January 4, 2007

TO: R. A. (Richard) Luben, Vice Chair, (Department of Biomedical Sciences)  
R. L. (Rusty) Russell, Secretary Parliamentarian, (Department of Sociology)  
N. E. (Nancy) Beckage, Chair, Affirmative Action and Diversity, (Department of Cell  
Biology and Neuroscience)  
W. P. (Ward) Beyermann, Chair, Committee on Committees, (Department of Physics and  
Astronomy)  
J. B. (Jan) Blacher, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee, (Graduate School of Education)  
J. W. (Joe) Childers, Representative to the Assembly, (Department of English)  
H. L. (Helen) Henry, Chair, Faculty Welfare, (Department of Biochemistry)  
C. (Carol) Lovatt, Junior Representative to the Assembly, (Botany & Plant Sciences)  
R. T. A. (Rene) Lysloff, Chair CHASS Executive Committee, (Department of Music)  
A. W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Planning and Budget (Department of Biochemistry)  
E. A. (Gene) Nothnagel, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy, (Department of  
Botany and Plant Sciences)  
L. P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee, (Department of Biology)  
T. D. (Tim) Paine, Chair, Undergraduate Council (Department of Entomology)  
T (Tom) Payne, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Technology  
(Computer Science)  
T. (Teodor) Przymusinski, Chair, COE Executive Committee  
W. (Waymond) Rodgers, Chair AGSM Executive Committee, (A. Gary Anderson  
Graduate School of Management)  
R. R. (Robert) Russell, Chair, Graduate Council (Department of Economics)  
T. (Theda) Shapiro, Chair, Preparatory Education Committee, (Department of  
Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages)  
I. A. (Ivan) Strenski, Chair, Physical Resources Planning, (Department of Religious  
Studies)  
K. (Kiril) Tomoff, Chair, Committee on Research, (Department of History)  
A. D. (Allen) Zych, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel, (Department of Physics  
and Astronomy)  

FR: T. Cogswell, Chair  
Riverside Division

RE: ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA – January 8, 2007

This is to confirm the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Monday, January 8, 2007 at 1:00  
p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building.

Please let me know your attendance plans. A light lunch will be served – Meatball sandwiches  
from the Substation by special request from Rusty!!

Following is the agenda - please print out a copy and the attachments and bring them to the  
meeting.
1. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**
   
   **Action items:**
   - Approval of the agenda
   - Approval of December 11, 2006 notes (see Attached)
   - Proposed Change to Regulation 6.IV – Academic Integrity Committee (Attached)
   
   **Information Items Only:**
   - Conflict of Interest Statements: AGSM (Attached)

2. **CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS:**
   
   Assessing Senate interest in complementary allied health programs

3. **DEVOLUTION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALLOCATING GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP FUNDS**
   
   R R Russell to lead discussions (Attached)

4. **HEALTH AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:**
   
   Draft Charge for the Committee (Attached)

5. **REVIEW OF DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN (HSCP) AND GUIDELINES FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN FOR THE UCR DIVISION OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES:**

6. **PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY**
   
   (Attached)
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES  
December 11, 2006

PRESENT:

Thomas (Tom) Cogswell, Chair, (Department of History)  
R. L. (Rusty) Russell, Secretary Parliamentarian (Department of Sociology)  
W. P. (Ward) Beyermann, Chair, Committee on Committees (Physics and Astronomy)  
J. B. (Jan) Blacher, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee (Graduate School of Education)  
J. W. (Joe) Childers, Representative to the Assembly (Department of English)  
H. (Helen) Henry, Chair, Faculty Welfare (Biochemistry)  
A. W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget, (Department of Biochemistry)  
E. A. (Gene) Nothnagel, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy (Botany and Plant sciences)  
T. (Teodor) Przymusinski, Chair, COE Executive Committee  
W. Rodgers, Chair, AGSM Executive Committee (AGSM)  
R. R. (Robert) Russell, Chair, Graduate Council (Department of Economics)  
T. Shapiro, Chair, Preparatory Education (Comparative Lit and Foreign Languages)  
K. (Kiril) Tomoff, Chair, Committee on Research (Department of History)

ABSENT:

R. A. (Richard) Luben, Vice Chair (Department of Biomedical Sciences)  
N. E. (Nancy) Beckage, Chair, Affirmative Action and Diversity (Department of Cell Biology and Neuroscience)  
R. T. A. (Rene) Lysloff, Chair, CHASS Executive Committee (Department of Music)  
L. P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee (Department of Biology)  
T. D. (Tim) Paine, (Department of Entomology) Chair, Undergraduate Council  
T. (Tom) Payne, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Technology (Computer Science)  
I. A. (Ivan) Strenski, Chair, Physical Resources Planning (Department of Religious Studies)  
A.D. (Allen) Zych, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (Department of Physics and Astronomy)

Consent Calendar:  
The consent calendar including the informational items was approved unanimously.

France wanted to visit with Advisory but due to the heavy agenda, asked if we could defer the meeting. He indicated that negotiations are ongoing about COR’s request. The EVCP has agreed to double the current amount to a total of $742,000. In addition, she has also agreed to backstop funds from OP to a total of 5,000 a year.

Graduate review data has been collected, it is hoped that the work will be completed early in 2007.

George Haggerty has agreed to chair the Ad Hoc Committee on Conversion Factor and General Education Curriculum.
Chair Cogswell also mentioned to the committee that he was seeking their advice on an issue regarding the COMPACT. He indicated that the COMPACT as written asks for a bare minimum and since this was an agenda item; there have been discussions on how to begin stressing in writing the need to augment the UC budget. He indicated that UCPB had done a study and the result was that unless funding was reinstated to what it was prior to the budget cuts; the outlook was pretty grim for the UC as a whole. OP’s stand is not to ruffle feathers and just accept the COMPACT as it is. The issue was discussed amongst the AC members and the general feeling was that the UC was party to the COMPACT and that all the COMPACT does is provide a floor and we (UC) can ask for me if there is proper justification. Other members felt that if asking for more than what the COMPACT currently had was a responsibility especially if the quality of the institution was at stake. After a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that Chair Cogswell would forward as much information as he had to the AC members.

Finally, Chair Cogswell mentioned that the President’s Advisory Council on Future Growth in the Health Profession has released a summary of their findings and recommendations. The report mentions the need for a couple of schools of pharmacy, more nursing programs and one new veterinary school. He mentioned that this is a once in a century chance to put together a bid for one of these programs. However, the Chancellor is not very eager to do so. He was now coming to the AC to seek their advice on whether they would like to push the Chancellor to try and make a bid for some on the issues that are being discussed in the report. He indicated he did not want a resolution today, but he hoped that they would be able to discuss this issue further in January. The report is to be found at the site below:


Proposed Name Change For the Department of Plant Pathology:
The Committee unanimously approved the proposed name change to Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology. The proposal will be submitted to the Division for adoption in February 2007 and then forwarded to the EVCP.

Proposal for an 11th Person on CAP:
The proposal was discussed and the Committee was informed that the main issue was that there was no COE representative on CAP. The proposal was meant to be a temporary solution. Discussed was whether to add a temporary member until such time that CAP was able to amend its bylaws to include another member, or to add a non-voting member as a COE consultant. There were concerns that doing this would create a situation whereby CAP would be seen as illegal. The item was tabled until later in January 2007.

Proposal to Move CAP:
The Committee unanimously voted to accept the proposal to move CAP back into the Senate. The issue of space and permanent staff will be negotiated. The proposal now moves to the Division for adoption.

Additional Research Awards and Committee on Faculty Research Lecture:
Chair Cogswell informed the AC that the EVCP had agreed to provide funding in response to his proposal to increase the number of awards given by the Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer. The additions would include two Senior Research Lecturers, one from CHASS, GSOE and AGSM and another from CNAS and COE with a cash award of $7,500 each. In addition, she also agreed to fund two Mid-Career Research Lecturers with a cash prize of $4,000 to honor research excellence and innovation among Associate and Assistant Professors. The AC approved the proposal as written and agreed that it should be sent out to the relevant committees for review. The committee also asked that data on how other campuses handle their awards should be included with the proposal.

