively small amount of time as substantial numbers of non-Senate faculty are hired into the clinical non-Senate ranks. Consequently, what may seem to be appropriate implementation procedures now may be found to be inappropriate in the future. Whereas CFW cautiously recommends approval of the proposed plan, we also recommend that future committees of the Academic Senate be vigilant to the possibility that inequities may emerge as the consequences of this proposed implementation become better known. Future committees of the Academic Senate should be prepared to facilitate appropriate changes in the proposed plan to mitigate such inequities as they arise.
March 22, 2011

TO: RISE AXELROD, CHAIR
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

       DAN HARE, CHAIR
       FACULTY WELFARE

FM: MARY GAVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES
COMPENSATION PLAN (HSCP)

Please have your committees review the attached document regarding the above referenced plan and send your comments to me no later than April 8, 2011. If you would like assistance with the document, Vice Chair Ameae Walker is available to attend your meeting to discuss any issue that you might have.

Thanks.

Encls.
Date: March 3, 2011

To: David Bocian, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel

Cc: Richard Olds, Dean, School of Medicine
     Dallas Rabenstein, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost
     Gretchen Bolar, Vice Chancellor, Finance & Business Operations

Re: UCR Health Sciences Compensation Plan

Attached is a transmittal letter from Dean Olds to me regarding the UCR Health Sciences Compensation Plan, as well as the plan itself.

I delegate to you the authority to transmit the HSCP to the Academic Senate, as described in the attached documents and following review by the Riverside Division, to forward it to Provost Pitts at UCOP.

If you have any questions, please contact Dean Olds with a copy to me.

Many Thanks,

Timothy P. White
Chancellor
I. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview and Philosophy

Health Sciences education occupies a special place in American higher education with unique functions and responsibilities. In medical education, the orientation to clinical practice, essential to the teaching function, requires an emphasis on sophisticated patient care, in addition to an emphasis on research and the advancement of knowledge. In dentistry, nursing, pharmacy, and other health science education as well, clinical teaching is integrated with basic and applied research. In joining the University of California system as its sixth and newest School of Medicine, the University of California at Riverside is committed to this same excellence in instruction, research, and public service in the health sciences just as it is committed to the same goals in other academic disciplines. Health science faculty members are expected to act as professional role models for all. As the only public university in California authorized to grant professional doctoral degrees in the health sciences, the University has a responsibility to the State, the public, and its students to maintain the breadth and depth of its curricula, the creativity of its research efforts, and the quality of its health care services.

To ensure the level of excellence essential in the University of California and at our UCR School of Medicine, special effort must be exerted to recruit and retain the best and most dedicated faculty.

The University of California Health Sciences Compensation Plans were established over the years to provide for quality across academic programs in the health sciences disciplines. These health sciences compensation plans must offer a competitive salary structure indispensable to the health sciences schools’ recruitment and retention efforts.
Health sciences disciplines require varying compensation levels in order to remain competitive with comparable schools elsewhere in the United States. However, because University health sciences schools share some common needs and operating requirements, the University has developed a uniform Health Sciences Compensation Plan to govern compensation arrangements and account for compensation plan income to the University’s Schools of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy, and other health sciences units as deemed appropriate by the President or the President’s designee.

Health sciences compensation plans must be clear and justify calculation of compensation and contain a mechanism for impartial review to protect the rights of individual faculty.

The Health Sciences Compensation Plan is approved, amended and repealed, by and under the authority of The Regents of the University of California. Through the Plan, compensation is set as a part of the employment relationship, and as a consequence, the level of compensation and the terms and conditions of the Plan may be amended or repealed at any time by The Regents, following consultation with the Health Sciences Chancellors, Deans and appropriate Academic Senate Committee(s).

The regulations included in The Regents’ Plan are intended to provide a policy framework within which implementing procedures have been developed by the UCR School of Medicine. The UCR procedures contained herein are developed to be consistent with the Regents’ Plan. Affected Plan participants have been afforded the opportunity to review and comment on these Implementation Procedures, including consultation with the School of Medicine Compensation and Outside Activities Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) and relevant committees of the Faculty Senate. All revisions to these Implementation Procedures will be approved by the Dean, the Chancellor and the President.

Included within the Implementation Plan in Section II below are the Guidelines on Occasional Outside Professional Activities by Health Sciences Compensation Plan Participants which provides guidance on the framework within which the UCR School of Medicine has developed its implementing procedures.

In addition to these Procedures, participants are also subject to the requirements of other...
University policies, including 1) the University's Conflict of Interest Code, adopted pursuant to the requirements of the Political Reform Act of 1974, which requires designated University employees to disqualify themselves from participating in University decisions in which they have a personal financial interest; and; 2) the Policy on Requirements to Submit Proposals and to Receive Awards for Grants and Contracts Through the University.

A faculty member's compensated outside activities may create an obligation for the faculty member to disclose a financial interest before making or participating in certain University decisions. Faculty can obtain information on the disclosure and disqualification requirements of the Political Reform Act of 1974, including the Academic Decision Regulation, from the UCR Campus Counsel's Office.

The implementation, administration and continued operation of this UCR School of Medicine Implementation Plan shall be, and is contingent on the understanding and assurance that it will not require the expenditure of more State-appropriated funds in the University budget than operation without the Plan would require.

B. Purpose and Goals of the Plan

The purpose of the UCR School of Medicine Implementation Procedures for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (Plan) is to provide a common administrative framework within which a participating health sciences school can compensate its faculty according to the competitive requirements of each discipline. Specific goals of this Plan are:

1. To provide sufficient non-State resources to recruit and retain outstanding health sciences faculty

2. To encourage a balance among teaching, research, and service activities (including clinical practice) of the quality required in the University of California

3. To provide teaching, patient care and research incentives that encourage and recognize academic merit as well as generation of income

4. To offer consistent benefits and privileges to UCR Plan participants, consistent with
other health sciences faculty and schools at all University of California campuses

5. To benefit the UCR School of Medicine by providing academic and research support funds in addition to State-appropriated funds.

In adopting these Implementation Procedures, the faculty and administration of the School of Medicine at UCR affirm the philosophy and goals as outlined above and which are also included in the Regents' Plan.

Consistent with The Regents' Plan, this UCR School of Medicine Implementation Plan has been developed to foster academic balance among the joint responsibilities of teaching, research, and service activities (including clinical practice). This document constitutes the Implementation Plan and Procedures for the UCR School of Medicine.

II. REVIEW AND APPROVAL RESPONSIBILITY

A. Overview

These Implementation Procedures are developed to be consistent with the policy framework of The Regents' Plan, and these Implementation Procedures apply to the UCR School of Medicine in its entirety. Affected Plan participants, and the UCR School of Medicine Compensation and Outside Activities Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) to the Dean, which includes members of the senate and non-senate faculty who are also eligible members of the Plan, shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed revisions to the Implementation Procedures. The Dean will also utilize the Advisory Committee to consult and advise him/her on matters related to School of Medicine Compensation Plan issues. All such revisions shall be approved by the Dean, the Chancellor, and the President. Local implementation shall be managed by the Dean of the School of Medicine.

B. Roles of The Regents and the President
After consultation with the Health Sciences Chancellors, Deans and the appropriate Academic Senate committee(s), The Regents may amend or repeal any portion of or the entire Plan.

The President or the President’s designee shall have the authority to:

- approve the inclusion or exclusion of a health sciences school, discipline or specialty in the Plan.

- approve campus procedures and revisions of approved campus procedures within the limitations of this Plan.

- issue administrative regulations and procedures further refining this Plan.

C. Role of the Academic Senate

The President shall consult with the appropriate Academic Senate committee(s) concerning proposed revisions of The Regents’ Plan before submitting such revisions to The Regents for approval.

The appropriate campus faculty Senate and other committee(s) shall be provided the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed exceptions to campus procedures which the Chancellor intends to submit to the President for approval.

D. Role of the Chancellor

The Chancellor shall have operational authority over the development and, subsequent to approval by the President, implementation and monitoring of the campus procedures for administration of this Plan. The Chancellor shall be responsible for assuring that affected Plan participants and the appropriate Academic Senate committees shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed campus implementing procedures. The Chancellor also shall approve individual exceptions to the provisions of this Plan to meet special teaching, research or clinical service requirements.