**Promise and Power of Ten Tour:**
Chair Cogswell indicated that the Chancellor had asked the Senate to provide some unique things that tie in with the Community that could be used for President Dynes’ tour to UCR in 2007. The tour was a photo-op to generate good publicity, and the idea is to have a series of 1 hour meetings which will include President Dynes. The following topics were suggested:

**ENVIRONMENT:**
- Hydrogen Engineering
- Corporate Governance
- Blakely Center
- Sloan Center

**ART BLOCK DOWNTOWN**

**CREATIVE WRITING**

**MEDICAL SCHOOL – WHAT IT MEANS TO US AND THE COMMUNITY**

**UNDERGRADUATE SUCCESS**

**EDUCATION:**
- Reading Project
- Teacher Training
- C4 Initiative
- Native American Studies/Tribes
- Seatrip
- Copernicus Project

**HSRI**

**PALM DESERT CAMPUS**

**CHINA INITIATIVE**
GENOMICS INSTITUTE

Medical School:
The Committee discussed the composition of the Health Affairs Committee and agreed that Committee on Committee will work to put together a strong committee. It was also agreed that Chair Cogswell would draft a Charge for the Health Affairs Committee and pass this around via email to the Advisory for discussion on January 8th.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sellyna Ehlers  
Executive Director  
Academic Senate
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION

Proposed Change to Regulation 6. IV.
Academic Integrity Committees

To be adopted:

PRESENT:

6. IV. College Academic Integrity Committees
An Academic Integrity Committee will be established in each of the Colleges and for the Graduate Division/Professional Schools to:
* hear cases referred by Student Judicial Affairs that are sufficiently complex to require additional review
* hear serious and repeated violations of academic misconduct upon referral from an instructor or Student Judicial Affairs
* hear appeals of decisions and/or sanctions imposed by an instructor or Student Judicial Affairs

Four to six faculty, four to six full-time undergraduate students, and four to six graduate students will be appointed to each College Committee and shall serve two year staggered terms to ensure continuity. In all cases an effort will be made to appoint members who represent the disciplinary diversity within each College.

The Graduate/Professional School Committee will be comprised of faculty and graduate students and shall be drawn from appointees to the College Committees. The faculty will be chosen by the College Executive Committees in consultation with the Graduate Council. The undergraduates shall be chosen from the undergraduate student body by the Associated Students of UCR. The graduate students shall be chosen from the graduate student body by the Graduate Student Association. Students who have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or who have a case pending before the Student Conduct Committee or an Academic Integrity Committee are not eligible to serve as committee members.

PROPOSED:

No Change

In the Spring quarter, the Committee on Committees shall appoint 4 BCOE faculty, 4 AGSM faculty, 2 GSOE faculty, 6 CHASS faculty and 6 CNAS faculty to the panels to serve one year terms effective July 1-June 30. Four to six full-time undergraduate students, and four to six graduate students will be appointed to each College Committee and shall serve one year terms effective July 1-June 30. In all cases an effort will be made to appoint members who represent the disciplinary diversity within each College. The undergraduates shall be chosen from the undergraduate student body by the Associated Students of UCR. The graduate students shall be chosen from the graduate student body by the Graduate Student Association. Students who have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or who have a case pending before the Student Conduct Committee or an Academic Integrity Committee are not eligible to serve as committee members.
A hearing panel of 3-5 members will be drawn from the pool of appointees for each case. A quorum of the committee consists of three persons, with at least one faculty member, one student for College Committees and one faculty member and one graduate student for the Graduate/Professional School Committee. In the absence of a quorum, the hearing will be rescheduled. Staff support to the Committee will be provided by the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution or his/her designee.

JUSTIFICATION:

Due to the increasing number of academic integrity cases and decreased ability and/or willingness of faculty to commit to serve on academic integrity cases, it is our recommendation to authorize the Committee on Committees (rather than burden the College Executive Committees) to appoint a specific number of faculty per College (see delineation per College in above proposed changes). We recommend one year terms versus two year terms in order to cut down on the demand for faculty time.

Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: November 1, 2006
Approved by the Graduate Council: November 15, 2006
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate: December 5, 2006
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee:
Date: December 18, 2006

TO: Thomas Cogswell
    Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: Waymond Rodgers
    Chair, Executive Committee
    College of A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management

RE: Conflict of Interest

During its December meeting of the Fall Quarter 2006, the Executive Committee of the College of A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management decided that if a member of the Committee perceives that a conflict of interest is present, he or she will bring it to the attention of the Committee. The Committee will then decide how the conflict of interest, if it is agreed that one exists, will be handled.

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

19 December 2006

TO: Chair Cogswell

FR: Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Wartella

RE: Assessing Senate interest in complementary health programs

I am writing to request that the Senate assess its interest in creating other health programs that would complement the medical program in the future School of Medicine. I expect to receive a request from the Office of the President regarding the campus’ interest in developing complementary programs in veterinary medicine and other allied health areas, and I want to be prepared to answer this request knowing the full campus perspective—administration and Senate.

Thank you for helping me prepare for this request. I do not know when this request will arrive, but will keep you updated.
Early this academic year, the EVC/Provost informed the Graduate Dean and the college deans that responsibility for allocating central graduate fellowship funds would devolve from the Graduate Division to the colleges. BCOE has assumed responsibility for this year’s decisions about allocation to its 2007-08 student cohort; CHASS and CNAS will probably do the same next year. The Graduate Council has deep concerns about this policy change.

The first concern is about the lack of any consultation with the Academic Senate, particularly the Graduate Council. The Council acknowledges the authority of the administration to implement this policy change but is disappointed about the lack of consultation not just because it appears to be inconsistent with the principle of shared governance but, more importantly, because the faculty, represented by the Academic Senate, has extensive, hands-on experience with different approaches to graduate student recruitment, experience that would properly inform decision making. (These experiences are salient in the concerns that follow.)

Devolution of responsibility for administering fellowship aid to the college deans was tried before, for the 02-03, 03-04, and 04-05 student cohorts, and the impression of Council members familiar with this experiment is that it was unsuccessful, that the process became muddled and only regained coherence with the return of responsibility to the Graduate Division. Indeed, the Council believes that there are serious design flaws in devolution:

• Centralized allocation of fellowship funds facilitates recruitment of the best students by allowing comparison of and competition among program applicant pools across the campus. Conversely, an a priori partition of funds to the three colleges limits comparison across programs.

• Centralized allocation similarly allows the Graduate Dean to take apparent risks in extra funding for programs with an unusually highly qualified pool of applicants in one program with some confidence that shortfalls in students in other programs across the campus will not imperil fiscal responsibilities. The experience of the physics program this year, increasing the number of entering doctoral students from 25 to 35,
relied critically on the ability of the Graduate Dean to satisfy overall budget constraints while “overfunding” the physics program. Such balancing acts would be impaired by devolution.

- Additionally, devolution threatens the fiscal stability of the cohort system, which was instituted largely to make allocations for graduate recruitment predictable and stable. However, the ability of the cohort system to distribute funds both fairly and flexibly depends on having a relatively large pool of students in each cohort. Devolution sharply reduces the size of each cohort pool, thus making overshoots (more students accepting fellowship offers than the budget covers) or undershoots (large surpluses for certain cohorts) much more likely. Moreover, the current cohort system funds dissertation fellowships out of original cohort allocations. But as the experience of the three-year experiment with devolution showed, this resulted in some cohorts with relatively abundant dissertation fellowship funding opportunities, while other cohorts were cut off entirely from dissertation fellowships because their cohort's budget was "overdrawn." Devolution thus critically undermines the fiscal goals of the cohort system while simultaneously increasing the likelihood of unfair distribution of funds.

- The Academic Senate charge to the Graduate Council stipulates that the Graduate Division review all applicants, not only for admission but also for satisfaction of the standards for fellowship support established (and overseen) by the Graduate Council. Devolution of responsibility for fellowship awards necessitates a duplication of review efforts. The addition of such bureaucratic layers of review inevitably slows down the process. During the earlier period of devolution, these delays led to losses of students to other schools. Shared responsibility for assessing qualification for fellowship support also raises the possibility of conflict; this possibility is enhanced by the need to evaluate, as well, the academic performance of continuing students with fellowship support (as well as continuation in the program).

- The Council believes that decisions about fellowship allocations are likely to be made on more objective grounds the further removed they are from College politics. One member cited examples of College politics undermining the allocation process under the earlier regime when decisions were made at the College level.

It is our understanding that the reason for the policy change is the administration’s concern about the slow growth of graduate student enrollment and the hope that the colleges will be able to increase the leverage of the fellowship funds through coordination with teaching and research assistantships to offer better funding packages. The Council shares the concern about graduate student enrollment but does not believe that the policy change will have a salutary effect. Graduate programs, in coordination with the Graduate Division, already coordinate the available funding sources to offer multiple-year packages of financial aid. According to those Council members who have been on the front line of graduate student recruitment, the absolute dollar amounts of awards need to be increased to be competitive with other programs, but this can be accomplished without devolution.
More fundamentally, the primary obstacle to growth in the graduate student body is the small size of our faculty and, consequently, the relatively low ratings of our graduate programs. It is well established that rankings of graduate programs are highly correlated with faculty size. While the UCR ratio of graduate students to total enrollment is well below the UC system average, the ratio of graduate student enrollment to faculty is not seriously out of line with the UC norm. When all is said and done, the necessary condition for growing our graduate student enrollment substantially is substantial growth of the faculty. Of course, growth alone is not sufficient: the campus needs a strategic plan to strengthen our core programs.

The Council requests that the Advisory Committee convey these concerns to the EVC/Provost, with the request that devolution be put on hold to allow informed deliberation and consultation on the question of the wisdom of this policy change.
January 3, 2007

TO: Advisory Committee Members

FM: Thomas Cogswell

RE: CHARGE FOR THE HEALTH AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Dear Colleagues:

Attached is the proposed draft for the Health Sciences Committee.

In addition to deciding on the precise wording of the charge, we must also resolve on whether this should become a standing senate committee or remain an ad hoc Committee. I of course leave any final decision to the collective wisdom of the AC. Yet in the interest of time, I will launch this first as an Ad Hoc Committee.
DRAFT

Charge for the Health Affairs Committee

Since the founding of the university, no single development will impact the campus more than the new medical school. Consequently it is imperative that the Academic Senate be closely involved with the planning and the implementation of this new school.

Towards this end, I am appointing an Ad Hoc Health Affairs Committee with the following charge:

- to develop the curriculum for the medical school; and
- to work with the administration to resolve other matters relating to the new school; and
- to help the founding Dean with initial hires.

While the longevity of this Ad Hoc Committee may be extended, its activities will in the first instance end with the opening of the Medical School.
December 20, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: HELEN HENRY, CHAIR
      FACULTY WELFARE

RE: REVIEW OF DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES FOR THE
    HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN (HSCP) AND
    GUIDELINES FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION
    PLAN FOR THE UCR DIVISION OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES

The Committee on Faculty Welfare has reviewed the Draft Implementation Procedures and the Guidelines for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan for the UCR Division of Biomedical Sciences.

The one substantive question that was raised was whether, as appears to be the case, the Dean and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost have complete control over the Optional Additional Compensation (IV.C. of the Guidelines) without any faculty input as to the principles and policies regarding the standards for this compensation ("Y"). Faculty input into these decisions might be advisable.

Other than this issue, the Committee on Faculty Welfare does not see any other problems with the Guidelines or Implementation Procedures, other than that they are written in such a legalistic style that they are difficult to follow.
TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

FROM: Allen Zych, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Review of Draft Implementation Procedures for the Health Sciences
Compensation Plan (HSCP) and Guidelines for the Health Sciences
Compensation for the UCR Division of Biomedical Sciences

It is CAP’s understanding that these procedures and guidelines will bring UCR in compliance with the current policies and practices at other UC campuses with health sciences latter rank faculty as well as the APM. Thus, it is imperative that they be approved and CAP supports their approval. The Plan for additional compensation is different enough from that of non-health sciences faculty that it is difficult for the present CAP membership to consider the different aspects in detail. We note that when UCR health sciences faculty do become involved in clinical services, this aspect will have to be included along with the traditional research, teaching and service activities for merit and promotion considerations.
November 21, 2006

TO: HELEN HENRY, CHAIR, FACULTY WELFARE
    ALLEN D. ZYCH, CHAIR, CAP

FM: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: REVIEW OF DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES FOR THE HEALTH
    SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN (HSCP) AND GUIDELINES FOR THE
    HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN FOR THE UCR DIVISION OF
    BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES

Please have your committees review the attached document regarding the above referenced plan and send your comments to me no later than December 20, 2006 so that it can be reviewed by the Advisory Committee.
To: Thomas Cogswell
   Academic Senate Chair

From: Elizabeth Lord
      Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

Re: Request for Review of Draft Implementation Procedures for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) and Guidelines for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) for the UCR Division of Biomedical Sciences

I write to request the Academic Senate's assistance in reviewing the attached draft documents on the University of California, Riverside, Division of Biomedical Sciences, Implementation Procedures for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan and the University of California, Riverside, Division of Biomedical Sciences Guidelines for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. These drafts have been reviewed and approved by the Division of Biomedical Sciences faculty and a preliminary review by the Office of the President has occurred. It is imperative that local implementation procedures and guidelines be issued as soon as possible to bring the campus in compliance with the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). Please consult the appropriate Senate committee(s) (e.g., Committee on Academic Personnel) for input on the drafts.

I would appreciate receiving comments by no later than December 16, 2006 (end of fall quarter). We have been out of compliance now for many years and the Office of the President is anxious for us to have an approved plan in place as soon as possible.

Attachments:
   UCR, Implementation Procedures for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan
   UCR, Guidelines for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan

cc: Chancellor Córdova
    Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Wartella
    Vice Chancellor Bolar
    Academic Personnel
I. INTRODUCTION

The Health Sciences Compensation Plan (Regents' Plan) was approved by The Regents of the University of California in July 1999 for implementation at all University of California health sciences schools. In accordance with the Regents' Plan, the President issued Guidelines on Occasional Outside Professional Activities by Health Sciences Plan Participants (Guidelines). These University of California, Riverside, Division of Biomedical Sciences Implementation Procedures for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (Implementation Procedures) provide supplementary regulations for implementation of the Regents' Plan. Any additional procedures or guidelines for the Division must be approved by the Dean of the Division of Biomedical Sciences (hereafter simply referred to as the Dean), the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Divisional faculty.

These Implementation Procedures have been recommended by the Chancellor, after consultation with the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, the Dean, and the Divisional faculty, and are effective January 1, 2006, after approval by the President.

In adopting these Implementation Procedures the faculty and administration of the UCR Division of Biomedical Sciences affirm the philosophy outlined in the Regents' Plan. The Regents' Plan and these Implementation Procedures will be used to foster academic balance and the joint responsibilities of teaching, research, patient care, and other public service responsibilities. Individual levels of compensation will be established so as to maintain this academic balance and to permit the recruitment and retention of the individuals necessary for the Division to fulfill its missions at a level of excellence.

In addition to these Implementation Procedures, Plan 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 the 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 may obtain information on the disclosure and disqualification requirements of the Political Reform Act of 1974, including the Academic Decision Regulation, from the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.

Operation of the Plan shall not require the expenditure of more State-appropriated (i.e., 19900) funds than would operation without the Plan.