E. Advisory Committee
The Compensation and Outside Activities Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee), which includes Senate and non-Senate faculty members representative of the disciplines participating in the Plan, will serve as the Advisory Committee to the Dean/VCHS of the UCR School of Medicine as well as to the Chancellor. The Advisory Committee is established and charged to assist the Chancellor/Dean in maintaining transparency and fairness in plan implementation, and in resolving issues that arise from implementation of the Plan.

The Committee will provide input and will assist the Dean/VCHS on compensation issues, as well as assuring compliance with and resolving issues concerning outside professional activities, conflict of interest, and conflict of commitment and/or disputes arising through the Plan. The Advisory Committee will also review the submissions of individual academic programmatic unit (APU) by-laws.

No more than 50% of the Advisory committee’s membership shall be appointed by the Dean/VCHS. Eligible members of the Plan (both senate as well as non-senate), will nominate faculty to fill four positions on the School’s Advisory Committee and will conduct elections to select those who will serve. Eligible Plan members will develop a process to facilitate an appropriate nomination process. Eligible voters shall include all Plan members of the School of Medicine. No fewer than one of these elected faculty members shall have a Ph.D. degree and derive from the basic science faculty.

The Dean/VCHS will appoint three additional members to serve on the Advisory Committee. Finally, the Dean/VCHS will appoint an additional member to serve as Chair of the Advisory Committee. Both the elected or appointed committee members are limited to four consecutive one year terms.

The Committee’s functions include:

1. Advising the Dean/VCHS on development of these Implementation Procedures, including establishment of Good Standing criteria and approval thresholds, Academic Programmatic Unit (APU) assignments, and APU Scales;
2. APU implementing procedures including methods for obtaining faculty input and for determining consistency with school implementation procedures.

3. Review of faculty grievances with regard to the implementation and administration of the Plan that are not resolved at the APU or School levels.

4. Review of formal appeals submitted by faculty to the Advisory Committee as a result of a determination of loss of Good Standing.

The Advisory Committee will provide an annual summary report on its activities to the Dean and Plan participants.

III. MEMBERSHIP IN THE COMPENSATION PLAN

A. Membership Requirements

Individuals in health sciences schools, disciplines or specialties that have been approved for participation in this Plan shall be members of this Plan if they hold a University appointment at greater than 50 percent of full time, funded by one or more of the participating health sciences units, in any of the following title series:

1. Professor

2. Professor In Residence

3. Professor of Clinical _________ (e.g., Medicine)

4. Adjunct Professor

5. Acting Professor

6. Clinical Professor

7. Any other title series approved for membership in this Plan by the President.
Deans and other faculty administrators in Plan Schools shall be members of the Plan if they hold an underlying Health Sciences Compensation Plan faculty title.

Faculty recalled as members of the Plan are subject to all Plan rules and local implementation procedures and guidelines.

Membership in the Plan is a term and condition of employment. Upon approval of this UCR School of Medicine Implementation Plan, all existing and new Plan members shall receive a copy of the Regents' Plan document, a copy of the UCR Implementation Plan, as well as any other relevant departmental guidelines. All new faculty members will be presented with a statement to be signed and filed in their personnel file as outlined below:

"I certify that I have received a copy of the University of California Health Sciences Compensation plan and the UCR School of Medicine Implementation Plan. I understand and agree to comply with all of the terms and conditions contained therein. I understand that I may not retain any income from my professional services except as stipulated in these documents. I understand further that compliance with provisions contained in the UCR Implementation Plan is a condition of employment for Plan members.

Membership in the Plan shall continue while the Plan continues to be in effect. Separation from an eligible appointment will terminate membership in the Plan.

Faculty in any of the categories 1 through 7 above with an appointment in more than one department or School may be considered for inclusion in the Plan if their appointment is more than 50% in a department participating in the Plan. If included in the Plan, they will be subject to continued membership and all regulations of the Plan. Determination of and responsibility for the faculty member’s salary must be jointly agreed to and memorialized by the Heads of the affected APU, and approved annually by the Dean. The annual review must include funding plans for the faculty member for at least three years. The APU participating in the Plan is responsible for administering compensation, including health and welfare benefits.

B. Exceptions to Membership Requirements
As specified at Section II. D., the Chancellor may approve exceptions to membership requirements in individual circumstances to meet special teaching, research, or clinical service requirements.

The Chancellor shall review and has authority to approve provisions in campus procedures, and requests by Deans in specific cases, for inclusion in the Plan of individuals in a health sciences school whose appointments are in the series listed in Section III.A, regardless of percentage of time.

IV. COMPENSATION

No single member professional corporations, or any other form of professional corporation, partnership, or other entity(s) for the provision of professional health care shall be permitted for faculty under the Plan without the express written approval of the President.

Plan participants in each Academic Programmatic Unit (APU) may elect a representative group of colleagues ("APU Representatives") to review questions about compensation or conditions of employment about which a Plan member is concerned.

Each APU shall develop compensation plan guidelines, and must ensure that affected Plan participants are afforded the opportunity to review and comment on these proposed guidelines, and when applicable, any significant modifications, including the setting of approval thresholds and APU assessment rates. These guidelines will detail:

A. Total Compensation

Faculty members participating in this Plan shall:

1) receive base salary as described in Section B, below.
2) be eligible for optional additional compensation as described in Section D, below.

3) be permitted to retain the other miscellaneous income as described in Section G, below.

No State funds shall be used for the portion of base salary that exceeds the Fiscal Year Salary Scale (HSCP Scale 0) for the Plan member's rank and step, or for optional additional compensation as described at Section D, below. Compensation above HSCP Scale 0 shall be funded using Compensation Plan funds and other non-State funds in compliance with any related fund source restrictions.

B. Base Salary (X and X')

Base salary for an individual is the approved rate on one of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan Salary Scales, associated with that faculty member's academic rank, step, and APU. Base salary shall equal at least the approved Scale 1 rate on the Fiscal Year Salary Scale for the faculty member's rank and step. The base salary is covered under the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) up to the amount permissible under law and in accordance with UCRP provisions and regulations. However, compensation above HSCP Scale 0, shall be funded from compensation plan funds, and/or other non-state funds, in compliance with any associated fund restrictions.

In consultation with the Advisory Committee and APU representatives, each APU will be annually assigned by its Head to a Health Sciences Compensation Plan Salary scale (i.e. any of the scales between Scale 1 and 9) and approved by the Dean/VCHS in accordance with guidelines issued by the President. The salary differential, between the value of Scale 0 (X) and the approved rate with the faculty member's rank and step on the HSCP Salary Scale 1 through 9 assigned to the faculty member's APU, is designated X-prime (X').

C. Academic Programmatic Unit (APU) Guidelines

At the outset, and until individual departmental guidelines are established, the UC Riverside School of Medicine will have APUs comprised of a subset of members of the entire School of Medicine, and are not necessarily department-based.
An APU is composed of faculty with similar clinical and/or teaching and research responsibilities. Each participating member of the UC Riverside Health Sciences Compensation Plan will be assigned by the Dean/VCHS, in consultation with the Advisory Committee to an appropriate APU, based on clinical and/or teaching and research responsibilities. Each APU shall be assigned to an HSCP salary Scale (1–9).

In keeping with the responsibility of the University to ensure consistency of compensation by creation of APUs or assignment of faculty to APUs, the following is noted:

a. The Dean/VCHS of the UCR School of Medicine is authorized to approve the faculty composition of each APU and assignment of a salary scale to that unit;

b. Once assigned, an APU must remain at its assigned HSCP salary scale for at least one year before being assigned to a higher or lower scale;

c. An APU is permitted to move to a higher or lower HSCP salary scale by a maximum of one scale per year;

d. No individual faculty member may be moved from one APU to another without a significant change in duties or a change in department

e. Any new APUs recommended to the Dean will include assessment and analysis of financial feasibility

The Base Salary ($X + X'$) is covered under the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) up to the amount permissible under law and in accordance with UCRP provisions and regulations.

No State funds shall be used for compensation above the portion of Base Salary equivalent to the Fiscal Year salary scale 0 ($X$).

Based on current numbers of faculty with clinical responsibilities of the UCR School of Medicine, a single APU may be comprised of fewer than 10 members. Given this, the Dean/VCHS will provide periodic, but no less than annually to the Chancellor of UCR:
a. Criteria for composition of any APU with fewer than 10 members, and the names, series, rank, and step of each member of the APU;

b. Any faculty member who has moved from one APU to another, and the reason for the movement.

D. Optional Additional Compensation

Individual levels of compensation will be established so as to maintain academic balance and to permit the recruitment and retention of the individuals necessary for the School to fulfill its missions at a high level of excellence. Faculty members participating in this Plan shall receive Base Salary and shall be eligible for additional compensation, as described below:

1) Negotiated Additional Compensation ("Y") will be negotiated with the Dean (or likely later in the evolution and maturation of the UCR School of Medicine, with an APU head or departmental chair on an annual basis. This component is beyond Base Salary and is not covered compensation for the UCRP, but may be eligible for optional disability and life insurance programs. Mid-year renegotiation of the "Y" is permitted only under unusual circumstances and only with the written approval by the Dean.

The Y component of the salary will be based on such activities as research, (the number and quality of publications, the acquisition of peer reviewed research grants, and special research awards), teaching (the extent of medical student and resident teaching, ratings, organizational and divisional/departmental responsibilities, teaching awards, etc.), clinical publications, administrative responsibilities (department, School of Medicine, hospital, and national and international service work), as well as clinical productivity and revenue generated by the individual's practice. All income due the plan, including clinical income and post-threshold professional income (see section G of these Guidelines below) will be deposited into the UCR School of Medicine compensation plan revenue fund. This applies to clinical work done at outside facilities, satellite clinics, or offices.
a. Policy for new faculty members: all new faculty members will have a guaranteed salary \(X + X' + Y\), as established by negotiations with the Dean for one year. All clinical income for services provided by the faculty member will be retained by the School Practice Plan revenue account. The Dean will provide each new faculty member a sum of $5,000 per year in an academic “escrow account” within the Dean’s Office, to be used for travel, books, subscriptions, meeting expenses or other academic expenses. The negotiated \(X + X' + Y\), and $5000 escrow account will be guaranteed for the first year.

2. Incentive/Bonus Compensation (“Z”) beyond Base and Negotiated Additional Compensation may be earned. These components are not covered compensation for UCRP.

All new faculty members (regardless of their rank) will not be able to participate in the incentive portion of the bonus pool for their first year. They will, however, be allowed to receive bonus compensation from the Dean’s discretionary funds, or from additional funds in the APU outside the School practice account, depending upon their academic and clinical contributions.

Excess monies after the UCR School of Medicine’s expenses may be used as a basis for a bonus Z factor. A Z factor bonus will only occur after individual, shared clinical and academic expenses, as well as retirement benefits, have been subtracted from the Z pool. The Dean’s tax and billing charges will also be subtracted from the net proceeds. Calculations for estimated Dean’s tax for the subsequent fiscal year will be discussed with the faculty during each budget resource call cycle.

Faculty must choose at the beginning of the fiscal year between two options for distribution of net bonus pool generated by proceeds from “for-profit” consulting, post-21 day consulting, and any other activities generating income due the Plan. The two options are: 1) distribution of Z payment as salary, through the University payroll system, or 2) an “enrichment fund”, which will be held in escrow in the School of Medicine on behalf of the faculty member. Unless approved by the Dean,
the decision of option will remain in effect for at least one fiscal year, and may not be split between the options.

Methodology for calculating incentive/bonus pool for the UCR School of Medicine:

a) The individual's incentive/bonus compensation (Z) will be determined in two ways. In the first component, after expenses are accounted and netted, following 20% off the top to build a School of Medicine financial reserve, then 50% of the remaining 80% of the overall bonus pool money will be distributed at the Dean's discretion in consultation with the APU Heads and Advisory Committee, based on a quantified annual report of faculty non-clinical activity (such as teaching, research, committee work, etc). The remaining 50% (half of the 80%) of the bonus pool will be awarded proportionately according to each individual's proportional contribution to the bonus pool, assuming a status of good standing.

b) A fully distributed costing of shared expenses will include (but is not limited to) rent (if applicable), support staff, medical student/residency program expenses not covered by other sources, fixed research expenses not covered by grants, clinical patient care expenses, etc. These shared expenses apply to the Z pool and equally to contributing faculty.

c) Each individual (other than for new first year faculty) will be responsible for their own travel expenses along with books, journals, and research costs not covered by grants. In the event that a member does not make his or her negotiated salary in the fiscal year (other than for new faculty whose negotiated salary is guaranteed for the first year), a salary reduction for the ensuing year may occur at the Dean/VCHS's discretion. The reduced salary will not drop below the base salary for that APU (X + X').

d) In April of each fiscal year, each faculty member will be required to complete and submit a brief, one-page Annual Faculty Report in addition to the annual Outside Professional Activities disclosure to be reviewed by the APU Head,
if applicable, and put forward for submittal to the Dean/VCHS. All faculty members hired within the prior three fiscal years, will be requested to meet with the Dean on an annual basis to review their academic and clinical activities. The results of this review process will be used as a means of setting equitable salaries and distributing the proceeds from the Dean’s incentive discretionary income (portion of Z).

e) Shared expenses will also include, if applicable, payments specifically for malpractice coverage, California state medical license renewal, DEA controlled substance license, and hospital staff dues.

f) Faculty with clinical responsibilities will be given a monthly statement from the billing service of the UCR Medical Group outlining their total billings to date, collections, and accounts receivable.

Negotiated Additional and Incentive/Bonus Compensation paid to faculty through the University payroll system, will be subject to Federal and State withholding, and will be reported on a W-2 form as wages.

Individual salaries shall be negotiated annually by the individual and the Dean/VCHS (or APU Head as appropriate), documented in writing. The Dean may consult with the Advisory Committee regarding faculty compensation, however the role of the Advisory Committee is consultative and advisory only, and final authority to negotiate and set individual, annually negotiated faculty compensation rests with the Dean/VCHS.

*Treatment of Accounts Receivables upon Separation:* For patient care activities, the revenue generated will be retained by the UCR School of Medicine Dean’s Office in the event of a faculty member’s departure, but are accounted for and treated in accordance with the compensation arrangement of the clinical faculty member. Receivables originated by those without incentive compensation will be the property of the University. Any payments will occur via the UC payroll system and will be net of the faculty member’s salary, fringe benefits and other expenses.
Individuals leaving with less than three years of salaried University service will not be entitled to their accounts receivable.

E. Good Standing Criteria

Faculty members of the UCR School of Medicine must comply with the “Good Standing Criteria” in order to engage in outside activity and successfully progress academically.

Good Standing Criteria for Health Sciences faculty will include expectations related to clinical practice for those faculty engaged in patient care. All members of a clinical practice plan shall be deemed in “good standing” until they encounter some circumstance in which their capacity to earn income is impaired. A faculty member may fail to be in “good standing” for conduct which significantly impairs the Health Sciences School’s central functions of clinical care, scholarship, teaching, and University and public service. Reasons for loss of “good standing” for faculty with clinical responsibilities might include, for example, instances of misconduct, loss of clinical privileges, or loss of licensure and/or credentialing, non-compliance with required training, etc. Reasons for loss of “good standing” for faculty without clinical responsibilities might include misconduct, non-compliance with required training, lack of quality in assigned teaching, refusal to teach, lack of research productivity that has not been counterbalanced by increased responsibilities elsewhere such as in teaching or administrative load, lack of quality in assigned administrative duties etc.

Any faculty member considered not in good standing will be notified by the Dean in writing. Notification will include reasons for the determination and any recommended remedy, as well as a time line to move back into good standing. Faculty members who believe that Good Standing Criteria have been applied unfairly may appeal to the Advisory Committee through its Chair.

In order to remain in “Good Standing”, the following criteria must be met:

a. Fulfillment of clinical, teaching, research and administrative obligations, as assigned.
b. Meet the Faculty Code of Conduct and other UC rules and regulations, including timely completion of all required compliance classes, meetings and procedures. Provision of accurate and timely documentation related to outside activities.

c. Compliance with State and Federal regulations as related to professional activities.

d. Collegial interactions with others.

e. Attendance at a minimum of 50% of department/University/affiliated health systems meetings involving compliance issues.

f. Compliance with guidelines on outside professional activities.

g. Meeting other requirements as determined by the department and described in these UCR School of Medicine Implementation guidelines.

h. Where appropriate, maintain active medical staff memberships, boards and current licenses.

i. Meet the practice standards and follow all policies of the University, School of Medicine and Department, including billing, medical records and incentive programs.