II. REVIEW AND APPROVAL RESPONSIBILITY

These Implementation Procedures are developed to be consistent with the policy framework of the Regents' Plan. Affected Plan participants, the Dean's Compensation Plan Advisory Committee, and the Committee on Academic Personnel shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed revisions to these Implementation Procedures. Any proposed revisions must be reviewed and approved by the Dean, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, the Chancellor, and the President. Local implementation shall be administered by the Dean.
The Dean shall also review annually the Compensation Plan budget and how allocations are being distributed.

The President may approve individual exceptions to the provisions of the Regents’ Plan to meet special teaching, research, or clinical service requirements. All such exception requests shall be proposed by the Dean upon the recommendation of the Divisional faculty, and endorsed by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and Chancellor prior to the President’s review. The UC Riverside Divisional Academic Senate Chair shall be provided the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed exceptions to these Implementation Procedures that the Chancellor intends to submit to the President for approval.

III. MEMBERSHIP IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN

A. Membership Requirements

Division of Biomedical Sciences faculty shall be members of the Plan if they hold a University appointment at greater than 50% of full time, funded by the Division, in any of the following professorial series.

1. Professor
2. Professor in Residence
3. Professor of Clinical ______________ (e.g., Medicine)
4. Adjunct Professor
5. Acting Professor
6. Clinical Professor
7. Visiting Professor
8. Health Sciences School Dean titles
9. Any other title series approved for membership in this Plan by the President

The Dean may approve membership in the Plan for otherwise eligible faculty members who have retired and are recalled.

Membership in the Plan is a term and condition of employment. It is the responsibility of the Dean to ensure that all new and continuing eligible Plan members receive a copy of the Regents’ Plan, these Implementation Procedures, and the Division Guidelines. All new faculty shall sign the following statement:

"I certify that I have received a copy of the University of California Health Sciences Compensation Plan, the UCR Division of Biomedical Sciences Implementation Procedures, and the Division Guidelines. 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 those documents. I understand further that compliance with provisions contained in The Health Sciences Compensation Plan, these Implementation Procedures, and related Division Guidelines are a condition of employment for Plan members."

B. Period of Membership in the Plan

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

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

A. Total Compensation

Faculty members participating in the Plan shall receive base salary, shall be eligible for optional additional compensation, and shall be permitted to retain other miscellaneous income as described below. No State funds shall be used for compensation that exceeds the portion of base salary equivalent to the Fiscal Year Salary Scales, or approved off-scale equivalent, for the Plan member’s rank and step, or for optional additional compensation as described in Section C below. This portion of additional compensation shall be funded using Compensation Plan funds and other non-State funds in compliance with any related fund source restrictions.

B. Base Salary

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 and step. The base salary is covered under the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) up to the amount permissible by law and in accordance with UCRP provisions and regulations. Salary scales are assigned to Academic Program Units (APU) and may be changed in accordance with guidelines issued by the President and with approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. See the Division Guidelines for salary scale assignment.

Base scale assignment will be uniform by APU as recommended by the Dean and approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. An APU may advance to the next highest salary scale (Health Sciences Compensation Plan Salary Scale table) each successive fiscal year with the approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. Except under unusual circumstances and only with approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, mid-year adjustments in APU salary scales are not permitted.

C. Optional Additional Compensation

Supplemental to the base salary, faculty members may receive additional compensation in accordance with fund source restrictions as described below. Division Guidelines shall specify how additional compensation is calculated and when it will be paid. Plan participants shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on proposed division guidelines and proposed revisions.

1. Negotiated additional compensation ("Y")

The Dean may annually negotiate and recommend to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for approval an amount of additional compensation to be funded from any allowable fund source and paid at the rate of 1/12 of the annual amount per month. This component is in addition to the base salary and is not covered compensation for the University of California Retirement Plan. Mid-year renegotiation of the "Y" is permitted only under unusual circumstances and with the approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost upon recommendation of the Dean.
2. Incentive/Bonus compensation ("Z")

Plan members may receive incentive/bonus compensation beyond base and negotiated additional compensation. All incentive/bonus compensation must be approved by the Dean. Division Guidelines shall describe the manner in which members may earn incentive compensation beyond base and negotiated compensation, upon approval of the Dean. Incentive/bonus compensation is not covered compensation for the University of California Retirement Plan.

Prior to the start of each fiscal year, 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 setting forth base salary scale assignment, additional compensation (if any is approved), and methodology for the calculation and payment of bonus/incentive compensation.

D. Income That May be Retained by Plan Members

Income due the Plan must be deposited into the Division compensation plan and maintained in individual revenue accounts. Income includes both cash and non-cash compensation, including stock and stock options, received for professional services. The categories of income listed below accruing from occasional service may be retained by the faculty member.

The Dean shall monitor the frequency of individual activity in these areas. Only income from category 1 of this section must be reported annually as described below in section E. 2. a. The income from categories 2-7 may be retained and is excluded from reporting requirements and does not count in the outside activities time or earning thresholds as described in section E. 1. of these Implementation Procedures. All other professional activity income is attributable to the Plan. All activities must be consistent with and conducted within the limitations of APM 025-10, Guidelines for Compensated Outside Professional Activities.

1. **Income** from up to 48 days of service (other than patient care) per fiscal year to government agencies, to non-profit health- or education-related organizations, to continuing medical education programs administered by the University, or to University Extension.

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

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

4. **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.

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

6. **Administrative stipends**, defined in Academic Personnel Policy 633 as payments by the University for responsibilities related to University administration beyond normal academic responsibilities.
7 Income from a profession or activity unrelated to the training and experience which is the individual's qualification (e.g., Ph.D. or M.D. degree) for University appointment as determined by the Dean, in consultation with the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

E. Requirements on Occasional Outside Professional Activities

The amount of time devoted to outside professional activities and the amount of earnings that may be retained from such professional activities are subject to the time and earning thresholds outlined below, item 1. of this section. Faculty in good standing, as described in 2.b. of this section, may retain income for occasional professional services (other than patient care) from governmental agencies, non-profit health- or education-related organizations, continuing health education programs administered by the University, and University Extension. In addition, faculty in good standing, as described in 2.b. of this section, may retain income from the following compensated professional services (other than patient care): consulting income from non-profit and for-profit entities, and/or income from consulting or testifying as an expert or professional witness. The maximum number of days allowed must not exceed the time limits established for compensated outside professional activities in Academic Personnel Policy 025 (currently 48 days). Professional income subject to the Regent's Plan requirements includes both cash and non-cash compensation (e.g., stock or stock options).

A faculty member's outside professional activities may create an obligation for the faculty member to disclose a financial interest before participating in certain activities. Plan participants must comply with the terms of 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 making or participating in University decisions in which they have a personal financial interest. Faculty may obtain information about these requirements from the campus Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel.

The following guidelines outline the requirements for Plan participants engaging in occasional outside professional activity. Affected Plan participants and the Dean's Compensation Plan Advisory Committee shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on proposed guidelines and revisions in such guidelines.

1. Annual Outside Professional Approval Threshold:

There are two components to the threshold: maximum time and maximum earnings. Service during paid and unpaid leave of absence (e.g., vacation, holidays, weekends) counts towards the threshold.

a. Limit on number of days devoted to outside professional activity

The total number of hours for all outside activities (service to government agencies, non-profits, for profit, legal witness, etc) for which income is retained must not exceed 48 days or 384 hours. Plan participants who wish to exceed this time threshold must receive approval for outside professional activities that exceed this amount from the Dean in advance of the activity. All income from activities beyond 48 days is due the Plan (even if the earning limit has not been reached).
b. Limit on amount of outside earnings

The maximum annual outside professional earnings is $20,000 or 20% of the faculty member’s base salary (covered compensation), whichever is greater. All income from activities above this threshold is due the Plan (even if the time threshold of 48 days has not been reached).