Prior to the implementation of these “Good Standing” criteria, affected Plan participants will have been notified and provided the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed criteria. When and if applicable, Plan participants will have the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed changes, additions, or revisions.

A determination that a faculty member is not in Good Standing may affect the amount of negotiated additional compensation (Y; see Section IV.D.1) and/or Incentive/Bonus compensation (Z; see Section IV.D.2) that the faculty member may earn, and may include space assignment forfeiture. If a faculty member is unable to practice at a specific site due to
revocation of clinical privileges, for example, that faculty member must be willing to undertake new duties as assigned, or otherwise forfeit the compensation from that assignment. Faculty who are not in Good Standing must obtain advance approval from the Dean to engage in any unassigned professional activities, and the income from all such approved activities shall accrue to the Plan, and not to the Plan participant. Exceptions may be approved in writing in accordance with campus procedures.

F. Annual Notification

On an annual basis, each faculty member of the Plan shall receive in writing from the Dean a Statement of Proposed Compensation for the forthcoming period July 1 – June 30.

This annual statement will include:

a. the amount of UCRP covered compensation ($X + X'$);

b. APU and HSCP Salary Scale assignment (HSCP Scale 1 – 9);

c. The amount of negotiated additional compensation ($Y$);

d. The payment schedule for Incentive/Bonus compensation ($Z$) payments and the taxation policy for $Z$ payments

G. Other Miscellaneous Income That May be Retained by Plan Members

There are two options, “University-wide Standard” and “Alternative”. Under both options, Plan participants may retain payments for occasional service (other than patient care) not to exceed 21 days of service per fiscal year, to:

a) governmental agencies (travel time excluded for this category only);

b) non-profit health or education related organizations;

c) continuing health education programs administered by the University, and/or

d) University Extension.
The following categories of income accruing from occasional service may be retained by the Plan member:

a) Income from occasional outside professional activity (other than patient care) in accordance with the Guidelines on Occasional Outside Professional Activities by Health Sciences Compensation Plan Participants issued by the President and campus implementing procedures.

b) Prizes, defined as gifts in recognition of personal achievements and not for services rendered.

c) Royalties, defined as shares of proceeds for contributions as authors or inventors, as allowed under the University's copyright and patent policies.

d) Honoraria, defined as payments by agencies outside the University for occasional lectures and similar public appearances beyond normal academic responsibilities to the University of California and which are not in return for other services, whether given directly or indirectly.

e) University honoraria, defined as payment for occasional lectures or similar services performed on a University of California campus as permitted by Academic Personnel Policy.

f) Administrative stipends, defined as payments by the University for responsibilities related to University administration beyond normal academic responsibilities. This component of income may be included as covering X' and included in calculating total covered compensation under UCRP.

g) Income from a profession or activity unrelated to the training and experience which is the individual's qualification for University appointment as determined by the Department Chairperson in consultation with the Dean.

The preceding bullets (b) through (g) are excluded from reporting requirements and do not count
in the outside activities threshold of these Implementation Procedures.

It is the policy of the UCR School of Medicine that all income derived from consulting with for-profit institutions, legal and professional witness fees, are due the Plan. Professional income, as used here, includes both cash and non-cash compensation (e.g., stock and stock options). Income due the Plan must be deposited into the appropriate revenue account of the School of Medicine.

Plan members of the UCR School of Medicine are not permitted to accept a salary or other regular income from any institution other than UC Riverside.

The Alternative Option listed below covers all current Plan participants of the UCR School of Medicine. Both options remain available when development and growth in numbers of eligible Plan participants warrant the development of individual APU/departmental guidelines for the UCR School of Medicine. Either option selected must be reviewed and approved by affected Plan participants of the APU, as well as the Dean/VCHS through consultation with the Advisory Committee before implementation.

1. **Alternative Option:**

The “Alternative Option” allows Plan participants in Good Standing at UCR in all or selected departments or units to retain additional types of income and/or income up to 21 days of compensated professional activities with an income retention cap of $20,000 or 20% of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan salary scale for an individual faculty member’s rank, step and APU ($X + X’), whichever is greater, without prior approval by the APU Head, department Chair or the Dean/VCHS to engage in the activities.

2. **University-wide Standard Option:** The University-wide Standard Option allows a
maximum time limit of 21 days, but has no income limit. The University-wide Standard Requirement will remain an option for the UCR School of Medicine.
3. **Additional Guidance on Outside Activities**

The UCR School of Medicine offers the following additional guidance on Outside Activities for faculty:

Faculty members have an obligation to disclose financial interests before making or participating in certain activities. The University policy related to Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of faculty members can be found at: http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-025-07-01.pdf  http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/9-01-00.pdf Additional reporting, disclosure and disqualification requirements can be found in the Political Reform Act of 1974, including the Academic Decision Regulation; and in the University’s Conflict of Interest Code, which requires designated University employees to disqualify themselves from participating in a University decision in which they have a personal financial interest. Faculty may obtain information about these requirements through the campus office of Legal Support Services.

4. **Monitoring and Enforcement**

“Twenty-one (21) days” is defined as 168 hours per fiscal year. When outside professional activities require travel time during regular UCR working hours, the time spent traveling shall be included in computing hours/days of outside service, except when the service is provided to governmental agencies.

Service performed during paid or unpaid leaves of absence (e.g. vacation, holidays, or weekends) counts toward the twenty-one day maximum.

5. **Time and Earnings Thresholds:**

Under the Alternative Option, there are two components to the threshold: **maximum time, and maximum earnings.**

**Time Threshold:** The total number of hours for all outside activities (service to governmental agencies, non-profits, legal witness, etc) for which income is retained must not exceed 21 days. The
Plan recognizes and supports a framework of diverse hours and schedules to accommodate teaching, research and creative work activity, University service and University-related public service, and a day for most faculty exceeds eight hours. However, total time, defined in these guidelines totals 168 hours over 21 days. Plan participants who wish to exceed the time threshold as established must receive approval for outside professional activities that exceed the UCR time threshold by the Dean/VCCHS. All income from activities beyond the time threshold are due the Plan (even if the earnings threshold has not been reached) and will be submitted for deposit into the appropriate medical school compensation plan revenue account. All such payments are due upon receipt.

**Earnings Threshold:** The maximum annual outside professional earnings approval threshold is $20,000, or 20% of the assigned Health Sciences Compensation scale (X + X'). All income from activities beyond the earnings threshold is due the Plan (even if the time threshold has not been reached.)

Plan participants have the responsibility for maintaining a running total of the time spent on all outside professional activities. With the election of the “Alternative Option” the UCR School of Medicine will have both a 21 days of service and an earnings threshold of $20,000 (or 20% cap) annually. With this option, earnings generated above the cap, even with Dean’s consent, within the 21 day threshold will be due the Compensation Plan.

The primary means of monitoring compliance will be review by the Dean from the information provided by the faculty member in the required annual reports on outside professional activities.

6. **Corrective Action and Disciplinary Measures**

The University reserves the right to take corrective action and disciplinary measures against any Plan member who fails to comply with the Regents' Plan and the UCR School of Medicine's Implementation Procedures. An Academic Senate member who is subject to corrective action has available to him/her a grievance process through the Privilege and Tenure Committee as described in Academic Senate Bylaw 335. Other faculty may grieve through the provisions of Academic Personnel Policy 140.

7. **Policy on Requirement to Submit Proposals through the University**
The **Policy on the Requirement to Submit Proposals and to Receive Awards for Grants and Contracts through the University** was issued by the University's President on December 15, 1994 and applies to all faculty members. Faculty who receive any part of their salary through the University, or whose activities use any University resources or facilities, must submit their proposals for extramural support through the UCR Research Office.

8. **Limitations on Use of University Resources**

The use of University staff, laboratories, facilities, or other University resources in connection with outside professional activities is subject to limitations. Faculty should take note and care not to unduly stress or over-tax University staff resources when outside activities income is retained by the faculty member. In these cases, faculty should take care to allot costs to the maximum extent possible to the faculty member directly, or a third party, and not the University. In addition, faculty should take special note that the University's liability coverage does not extend to certain faculty consulting and expert witness activities. For example, University malpractice/professional liability coverage does not extend to expert witness activities when the faculty member retains the related income.

Reasonable use of UCR School of Medicine equipment and university resources is acceptable and may include the following: use of office email, scanners, telephones or faxes for incoming or outgoing communications, but not long-distance charges (which should be reimbursed to the University by the individual incurring them); use of departmental offices for interviews or other similar activities, unless usage creates difficulties for other School of Medicine scheduling access; using administrative support personnel to accept phone calls, take messages, and schedule appointments at the request of individuals outside the university (but not asking staff to arrange meetings, prepare materials, arrange travel, etc. when these activities relate to outside professional activities).

9. **Disposition of Income Due the Plan**

If there is income due the Plan above the $20,000/20% or 21-day maximum time limits, it will be added to the calculation for the bonus (Z). Faculty are eligible for a bonus if all clinical and
academic expenses not covered by any other fund sources have been met, including Dean's tax and billing charges.

10. Non-cash Compensation

Professional income governed by the Plan includes not only cash compensation, but also non-cash compensation. Faculty who receive stock or stock options in lieu of compensation for outside professional activities must disclose them to the Dean's Office within 30 days of receipt, and the stock/stock options will be valued at that time. If the purchase price is less than the stock/stock option's valuation on the day of receipt, the difference between the purchase price and the value of the stock/stock options is due the Plan. **Faculty must count this difference in their earnings threshold.** Faculty who neglect to disclose the stock/stock options at the time of receipt will owe the Plan the difference between the initial purchase price and the market value at the time it is disclosed.

V. BENEFITS

Benefits provided as outlined below are consistent with benefit levels approved by the Regents. The UCR School of Medicine may not offer faculty benefits beyond those approved by the Regents.

A. **Base Salary-Related Benefits** are associated with an individual's base salary (from one of the Health Sciences Salary Scales) paid through the University of California payroll system. These benefits may include participation in the University’s basic retirement plan, health care insurance, disability insurance, regular term life insurance, and other benefits as may be approved by The Regents under the same eligibility requirements as other members of the University’s faculty.

B. **Optional Benefits on Additional Compensation**

The Regents have authorized some disability and life insurance benefit programs related to health sciences additional compensation beyond the base salary. These programs must be approved by the Office of Employee Benefits/Human Resources, Office of the
President. Policies governing optional disability and life insurance programs on additional compensation are available from that Office.

C. Paid Leave

Faculty members remain members of the Compensation Plan while on paid leave, even if salary is dropped to base. While on paid leave, faculty members are bound by the rules of the Plan, the Departmental Implementation Procedures, and any departmental Guidelines, including those policies related to income due the Plan.

1. Extended Illness/Disability Leaves:

Faculty do not accrue sick leave, but may be approved for leaves with pay (i.e. salary continuance) during periods of extended illness or disability (APM 710). An absence of greater than two weeks for health reasons is considered an extended illness and should be officially recorded as a leave with pay, and when appropriate, will be designated as Family Medical Leave (FMLA).

Faculty who can perform part of their usual duties or other duties assigned will be required to do so. With appropriate documentation, which may include a physician’s certification of disability, and/or an outside third party review (at the School’s expense), the School will provide salary continuance during periods of extended illness or disability as follows:

Faculty with 0 – 3 years of service: Full-time faculty members unable to work for health reasons, who have less than three years of service at the time of illness, will continue to receive full salary \((X + X' + Y)\) for a period equivalent to 1 day/month from date of hire to date of illness or disability.

Faculty with 3+ years of service: Faculty unable to work for health reasons, who have more than three years of service at the time of disability, will continue to receive full salary \((X + X' + Y)\) for 90 days.
Faculty members who are still unable to return to work will then need to rely on employee-and/or employer-paid plans (whether through the University or privately-funded) for income while eligibility for disability benefits continues. Long term disability insurance for the "Y" portion of salary is an employer-paid benefit that provides coverage to eligible faculty following a full year of full disability. Faculty should consult current plan documents for complete information about the University plans available and the coverage they provide.

2. Other Paid Leave:

A. Vacation: Faculty members accrue vacation leave at a rate of two days per month for full time service. For approved plan participants working part-time at 50% time or more, vacation allowance accumulates at a proportionate rate of full-time credit. For approved Plan participants working part-time at less than 50% time, there is no vacation accrual. Unless approved by the Dean, an appointee must serve the University for six months after initial appointment before accrued vacation allowance may be used. Accrued vacation may be approved for use during periods of extended illness, disability, and child bearing/child rearing/approved family leaves. Faculty eligible to accrue vacation credit may accumulate a maximum of 48 working days (384 hours). Terminal vacation leave (paid to those separating from University service) is paid at a rate equal to the full salary in effect immediately prior to separation.

B. Childbearing and Other Parental Leaves: In accordance with APM 710, childbearing leave shall be granted on request to a faculty member who bears a child, for the period prior to and following childbirth; the department will provide salary at the full negotiated salary rate (X + X’+Y) during these leaves. The normal period for childbearing leave is typically six weeks, although more time may be necessary for medical reasons; in such cases the faculty member may consult with the APU Head/Departmental Chair for funding of childbearing and other parental leave beyond six weeks. An additional six weeks of paid leave may be supported at the negotiated salary as defined above, excluding bonuses, upon discussion and approval by the APU Head/departmental Chair and the Dean.
The School of Medicine will not distinguish between academic senate and non-senate members for the purposes of maternity leave for a faculty member who bears a child even if the member has served in their faculty title less than 12 consecutive months. It is expected that the funding sources supporting a faculty member at the time of her childbearing leave will continue to be used during childbearing leaves. If additional leave is required for medical reasons, the School’s policy regarding leaves for extended illness shall apply.

Fathers/non-birth parents shall be granted up to two weeks paid parental leave, upon request, at their currently negotiated compensation.

Parental leave without pay is subject to approval, but may be granted for up to one year to any academic appointee for the purpose of caring for a child. Normally, this unpaid leave, when combined with childbearing leave and/or Active Service—Modified Duties (see below) shall not exceed one year for each birth or adoption.

In addition to these paid or unpaid parental leaves, periods of Active Service—Modified Duties (ASMD), at full negotiated pay (i.e., $X + X' + Y$) shall be granted on request to any faculty member who has primary responsibility for the care of an infant or child for the period before and/or immediately following a birth or adoption of a child under age five. Under academic policy, the total combined period of childbearing leave and ASMD for each childbirth or adoption may not exceed one quarter. The faculty member requesting a period of ASMD must confer with the Dean of the UCR School of Medicine prior to the begin date, in order to reach agreement on the nature and scope of the individual’s duties during this period.

C. Sabbatical Leave: Sabbatical leaves are a privilege accorded to eligible Ladder Rank faculty to allow them to engage in periodic and intensive programs of research and study (see APM 740). During an approved sabbatical, the salary rate will at a minimum be equal to the individual’s rate of covered compensation ($X (1 - 9)$). Additional compensation ($Y$ portion) may be granted from the same or similar sources as those providing negotiated compensation prior to the period.
of leave (i.e., faculty may not accept salary directly from another institution while on sabbatical), but any salary above covered compensation (base) shall be limited by the availability of extramural, clinical or other discretionary funds. Total salary during sabbatical leave from all sources may not exceed the faculty member's total salary prior to the leave. Faculty shall remain members of the compensation plan and subject to all of its requirements while on sabbatical leave.

D. Professional Development Leave: Faculty who are members of the Academic Senate but not eligible for sabbatical leave may apply for professional development leave. Such leaves will generally not be approved for more than six months' duration. During an approved professional development leave (at the discretion of the Dean), the salary rate will at a minimum be equal to the individual's rate of covered compensation (Scale 1–9). Additional compensation may be granted for the same or similar sources as those providing negotiated compensation prior to the period of the leave (i.e., up to the X + X' + Y) if such funds are available. Total salary during professional development leave from all sources may not exceed the faculty member's total salary prior to the leave. Faculty shall remain members of the compensation plan and subject to all of its requirements while on professional development leave.

E. Other: On occasion, leaves of absence with pay may be approved for good cause (for example, during military service or for brief periods of governmental service); salary during such leaves will in general be at the full negotiated rate.

These paid leave provisions are available to Plan members who are appointed less than 100%, after having been employed for at least one full year, for the length of paid leave prorated according to the percentage appointment, and paid at the full Health Sciences Scales Base Salary rate or total negotiated salary rate.