A Plan participant who has satisfied the department’s good standing criteria (see below, section 2.b.) who has not exceeded the limit on the number of days devoted to compensated outside professional activities and whose annual earnings from all outside professional activities will be less than $20,000 or 20% of the faculty member’s base salary (covered compensation), whichever is greater, is allowed to engage in outside professional activities (other than patient care) without having to request prior approval from the Dean to engage in the activities.

Plan participants have the responsibility for maintaining a running total of their annual earnings and the time spent on all outside professional activities.

Only the Chancellor has the authority to approve a professional activity that exceeds the Plan maximum. If a Plan participant wishes to engage in an activity that might reasonably be expected to generate earnings in excess of $20,000, or 20% of the faculty member’s base salary (covered compensation), whichever is greater, the participant must request approval from the Dean who will then forward it to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Chancellor. The request must describe the nature of the activity, the person or entity that will receive and/or pay for the service (e.g., government entity, for profit company, etc.), the anticipated time/days, the total expected income, and must specifically state by how much the earnings threshold will be exceeded if the activity is approved. All such approvals must be in writing with a copy to the President.

If a request is not approved, the Dean will advise the Plan participant whether: 1) the activity may be undertaken, but with all related income accruing to the Compensation Plan, or 2) the activity may not be undertaken at all.

After a Plan participant has received approval to engage in the one activity which may cause the total time and/or annual earnings from outside professional activities to exceed the established approval thresholds, s/he must request the Dean’s approval for all subsequent engagement(s). If such engagements are allowed, they shall be undertaken with all related income accruing to the Compensation Plan.

Plan participants shall notify the Dean immediately if they inadvertently exceed the time or dollar threshold, or if any of the information they provided in an approval request changes or becomes inaccurate. The Dean should immediately notify the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost if s/he believes a Plan participant has violated, neglected, or manipulated Plan requirements. Plan participants are subject to corrective action and disciplinary measures as described in section E.5. for such violations.

2. Mechanisms for Addressing Potential Conflicts of Commitment

   a. Reporting of Outside Professional Activities
Each Plan participant must submit to the Dean an annual report describing the previous year’s outside professional activities from which the Plan participant retained income and an attestation of adherence to Division’s Implementation Procedures and Division Guidelines. This report must itemize outside activities in temporal order and should be consistent with the reporting requirements specified in APM 025. This report is due by the 15th of each January. It is the Plan participant’s responsibility to bring to the attention of the Dean those activities that require advance approval pursuant to sections IV. E.1. and E.2.b.

The report will include, at a minimum, the following:

1) description of service performed
2) name of organization or person who received the service
3) type of organization (e.g., non-profit, for-profit, govt. agency, etc.)
4) amount of compensation
5) number of compensated days involved

b. Good Standing Criteria

A Plan participant must satisfy the following good standing criteria in order to be allowed to earn and/or retain income from professional activities. Any faculty member who is not in good standing shall be notified in writing by the Dean of the reasons for that determination. Faculty not in good standing must obtain advance approval from the Dean to engage in any unassigned professional activities and the income from all such activities shall accrue to the Plan, not to the Plan participant. Faculty who believe the good standing criteria have been applied unfairly may appeal to the Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee, see section VII. Prior to the implementation or revision of good standing criteria, Plan participants shall be provided the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed criteria.

Good standing criteria include requirements for the following:

1) fulfillment of teaching obligations in the Division of Biomedical Sciences
2) active engagement in research
3) active engagement in activities of the Division pursuant to its educational and service missions
4) compliance with the compensation plan
3. Limitations on Use of University Resources in Connection with Outside Professional Activities

The use of University staff, laboratories, facilities or other University resources in connection with outside professional activities is subject to limitations. The Faculty Code of Conduct, Part II, C. lists the unauthorized uses of University resources or facilities on a significant scale for personal, commercial, political, or religious purposes as a type of unacceptable conduct (ref. APM 015, Section II). When faculty retain income from professional consulting for-profit entities or expert witness activities, the costs associated with the consulting or witness activities are to be borne by the third party or faculty member, not the university. In addition, 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.

Examples of acceptable use include: use of office telephones or faxes for incoming or outgoing communications (although long-distance charges should not be borne by the University); use of departmental office for interviews or other similar activities; use of University-provided computer (though not departmental computer support personnel). While administrative support staff might appropriately accept phone calls, take normal messages, and schedule appointments at the request of individuals outside the university, they should not be asked to arrange meetings, prepare materials, schedule travel, etc. when these activities relate to the outside professional activities of a faculty member.

4. Monitoring and Enforcement

Responsibility for monitoring and enforcement will rest primarily with the Dean. The primary means of monitoring compliance will be review by the Dean of information provided by the faculty member in annual reports on outside professional activities. If the Dean has any concerns about whether a Plan participant is meeting the established standards, the matter should be referred to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. If the Dean or the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost has reason to believe that a Plan participant has not complied with the procedures on outside professional activities, the Dean, after consultation with the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee, may take appropriate action to bring the plan member into compliance.

5. 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 Plan, the Implementation Procedures, and/or Division Guidelines.

Situations where Plan participants will be considered out of compliance with the guidelines on outside professional activities include, but are not limited to:

a. Failure to turn over income due to the Plan as required by these Implementation Procedures and Division Guidelines.

b. Failure to accurately disclose and describe the nature and scope of outside professional activities as required by these Implementation Procedures and Division Guidelines, including submission of an annual report.
Corrective action refers to the discontinuation of certain privileges available only to Plan members, in particular the opportunity to earn and receive compensation above the fiscal year salary scale through the Plan because of non-compliance. For example, corrective action may include the reduction of Additional Compensation (the "Y") with consideration of the Plan member’s prior performance, including compliance with guidelines on outside professional activities; and/or the discontinuation of Bonus Compensation (the "Z") until such time as the Plan member complies with the Regents’ Plan provisions. Whenever such corrective action is taken, faculty shall be so notified in writing.

In addition, corrective action will not preclude sanctions or disciplinary measures in accordance with the Faculty Code of Conduct and Academic Senate Bylaws. Violations by Plan members of either the time limits or approval thresholds on outside professional activities represent an unauthorized use of University resources and/or retention of funds belonging to the University. Such violations are subject to discipline in accordance with the Faculty Code of Conduct. 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.


Policy on the requirement to submit Proposals and to receive awards for grants and contracts through the University applies to all faculty. This policy states that employees who receive any part of their salary through the University, or whose activities use University resources or facilities, must submit their proposals for extramural support through the appropriate University contracts and grants office. This requirement ensures that all research and other extramurally funded projects comply with relevant University policy and guidelines.

7. Disposition of Income Due the Plan

Income due to the Plan must be deposited into the Division Compensation Plan and will be maintained in individual accounts. Income will be banked for use in paying the "Y" portion of the faculty salary. Payment of incentive/bonus compensation must be approved by the Dean. See section IV.C.2. for policy governing incentive/bonus compensation.

8. Non-cash Compensation; Guidelines on Valuing Stock and Stock Options

Professional income governed by the Plan includes not only cash compensation, but also non-cash compensation. Plan participants are required to disclose non-cash compensation received in exchange for professional services to the Dean within 30 days of receipt, at which time it will be valued. If the stock is given to the faculty member at no cost, dollars equal to the stock’s full value on the date of receipt are due to the Plan. If the purchase price is equal to the market price/value on the date of receipt, no money is owed the Plan. If the purchase price is below valued price on the date of receipt, the difference between the purchase price and the value of the stock on the date of receipt is due the Plan. Following the determination of the value of the stock, the faculty member will be notified of the nature of any Plan obligations, based on the above methodology. Faculty who neglect to disclose the stock at the time of receipt will owe the Plan
the difference between the stock at the purchase price or the value of the stock at the time of receipt and the value of the stock at the time it is disclosed.

Disclosure at the time of receipt is required regardless of the stock’s potential value, and regardless of whether a faculty member believes that any dollars are due the Plan. Participants may be able to retain the dollars due the Plan if they have not yet met or exceeded their time/dollar threshold for outside professional activities. However, both the time spent in outside professional activities related to the receipt of stock and any dollars due the Plan under the formula above must be counted in the time/earnings threshold.

**Stock options** received in lieu of compensation for outside professional activities also must be disclosed to the Dean within 30 days of the date the stock option agreement is signed. The Dean’s Office will obtain a valuation of the stock as of the date of the agreement. If the option offer price is equal to or greater than the stock’s valuation/market price on the date the agreement is signed, no money is owed the Plan. If the option price is below its valued price on the date the agreement is signed, the difference between the option price and the value of the stock is due the Plan. Following determination of the value of the stock, the faculty member will be notified of the nature of any Plan obligations, based on the above methodology. Faculty who neglect to disclose agreements will owe the Plan the difference between the offered option price at the time the agreement was signed and the value of the stock at the time it is disclosed.

Disclosure of stock options is required regardless of 1) the stock’s potential valuation, 2) whether the faculty member intends to exercise the options, and 3) whether the faculty member believes that any dollars are due the Plan. Faculty may be able to retain the dollars due the Plan if they have not yet met or exceeded their time/dollar threshold for outside professional activities. However, both the time spent in outside professional activities related to the receipt of stock options and any dollars that would be due the Plan under the above formula must be counted towards the time/earning thresholds.

**Founder’s stock** received in lieu of compensation for outside professional activities must also be disclosed to the Dean within 30 days of the date of receipt. It will be valued at the time of receipt and any value will be due the Plan. Since the value of founder’s stock is generally insignificant, in most cases a negligible amount would be owed the Plan. However, if the founder’s stock is not disclosed upon the time of receipt, the value of the stock at the time of disclosure is due the Plan.

V. BENEFITS

A. Base Salary-Related Benefits

These benefits are associated with that portion of an individual’s salary from one of the Health Sciences Salary Scales, paid through the University of California payroll system. These benefits include participation in the basic University of California Retirement Plan, health care insurance, disability insurance, regular term life insurance, and other benefits as may be approved by The Regents. Base salary-related benefits will be available to faculty members who are members of this Plan on the same basis as to all other members of the University’s faculty.
B. Paid Leave

Plan members who are eligible for sabbatical leave, leave with salary, vacation leave, parental leave or sick leave may be granted such leave at the Health Sciences Scales Base Salary or the total negotiated salary rate as set forth in the Division Guidelines. While on paid or unpaid leave, faculty are bound by the rules of the Plan, even if salary is dropped to the base salary rate. While on leave faculty are bound by the rules of the Plan, Implementation Procedures, and Division Guidelines, including those policies related to income due the Plan.

VI. 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 these Implementation Procedures, Section IV.D. 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. All income owed the University must be deposited into the Division's revenue account. All financial transactions must be approved, documented, and otherwise processed or executed in accordance with University policies, procedures and delegations of authority.

   a. There is no clinical practice in the Division, and consequently, there are no professional fee and collection activities. If at some time in the future Division faculty members do start to engage in clinical activities these Implementation Procedures will be revised in advance of such activity.

   b. Divisional records shall be maintained whereby the collections for each faculty member will be separately identified. These records will be made available to the respective faculty member or group upon written request to the Dean. These records may serve as a basis for determining compensation paid to individual faculty members in accordance with Section IV and/or for establishing a budget to be used by faculty members for academic enrichment. This budget may be used to fund University approved expenses such as professional organization dues, travel expenses or professional subscriptions. Funds to pay these University approved expenses should be separately identified within the Division's fund and account structure. Payments for such expenses must be processed in accordance with University policies.

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

The Division, in cooperation with the Campus Accounting Office, shall establish a separate Compensation Plan fund account(s) for the Division. All fund accounts shall be separate University accounts and shall receive income from the following sources:

1. Income from professional services.

2. Professional school fees paid by the medical students for enrollment in year 1 and 2 of the medical school curriculum.

3. Such other funds as are required by the Chancellor or the 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 and Clinical Services Income

All assessment rates described below will be reviewed annually. The Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee will review and make recommendations on proposals submitted by the Dean to change the Division and Practice Development Assessment rates. If the Dean and Committee cannot reach an agreement as to the assessment rates, the Dean may decide the issue or refer the issue to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for a decision.

1. Assessment of Professional Income

An assessment will be charged annually on gross income from professional services and related professional activity. The assessment rate will be determined between the Dean and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and be reflected in the annual Division Budget Plan.

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

The Division shall establish a reserve fund whose purpose is to provide the funds necessary to pay Plan expenses, including the agreed upon expenses to each Plan participant, in the event that the current year income of the Plan is insufficient to do so. If the funds in the reserve account are insufficient for the purpose, the Chancellor may seek support from another non-State fund account. If such support is not forthcoming, the campus will reduce the participants’ additional compensation in a uniform manner across the Division in accordance with any fund restrictions.

Although funds may be transferred from one fund to another within the Division in accordance with University accounting and budgeting policies and procedures, Division fund accounts shall be maintained as financially independent for administrative purposes.
E. Budgeting

The Dean shall annually submit a budget of estimated revenues and expenditures to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Chancellor for approval. The budget will consist of a revenue projection and anticipated expenses including salary and benefits, assessments and all other expenses. Budget updates may be required as frequently as the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost considers necessary. Current year expenditures shall be budgeted for and funded in the following order of priority:

1. Should UCR faculty develop Clinical practices, these Implementation Procedures will be revised to delineate the management of clinical practice operating expenses.

2. Compensation 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 all the foregoing expenditures, the Division shall contribute funds to the reserve for contingencies in an amount recommended by the Dean and the Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee, and approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Chancellor.

4. When the Division 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 Division (including but not limited to salaries for support personnel) as recommended by the Dean and the Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee and approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost;

b) The remainder may be used for other purposes in the Division as recommended by the Dean and the Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee and approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Chancellor.

VII. Advisory Committee

A Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee, comprised of three (3) faculty members elected by Plan participants and one administrative staff member appointed by the Dean shall be established to advise the Dean in resolving issues which arise from implementation of these Implementation Procedures and in resolving issues on outside professional activities. The Dean shall also review annually the Compensation Plan budget and how allocations are being distributed. The term for each faculty member shall be three years with one person leaving each year. Should a member depart the committee prior to the end of his/her term, a replacement member shall be elected to serve the remainder of the term. The committee’s functions shall include advising the Dean on:

a. processes for developing Division implementation procedures, including the establishment of good standing criteria and approval thresholds

b. process for developing Division procedures including methods for obtaining faculty input and for determining consistency with the Division Implementation Procedures and Division Guidelines
c. faculty grievances with regard to the implementation and administration of the Division Implementation Procedures and Division Guidelines

d. assistance in assuring compliance with and resolving issues on outside professional activities, conflicts of interest, and conflict of commitment. To ensure that the formal complaint process is fair and impartial, committee members shall excuse themselves from deliberation on any single complaint if the committee member has already participated in an administrative review of the action being considered in the grievance process or if there is a conflict of interest.

Faculty who have a complaint about issues related to outside professional activities should first try to resolve the issues at the Division level through the Dean's Compensation Plan Advisory Committee. If the complaint cannot be resolved through discussion, the faculty member’s complaint and the Dean’s response should be memorialized in writing. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Dean’s decision, the member should write a formal complaint in a letter to the Vice Chancellor for Conflict Resolution. The Vice Chancellor for Conflict Resolution will review the facts of the case. Both the complainant and the Dean will have the right to present their case. The Vice Chancellor for Conflict Resolution will issue a formal recommendation for resolution for consideration by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost’s decision, the member can pursue administrative remedies through applicable University academic personnel processes.
I. INTRODUCTION

The Health Sciences Compensation Plan (Plan) was approved by The Regents' of the University of California in July 1999 for implementation at all University of California health sciences schools. These Divisional Guidelines (Guidelines) supplement the UCR Implementation Procedures (Implementation Procedures) for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. In adopting these Guidelines, the faculty and administration of the UCR Division of Biomedical Sciences affirm the philosophy outlined in the Plan. The Plan, Implementation Procedures, and Guidelines will be used in the Division to foster academic balance among the joint responsibilities of teaching, research, patient care, and other university and public service responsibilities. Benefits and individual levels of compensation will be established so as to maintain this academic balance and to permit the recruitment and retention of the individuals necessary for the Division to fulfill its missions at a level of excellence.