The above are provided uniformly within APUs as reviewed by their participants and as approved by the Dean.
3. Leaves Without Pay: In addition to the types of leave described above, leaves of absence without pay for other good cause (e.g., for family care or other personal reasons) may be granted, subject to approval by the department chair, and Dean. In general, such leaves may not exceed one year. However, during such periods of leave, faculty may not engage in compensated outside professional activities consistent with the guidelines of this Implementation Plan, and they shall remain members of the compensation plan and subject to all of its requirements. Exceptions to this policy are granted only in extraordinary circumstances, or where other policy or formal agreements supersede compensation plan policy (for example, in cases of extended governmental service or for faculty placed on administrative leave).

VI. COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS FOR PLAN MEMBERS

Faculty members who have a complaint about issues related to outside professional activities should first try to resolve the issue at the APU/department level. If the complaint cannot be resolved through discussions, the faculty member's complaint and the APU/department response should be memorialized and documented. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the APU/department decision, s/he should file a formal complaint with the Dean/VCHS. The Dean/VCHS will charge the Advisory Committee with fact finding. Both the APU Head/Chair or their designee and the faculty member will have the right to be heard by the Committee. The Committee will issue a formal recommendation for resolution to the Dean/VCHS. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Dean/VCHS's decision, s/he can pursue administrative remedies through applicable campus academic personnel processes.

VII. CAMPUS ACCOUNTING AND BUDGETING METHODS

A. Management and Reporting of Professional Services Income and Expenses

1. University Management

All professional services income generated by Compensation Plan members shall be managed by, accounted for and reported as revenue of the University; the only exception to this requirement shall be income which the Plan participant is allowed to retain in
accordance with Section IV.G.1. All compensation paid by the University to Plan members will be subject to Federal and State withholding and reported on a W-2 form as wages. Campus procedures shall include billing and accounting procedures necessary to assure accountability for all funds. All financial transactions shall be approved, documented, and otherwise processed or executed in accordance with University policies, procedures and delegations of authority.

All professional fee billing (including, and not limited to clinical revenue, for-profit consulting income, expert witness fees) is due the Plan and collection activities shall be conducted by authorized University billing groups, by external vendors with which the University has contracted, or as otherwise permitted by University procedures. All such fees shall be deposited upon receipt by the University or by an external vendor in a University bank account established in accordance with University delegations of authority.

2. Reports

The accounting standards specified in the University of California Accounting Manual must be used in reporting income and expenses in all compensation arrangements.

B. Fund Accounts and Sources

All income generated by a Plan member’s professional activities (e.g. all income due the Plan, including but not limited to clinical revenue, consulting income and professional/legal witness fees) shall be managed by, accounted for, and reported as revenue of the University; the only exception to this requirement shall be income that the Plan participant is allowed to retain in accordance with this Implementation Plan. All income owed to the University must be submitted to the Dean’s Office for deposit into the appropriate UCR School of Medicine professional fee revenue account.

Compensation Plan fund accounts will be structured so that each department has at least two distinct funds: a current-year operations fund and a prior-year fund to which accumulated surpluses will be transferred.
All fund accounts shall be separate University accounts and shall receive Plan income from the following sources:

a) Income from professional services;

b) Amounts paid by University hospitals or affiliated institutions for professional and managerial services rendered to the hospitals by participants in the Plan;

c). Such other funds as are required by the Chancellor or President to be included in fund accounts.

Certain other sources of University income may be available to support faculty compensation and benefits but are not recorded in Compensation Plan fund accounts, such as:

1. Funds made available for salaries from University-administered grants and contracts.

2. Funds made available from unrestricted, non-State fund accounts within the school.

3. Gifts and other funds available for such purposes, as allocated by the Dean or Chancellor.

C. Assessment of Professional Services Income

An assessment rate annually recommended by the Dean and approved by the Chancellor for the UCR School of Medicine shall be applied against gross Plan members' professional fee collections. The UCR School of Medicine Dean's Tax, which in consultation with the Advisory Committee is subject to change annually, is currently at 10% on gross receipts in the current year Professional Fees revenue fund.
Dean’s Tax on Outside Professional Income deposited to the Plan is currently at 20%. This rate can be reset on an annual basis, and although consultation with the Advisory Committee will occur, authority rests with the Dean.

D. Contingency in Event of Inadequacy of Health Sciences Fund Accounts

An allocation of 20% of net funds comprising the available bonus pool will be set aside to enable the Dean/VCHS to build an adequate reserve contingency fund in the event that current year fund accounts are inadequate to meet annual commitments. The purpose of the reserve(s) is to provide the funds necessary to pay Plan expenses, including the agreed-upon compensation to each Plan participant, in the event that the current year income of the Plan is insufficient to do so.

If the reserve funds are insufficient for the purpose, other non-restricted and non-19900/state fund balances will be utilized within the School, and in the event that resources are still inadequate to meet annual commitments, the Dean will seek approval from the Chancellor to reduce the participants’ additional compensation in a uniform manner in accordance with any fund source restrictions across the school, division, or APU as recommended by the Dean and approved by the Chancellor.

E. Budgeting

Each department shall develop and submit to the Dean each year an annual budget projecting income and expenses for the upcoming year as part of its annual faculty salary budget submission. Except where accumulated surpluses are being used to support an extensive growth phase, it is expected that revenue will always be adequate to support anticipated expenses. Departments should clearly indicate the funding mechanism for all benefits provided under the provisions of the Plan.

Expenditures shall be budgeted for and funded in the following order of priority:

1. Clinical practice operating expenses, defined as costs incurred by the University for billing and collection of fees for clinical services; for faculty use of University-owned and/or leased practice facilities, and for related professional operating activities;
2. To the extent that funds remain after expenditures for clinical practice costs, compensation may be paid to eligible participants in the Plan. Base salary and related benefits, including any required contribution on behalf of University of California Retirement Plan covered compensation, shall be funded before additional compensation;

3. To the extent that funds remain after the foregoing expenditures, benefits approved in accordance with Sections V.B. and V.C. may be paid.

4. To the extent that funds remain after all the foregoing expenditures, funds shall be contributed to the reserve(s) for contingencies in an amount recommended by the Dean and approved by the Chancellor.

5. When a health sciences fund account has accumulated a surplus beyond that required for expenditures and reserves as provided in all the above categories, the surplus shall be used as follows:

   a) At least one-half for academic purposes in the department or division of origin (including but not limited to salaries for support personnel) as recommended by the APU Head/Chair and approved by the Dean;

   b) The remainder may be used for other purposes in the school or campus as recommended by the Dean and approved by the Chancellor.

VIII. Implementation

The Implementation Plan for the UCR School of Medicine is designed to be consistent with the policy framework of the Regents' Plan for Health Science Compensation Plans.

The Implementation Plan for the UCR School of Medicine Compensation Plan supersedes any prior HSCP plan for UC Riverside. This document has been reviewed and approved by the APUs of the UCR School of Medicine, and reviewed by relevant committees of the Academic Senate at UC Riverside prior to submittal by the Dean of the UCR School of Medicine to the Chancellor for submittal to the President.
April 21, 2011

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: MORRIS MADURO, CHAIR
GRADUATE COUNCIL

RE: PROPOSAL TO DISESTABLISH/CONSOLIDATE DEPARTMENTS WITHIN THE UCR SCHOOL OF BUSINESS - SoBA

The Graduate Council at its April 20, 2011 meeting evaluated the proposal to disestablish/consolidate SoBA. The disestablishment does not have an impact on graduate programs and thus the Graduate Council members voted unanimously (12,0) to support this proposal.
April 13, 2011

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: D. J. HARE, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE: PROPOSAL TO DISESTABLISH AND CONSOLIDATE THE ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (SOBA)

The Committee on Faculty Welfare evaluated the proposal to disestablish and consolidate the academic departments in the School of Business Administration (SoBA). The Committee noted the agreement of the Faculty of SoBA with the Administration on the proposal and concluded that the proposal raises no issue of faculty welfare.
April 11, 2011

TO:     RISE AXELROD, CHAIR
        ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

        JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
        EDUCATIONAL POLICY

        MORRIS MADURO, CHAIR
        GRADUATE COUNCIL

        DANIEL HARE, CHAIR
        FACULTY WELFARE

        PETER CHUNG, CHAIR
        PLANNING AND BUDGET

FM:     MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
        RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE:     PROPOSAL TO DISESTABLISH/CONSOLIDATE SoBA DEPARTMENTS

Enclosed is a proposal to disestablish SoBA’s three departments. Please review the report and submit your responses to me for onward submission to the Executive Council.