II. REVIEW AND APPROVAL RESPONSIBILITY

The regulations included in the Plan are intended to provide a policy framework with which the Implementation Procedures and these Guidelines are consistent. These Guidelines and any subsequent revisions must be reviewed and voted upon by the entire faculty in the Division and approved by the Dean and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. Annually, the methodology for determining the "Y" factor, outside compensation assessment fee, or any other components of these Guidelines will be reviewed.

III. MEMBERSHIP IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES COMPENSATION PLAN

Membership in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan is consistent with Section III of the Plan and the Division Implementation Procedures for all faculty in eligible status. All new and continuing Plan members will receive a copy of the Plan document, the Division Implementation Procedures, and these Guidelines.

IV. COMPENSATION

A. Total Compensation

Faculty members participating in this Plan shall receive Base Salary and shall be eligible for additional compensation, as described below:

B. Base Salary

Base Salary ("X") for an individual is the approved Scale 1 of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan Salary Scales, associated with that faculty member's academic rank, step, and Academic Program Unit (APU). 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. No State funds shall be used for compensation above the portion of Base Salary equivalent to the Fiscal Year salary scales, or approved off-scale equivalent, for the Plan member's rank and step, or for optional additional compensation as described in Section C below. All Division faculty shall be members of the same APU. The base salary for all Division faculty is set at Salary Scale 1 of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan Salary Scales, associated with
the individual’s academic rank and step. APU structure and salary scale assignment will be reviewed annually.

C. Optional Additional Compensation

Optional Additional Compensation may be paid, in accordance with fund source restrictions, as follows:

1. Negotiated additional compensation ("Y")

   A member of the Biomedical Sciences Faculty may also receive optional additional compensation of a factor 0.25 to 0.75 of the corresponding “Fiscal Year Professorial Salary Scale” from any allowable fund source and paid at a rate of 1/12 of the annual amount per month. This additional compensation will be negotiated annually with the Dean and recommended to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for approval. Negotiations for additional “Y” compensation should be done with the Dean prior to May 15th with an effective date of July 1st.

   Faculty members will only be eligible to receive negotiated additional compensation (i.e., the “Y” compensation) if:

   a. the faculty member meets the “good standing criteria” as defined in the Implementation Procedures section IV.E.2.b;
   b. the faculty member demonstrates a strong record of productivity in teaching, research and service;
   c. funding is available in the Plan member’s individual Salary Retention Account, defined as extramural funding over and above the “X” component and allowed by the funding agency or other secure funds with which to fund a higher salary in the subsequent fiscal year;
   d. there is a history of funding as well as a strong indication that the funding will continue.

   Division standards for determining “Y” compensation, as defined above in section C.1.c, will be reviewed annually with the Division faculty, with any changes approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost upon the Dean’s recommendation.

   The “Y” component is beyond the base salary and is not covered compensation for the University of California Retirement Plan.

2. Incentive/Bonus compensation ("Z")

   Plan members may receive incentive/bonus compensation ("Z") beyond base and negotiated additional compensation ("Y"). All incentive/bonus compensation must be approved by the Dean, and is not covered compensation for the University of California Retirement Plan. It is expected that this type of compensation will be paid only in exceptional cases, as determined by the Dean. At a minimum, the faculty member involved should meet the same minimal criteria as defined in section 1a-d above. Division standards for determining Incentive/Bonus pay will be reviewed annually with the Division faculty, with any changes approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost upon the Dean’s recommendation.
By July 1 of each fiscal year, 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. Base salary scale assignment, Additional Compensation, and the methodology for calculating and paying out all types of Optional Additional Compensation must be detailed in this Statement.

D. Income That May be Retained by Plan Members

Income due the Plan must be deposited into the Division compensation plan and maintained in individual revenue accounts. Income includes both cash and non-cash compensation, including stock and stock options, received for professional services. The Division Implementation Procedures detail what types of income may be retained by Plan participants. The Dean shall monitor the frequency of individual activity in these areas. All other professional activity income is attributable to the Plan. All activities must be consistent and conducted within the limitations of APM 025-10, Guidelines for Compensated Outside Professional Activities.

E. Requirements on Occasional Outside Professional Activities

Faculty in good standing, as described in the Implementation Procedures, may retain income for occasional services (other than payments for patient care) from governmental agencies, non-profit health- or education-related organizations, continuing health education programs administered by the University, and University Extension which does not exceed 48 days. The maximum number of days allowed must not exceed the time limits established on compensated outside professional activities in Academic Personnel Policy 025 (currently 48 days).

In addition, Plan participants may also retain the following kinds of professional income: consulting income from non-profit and for-profit entities, and/or income from consulting or testifying as an expert or professional witness as outlined in the Implementation Procedures. Professional income subject to the Regent’s Plan requirements includes both cash and non-cash compensation (e.g., stock or stock options).

These Guidelines provide supplemental information for Division Plan members regarding the Division’s requirements on occasional outside professional activities. Division Plan participants and the Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on proposed guidelines and revisions in such guidelines. Division good standing criteria and annual approval thresholds will be reviewed annually with Division faculty, with any changes approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost upon the Dean’s recommendation.

1. Annual outside approval time-limit and dollar-limit thresholds are delineated in the Divisional Implementation Procedures.

2. Types of income that may be retained by Plan participants are delineated in the Divisional Implementation Procedures.

3. Mechanisms for addressing potential conflicts of commitment include reporting of outside activities and meeting the Division’s good standing criteria.

   a. Reporting of Outside Professional Activities

   Each Plan participant must submit to the Dean an annual report describing the previous year’s outside professional activities from which the Plan participant retained income and
an attestation of adherence to Division’s Implementation Procedures and Guidelines. This report must itemize outside activities in temporal order and must be consistent with the reporting requirements specified in APM 025. This report is due by the 15th of each January. It is the Plan participant’s responsibility to bring to the attention of the Dean those activities that require advance approval pursuant to sections IV.E.1 and E.2.b. The report will include, at a minimum, the following:

1) description of service performed
2) name of organization or person who received the service
3) type of organization (e.g. non-profit, for-profit, govt. agency, etc.)
4) amount of compensation
5) number of compensated days involved

4. Good standing criteria are delineated in the Divisional Implementation Procedures.

V. BENEFITS

A. Base Salary-Related Benefits

These benefits are associated with that portion of an individual’s salary from one of the Health Sciences Salary Scales, paid through the University of California payroll system. These benefits include participation in the basic University of California Retirement Plan, health care insurance, disability insurance, regular term life insurance, and other benefits as may be approved by The Regents. Base salary-related benefits will be available to faculty members who are members of this Plan on the same basis as to all other members of the University’s faculty.

B. Paid Leave

1. Vacation Leave

Faculty members accrue vacation leave at a rate of two days per month for full time service. For part-time faculty working 50% time or more, vacation allowance accumulates at a proportionate rate of full-time vacation leave credit. For part-time appointees working less than half time, there is no vacation accrual.

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 is paid at a rate equal to the full salary in effect immediately prior to separation.

2. Extended Illness/Disability Leave

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. In such cases, the Division faculty will receive for six weeks the full negotiated salary rate that was in effect immediately prior to the leave (i.e., X + Y, excluding any incentive bonuses), followed if necessary by six weeks of pay at the level of the individual’s covered compensation (as determined by rank, step and approved APU salary scale).
Eligible faculty are encouraged to enroll in the UC employee-paid supplemental disability plan at the time of hire. Faculty should consult current plan documents for complete information about the University benefit plans and the coverage they provide.