While the EVCS’s letter refers to senate bylaw 7.3, please note that all actions involving departments are carried out on the 10 established campuses and there is no systemwide review required. Bylaw 7.3 refers to academic programs and units.

Please note that according to our Senate Bylaws, this issue will need to be voted on at the Division and our next meeting is scheduled for May 24, 2011. Please submit your response to me by April 28, 2011.
April 8, 2011

Mary Gauvain, Chair
UCR Division of the Academic Senate

Re: Proposal to Disestablish/Consolidate SoBA Departments

Dear Mary,

Enclosed is a proposal to consolidate and disestablish SoBA’s three departments. The Chancellor is the final decision-maker on this proposal, but the Academic Senate’s judgment is vital to inform that decision. My overall conclusion, based partly upon an external administrative review and individual interviews that the Chancellor and I have had with SoBA faculty, is that the small departments in SoBA are at variance with how other UC business schools are organized. These small departments also tend to worsen a host of other challenges, such as SoBA faculty disengagement from the campus and our traditions and sensibilities around shared governance.

Accordingly, I request that you seek out advice from the appropriate Senate committees per Senate Bylaw App. §7.3 and provide the administration with the Senate’s views in a timely manner (e.g., the May 24th Divisional meeting). My goal and expectation is that this proposal can be put into effect beginning at the start of the new academic year (July 1), which would allow new school-wide academic personnel review procedures in SoBA to be put in place by that time. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dallas Rabenstein
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

cc: Chancellor White
Dean Stewart
Senate Vice-Chair Walker
Vice Provost Bocian
Proposal to Disestablish & Consolidate Departments within the UCR School of Business Administration (SoBA) and to Return to School-Wide Governance

Proposal by Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost Dallas Rabenstein

April 8, 2011
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I. Executive Summary

The School of Business Administration (SoBA) has had departments for about a decade. In retrospect, departmentalization within SoBA unfortunately created a more troublesome set of problems than it remedied. The consolidation and disestablishment of departments is a campus-level action in which the Chancellor is the final decision-maker. Evidence from several sources, including an external administrative review, raise significant concerns about the handling of academic personnel matters in SoBA, about faculty morale and engagement, as well as the existence of a fissure between SoBA and the rest of the campus in terms of the understanding of shared governance. In order to uphold the highest standards in academic personnel review, to more closely align SoBA with practices at other UC business schools, and to address these other challenges, I am proposing to Chancellor White that the three departments in SoBA be disestablished and consolidated. In this way, academic personnel input will be channeled through an appropriate school-wide mechanism beginning July 1, 2011. To be clear, this proposal has no impact on the security of employment that SoBA faculty have in their tenured (or tenure-track) positions within the School, nor does it change SoBA’s authority to grant degrees. Rather, this proposal is about changing SoBA’s current department-level structure.
II. Authority & Scope

Under the UC Compendium – which details policy and procedure for reviewing University programs and units – the consolidation and disestablishment of existing departments is a campus-level matter that does not require UC systemwide review:

**Actions involving departments are carried out on the ten established campuses and do not involve review by the systemwide office.** Such actions include creating a new department, changing the name of an existing department, and consolidating, transferring, or disestablishing an existing department. If approved by the appropriate agencies of the Divisional Academic Senate and by the campus administration, an action involving an academic program that appoints faculty who are members of the Academic Senate and who vote as a unit under Academic Senate Bylaw 55 shall be reviewed as an action involving a department.¹ (emphasis added)

Moreover, the Chancellor has final decision-making authority with respect to the consolidation and disestablishment of departments, whereas the Academic Senate is vested with the authority to carry out the role of ultimate decision-maker with respect to academic programs.²

The above distinction between units and programs is a consistent part of the division of responsibility between the administration and the Senate under UC’s shared governance traditions.

This proposal is intended to initiate the consultation process with the Academic Senate and other campus stakeholders. I ask that Senate consultation be completed by the May 24th Divisional meeting, so that academic personnel processing and other changes can take effect July 1, 2011. Chancellor White and I have already met with SoBA faculty during two sessions in March where we expressed our concerns and began the informal consultation process about disestablishing/consolidating the SoBA departments.

---


2 UCR Senate Bylaw Appendix 7, Preamble: “The ultimate decision to recommend the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, or discontinuance of an academic program resides with the Academic Senate of the campus and that of a unit resides with the Chancellor. In the context of these procedures, a program is defined as a course of study leading to a degree, and a unit is a school, college, department, or division within a department, school, or college.” available at http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=app&section=07
Under the Compendium, “Disestablishments and discontinuances are two actions that are usually interrelated.”3 While the current proposal entails disestablishment in the sense that the three departments in SoBA would no longer exist, this proposal differs from typical “disestablishment” actions in that it is not being proposed in tandem with the discontinuation of existing degree programs. Rather, this proposal is to consolidate all existing departments within SoBA while leaving other core aspects of the School unaltered (e.g., current SoBA faculty will maintain their tenured positions within the School; SoBA will still confer degrees). This proposal would, in effect, return SoBA to the organizational structure it had roughly a decade ago prior to departmentalization.

In other circumstances it is natural that academic proposals develop from the “bottom-up” through the interest of affected faculty (e.g., creating a new department or degree program). By contrast, this proposal is primarily motivated by the need to maintain campus-wide and University-wide standards of excellence, so here a “top-down” proposal from the EVC is quite appropriate (and it is recognized in the UCR Senate Bylaw that such proposals can originate with the EVC⁴).

III. Key Considerations Supporting this Proposal

Our merit-based and labor-intensive academic peer-review process at UC Riverside is a defining feature of what it means to be a world class research university and part of the University of California system.⁵ Given the relatively modest size of SoBA’s ladder-rank faculty, having three departments within SoBA necessarily means small departments (see graphic below), and this in turn creates a significantly increased risk of questionable and/or compromised departmental input into the UCR academic personnel process. As your EVC/Provost, I believe that consolidating the three departments in SoBA is a necessary first step to ensure that our most cherished values at UCR are rigorously upheld in SoBA and across the campus.

---

3 Compendium, page 31.

4 UCR Senate Bylaw Appendix 7.3.

Several developments led me to what is now a firm conclusion: SoBA departments are currently not functioning satisfactorily, including with respect to handling academic personnel matters. I initiated an outside administrative review of SoBA that was conducted last year by three seasoned business school faculty from other UC campuses. The review team made a two-day visit in March 2010, and the team interviewed all SoBA faculty (and several staff) who wished to participate. The review team’s subsequent findings (See Appendix for one-page summary of findings) included the following:

SoBA delegates academic personnel decisions to very small departments in contrast to the norms at the other UC management/business schools that emphasize school-wide voting. We recommend faculty oversight for personnel decisions by an associate dean for academic affairs or through a school-wide body and faculty chair....We also recommend that the School’s academic leaders work with the University leadership to develop a common understanding about how UC shared governance processes apply to SoBA.

Consistent with the review team’s claim, the graphic below depicts the extent to which departmentalization within SoBA marks a clear departure from how other accredited UC business/management schools are administratively organized. Even the UC business schools that are substantially larger than UCR’s SoBA are organized into “academic areas” (UCLA and Irvine) or “academic groups” (Berkeley) rather than departments.6

---

6 [http://www.anderson.ucla.edu/x24217.xml](http://www.anderson.ucla.edu/x24217.xml); [http://merage.uci.edu/Faculty/AcademicAreas/index.aspx](http://merage.uci.edu/Faculty/AcademicAreas/index.aspx); [http://www2.haas.berkeley.edu/Faculty/Faculty%20Groups.aspx](http://www2.haas.berkeley.edu/Faculty/Faculty%20Groups.aspx).
Both last year’s external administrative review and a 2006 external evaluation report (part of a Graduate Council program review) identified low morale and a high degree of factionalism among SoBA faculty (consistent with earlier reviews). While faculty morale and conflict are complex issues with multiple causes, I believe such problems are made worse by having three small departments that take away from school- and campus-wide engagement. Likewise, the administrative review team, which interviewed SoBA faculty and Academic Senate leaders, identified shared governance tensions between SoBA and the rest of the campus. This finding rings true based with my overall experience as UCR’s EVC/Provost, as does the finding about sub-optimal academic personnel input.

In light of the external administrative review, Chancellor White and I individually interviewed all available SoBA faculty last fall, and again we met with most SoBA faculty in group meetings a few weeks ago. This proposal is informed by the collective judgment derived from all of the above sources of information. In a nutshell, we must return to prevailing academic norms of UC business schools by disestablishing the departments we now have in SoBA.\(^7\)

\(^7\) It should also be emphasized that the problem identified is one of organizational structure (and departmental culture); it would be unfair to blame SoBA staff who handle administrative aspects of academic personnel for the problems detailed herein.
IV. Departmental Rights and Related Concerns

“Department” has a particular meaning within UC, including provisions around departmental voting rights (Regents Standing Order 105.2; Academic Senate Bylaw 55). It follows that if the departments in SoBA are consolidated, then faculty in these departments will no longer vote along departmental lines on matters like academic personnel (indeed, that is an aim of the proposal). At the same time, faculty rights and privileges will be maintained in a fundamental sense insofar as other schools at UCR without departments (namely, the Graduate School of Education) and the business schools at other UC campuses all uphold University policy in academic personnel and other matters without voting along departmental lines. In concert with this proposal, Dean Stewart would consult with Vice Provost Bocian on the most appropriate alternative mechanism for handling SoBA academic personnel matters (consistent with e.g., APM 160 Appendix A), and such arrangements would be in place for the next academic year.

While some SoBA faculty might argue that disciplinary differences could raise concerns about the evaluation of their merit and promotion files (e.g., “Marketing professors don’t understand my work”), such an argument is not persuasive given that other large departments on our campus have as great (or greater) degrees of sub-field differences yet are able to fairly and adeptly handle academic personnel evaluations.

Another implication of this proposal is that there would no longer be chairs with departmental responsibilities within SoBA, so note that department chairs serve at the pleasure of the Chancellor and these administrative posts can be terminated at any time with or without cause (APM 245). Thus, for a faculty member holding a chair appointment, ending that chair position (and any associated stipend) does not ordinarily affect his or her fundamental rights and privileges as a member of the Academic Senate.8

V. Conclusion

UCR has individual departments that are larger than the three SoBA departments combined. In this straightforward proposal I recommend that the Chancellor disestablish and consolidate SoBA’s departments, thus paving the way for academic personnel to be handled on a school-wide basis. Disestablishing and consolidating these departments will (1) facilitate improvements in the quality of input into our cherished faculty peer-review system; (2) bring

8 See e.g., University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, Legislative Ruling 10.08 (“Inasmuch as having an at-will administrative appointment is neither a right nor a privilege of Academic Senate members, a divisional Privilege and Tenure Committee does not have jurisdiction to hear a grievance that is asserted with regard to the loss or withdrawal of such an appointment.”).
SoBA into closer alignment with the other UC business schools, as noted by the external review team; and (3) given that shared governance is part of the very fabric of UCR, my hope that this proposal is an important first step toward improving understanding across the campus regarding norms and expectations around shared governance.

(Appendix on Next Page: Executive Summary of the 2010 SoBA External Administrative Review)
Executive Summary

The following summarizes the key findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Administrative Review Committee on the progress of the SoBA since the Graduate Program review of June, 2006. The committee members comprised Professors Paul Griffin (Davis), Ganesh Iyer (Berkeley), and Jone Pearce (Irvine), who met with UC Riverside faculty, staff, and administrators on March 1-2, 2010.

- We found faculty compensation, while high relative to other campus units, as reasonable compared to other UC management/business schools. The School, however, lags the other UC schools in not funding appropriate amounts of compensation through self-supporting programs and professional fees. We recommend a clear road map for resolving SoBA’s funding model by shifting from state funds to professional fees and self-supporting programs as the primary revenue drivers.

- SoBA delegates academic personnel decisions to very small departments in contrast to the norms at the other UC management/business schools that emphasize school-wide voting. We recommend faculty oversight for personnel decisions by an associate dean for academic affairs or through a school-wide body and faculty chair. SoBA delegates academic personnel decisions to very small departments in contrast to the norm at other UC business schools of school-wide votes. We also recommend that the School’s academic leaders work with the University leadership to develop a common understanding about how UC shared governance processes apply to SoBA.

- The School suffers from a serious morale problem, in part, because of differences between newer faculty hired since 2006 and those with longer tenure. The level of distrust and animosity is striking. Even routine issues are seized upon as evidence of the perfidy and corruption of the other group (or senate colleagues). We did not observe strong faculty motivation to repair and rebuild trust. Both groups seem to feel they can prevail, or do not need the collaboration and trust of members of the other group.

- The School’s strategic plan should make clear how and when the School will achieve the twin objectives of sustainable long term growth and program excellence at levels approaching or similar to the other UC graduate management/business schools. If the campus were to invest in SoBA, it should exercise the fullest leverage possible to seek firm and credible commitments from the School and faculty.

- Much of the financial success of the strategic plan hinges on two to-be-implemented programs. These programs require campus and possibly system-wide approval, which can be time-consuming in the UC system. Assuming continuity, we recommend that the School and campus work together to expedite approvals of the MS in Accounting and FEMBA degree programs.

- More emphasis should be placed on the undergraduate business program. In the four years since the earlier review, we did not see strong evidence of an increase in the quality of the undergraduate program. During our interviews with faculty and staff, we heard more about issues of poor teaching and excessive class size.
April 10, 2011

Dallas Rabenstein
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

As Chair of the faculty of the School of Business Administration, on behalf of the faculty of the School, I would like to thank you for initiating the formal process of disestablishing the separate departments within the School. Indeed, the School faculty is committed to moving to a School-wide department model and has been actively working to accomplish this restructuring in time for implementation by July 1. It is perhaps ironic that your message reached us as we were engaged in a structured retreat that was designed to assure that all members of the faculty are given the opportunity to identify any concerns they may have, to provide constructive suggestions for improvement and implementation, and to develop an inclusive process for preparing the memorandum of understanding that you and the Chancellor have requested. I am pleased to report for this retreat that enabled all faculty members but one to participate, was very positive, collegial, and constructive, and that the process agreed to at the retreat will enable all faculty members (as well as all staff members) to engage and contribute.

I believe I can speak for the faculty in saying that we are on board with the proposal to disestablish the three separate departments of the School and to restructure as a single department. In fact, the smaller departments were actually imposed on the School a number of years ago as a perceived solution to personnel-related issues at that time. Thus, the issue of “top-down” or “bottom-up” should not be of concern to the academic senate in deciding how to respond to the request. However, one can reasonably infer from past evidence that simply restructuring as a single department will not necessarily “fix” whatever problems may currently exist. Accordingly, the faculty of the School is heavily invested in developing and thinking through the implementation details that could enable a single-department model to help us to achieve what we all want – a school of business that respects, recognizes and appropriately rewards the individual and unique contributions of all of its faculty; and that is nationally recognized, respected on campus, and delivers excellent education to students at all levels.

Thus, we join with you in asking the academic senate to begin the processes that will enable it to advise the administration in a timely manner. We invite and encourage the relevant academic senate bodies to engage in an open exchange of information with us. In fact, we have already undertaken some outreach efforts both on campus and with other UC campuses for the purpose of developing a single-department model that will become a core strength of the School.

We look forward to a collaborative and collegial process with the academic senate and the administration.

Regards,

Richard Smith, Faculty Chair
School of Business Administration
Campus procedures are effective as of the date of approval of this Implementation Plan approval by the President.
April 22, 2011

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: Y. PETER CHUNG, CHAIR
PLANNING AND BUDGET

Re: Proposal to Disestablish/Consolidate Departments within The UCR School of Business - SoBA

Planning and Budget met and reviewed the proposal to disestablish/consolidate departments within the UCR School of Business (SoBA).

The committee approved the proposal unanimously (5, 0).
April 22, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
   Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Rise Axelrod
    Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Proposal to Disestablish/Consolidate SoBA Departments

CAP discussed the proposal to disestablish/consolidate SoBA departments on April 18, 2011. CAP supports the proposal and recommends the GSOE model for personnel issues.