3. Childbearing and Other Parental Leaves

In accordance with APM 760, childbearing leave shall be granted on request to eligible faculty, for the period prior to and following childbirth. The Division will provide salary at the full negotiated salary rate (i.e., X + Y) during these leaves. The normal period for childbearing leave will be six weeks, although more time may be necessary for medical reasons; in such cases the Division’s policy regarding leaves for extended illness shall apply. An additional six weeks of paid leave may be provided at the level of the individual’s covered compensation (as determined by the individual’s rank, step, and approved APU salary scale), as above under Extended Illness/Disability Leaves.

Paternity/co-parent leave shall be granted on request to a faculty member for the period following childbirth. The Division shall provide salary at the full negotiated salary rate (i.e., X + Y) during these leaves. The normal period for parental/co-parent leave shall be one week.

Parental leave without pay is subject to the Dean’s approval and 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 + 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 for Health Sciences Compensation Plan faculty members. The faculty member requesting a period of ASMD must confer with the Dean prior to its effective date, in order to reach agreement on the nature and scope of the individual’s duties during this period. A maximum of one quarter may be granted at the Scale 1 salary rate.

4. 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. Additional negotiated compensation 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 shall be limited by the availability of extramural 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.

5. Other Leaves with Pay
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 (i.e., \( X + Y \)).

6. **Leave 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 Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. In general, such leaves may not exceed one year. However, during such periods of leave, faculty may not engage in compensated outside professional activities, 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, for faculty placed on administrative leave, or for those on leave under the terms of a formal UCR affiliation with an outside organization such as the Howard Hughes Medical Institute).

**VI. CAMPUS ACCOUNTING AND BUDGETING METHODS**

The Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee will review and make recommendations on proposals submitted by the Dean to change the Division and Practice Development Assessment rates annually. If the Dean and Committee cannot reach an agreement as to the assessment rates, the Dean will determine the assessment rate or refer the issue to the Chancellor for a decision.

   a. The Division assessment will be five percent. The Division assessment will be used by the Division for purposes as determined by the Dean in consultation with the Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee. The annual Division assessment rate will be determined by July 1 and will be effective on that date.

   b. Use of Assessments will be determined at the discretion of the Dean upon consultation with the Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee and approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. The Dean shall submit an annual report to the Dean’s Compensation Plan Advisory Committee and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost on the use of these funds.

**VII. ADVISORY COMMITTEE WILL BE ESTABLISHED AS DELINEATED IN THE DIVISIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES**
November 13, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: EUGENE NOTHAGEL, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: PUBLIC POLICY SCHOOL PROPOSAL

In its meeting on November 8, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) discussed the Proposal for a School of Public Policy at UCR. While CEP found the proposal to be interesting and have considerable merit, the proposal lacked several pieces of information that prevented CEP from giving a strong endorsement at this time. The lacking information includes the following:

1. An impressive number of supporting letters from UCR faculty and college-level administrators were appended to the proposal, but CEP was greatly concerned about the complete lack of supporting letters from faculty and administrators in similar programs at other UC campuses or other peer institutions. Such letters are routinely appended to proposals of this impact to provide expert external analysis of the potential strength of the proposed program and of its fit within the context of other UC and area programs. CEP appreciates the unique link of social policy and environmental policy that the proposal outlines, as well as the focus on regional, rather than global, policy. Nevertheless, other university-based programs in public policy exist at UCLA, USC, CSU-San Bernardino, and Pepperdine University in our immediate area, and at UC Berkeley, CSU-Sacramento, and CSPU-San Luis Obispo elsewhere in the state. Another program is available through Rand. The CEP thinks it highly unlikely that a proposal for a School of Public Policy at UCR would be approved at the systemwide level without supporting, analytical letters from peers at other institutions who give expert analysis of the quality and fit of the proposed UCR program. The CEP would be reassured by expert external opinion that the proposed UCR school would be truly competitive, presenting a market value that would enable it to compete at the needed level with other schools in the area to attract the needed quality and quantity of students.

2. The proposal contained no supporting letters from the top-level UCR administration. The proposal plans for 12 faculty FTE, 6 of which would be split appointments, thereby extending the number of involved faculty persons to 18. Will the Executive Vice Chancellor provide this number of positions, and if so, from where will they come? The importance of assurance of this substantial number of FTE from the Executive Vice Chancellor is heightened by the possibility of the start-up of a School of Medicine at the same time as the build-out of this proposed School of Public Policy. The Office of Planning and Budget
projection shows a substantial continuing contribution from “State Marginal Growth”. CEP trusts that the Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget will have a careful look at these financial matters. The CEP is very concerned about the funding for this proposed school to the extent that problems here could cause existing educational programs elsewhere on campus to suffer, especially if the estimated numbers of students in public policy do not materialize.

3. Although supportive letters from faculty who were interested in collaborating were appended to the proposal, the CEP is concerned about how this proposed school might interact (rather than compete) with the Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development. In his attached supporting letter, Professor Warren, Director of the Blakely Center, writes that he sees that “the potential relationships are many and deep” between the Blakely Center and the proposed School of Public Policy. Perhaps the synergism, rather than competition, between these two entities is obvious to Professor Warren, since he is a co-author of the proposal for the School of Public Policy. For the benefit of others, including those at systemwide, who will review the proposal, it might be worthwhile for the proposal to deal more directly with the anticipated relationship to the Blakely Center.

4. Regarding space for the school, the proposal states that options will initially include existing campus space. While we have been told that there are two CHASS buildings under construction, one of our members who is a CHASS department chair understands that the plans for those were downsized by about 30%, and that the new space there is already planned out for existing programs. Where specifically, then, would the new school be housed?

5. Finally, a correction is needed on page 11 of the proposal where, addressing the Ph.D. oral qualifying examination, it is stated that “The student’s dissertation committee will offer this examination.” The composition of the dissertation committee is, in fact, first recommended for appointment by the Graduate Dean on the same form that the results of the qualifying examination are reported, i.e., the dissertation committee is not appointed until after the exam is passed. The CEP trusts that the Graduate Council will also recognize this error in its review of the proposal.

If these additional items of information and the correction are provided, the CEP would be able to deliver a more definite opinion on the proposal.
November 17, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: PROPOSAL FOR SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

The Committee on Planning and Budget has reviewed the proposal for a School of Public Policy on the UCR campus. The Committee fully endorses the proposal. The Committee members feel that the existence of the two new degree programs will help in the recruitment of graduate students to UCR. The members noted that 12 FTEs necessary to found the School have already been allocated. However, because it is a professional school, there were budgetary concerns about the issue of raising additional funds. While there is an impressive outline of a Development Plan of fundraising efforts, the Committee is concerned what will be the consequences to the School if the ambitious goals are not achieved.
TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair  
Academic Senate  

RE: Proposal for a School of Public Policy  

The Council commends the Task Force on Public Policy, particularly its Co-Chairs, Anil Deolalikar and David Warren, for making the strongest possible case for the establishment of a School of Public Policy (SPP) at UCR. We agree that, prospectively, an SPP has much to offer to the academic and intellectual environment of the campus and the community. Nevertheless, serious concerns were raised about the (1) the costs to our core departments of building a robust SPP and (2) the extent to which potentially associated departments have thoroughly vetted and signed on to the proposals for joint appointments and joint programs.

(1) Perhaps to keep the explicit cost low, the authors propose that half of the new school’s complement of 12 FTE lines be used for joint appointments in related departments, specifically economics, political science, sociology, psychology, and environmental science. We have several concerns here. First, we wonder whether eight or nine FTE’s is sufficient to deliver the rather heavy curriculum of the proposed programs. If not, will additional lines be required? Second, ongoing reviews of our graduate programs have made the Council painfully aware of the serious understaffing of many of our core graduate programs; even eight or nine lines would go a long way toward rectifying some of the shortcomings of these programs. Third is the worry about the potential cost to our core graduate programs of having to configure some of their hires to qualify as a joint appointment in the SPP; a recent external review team emphasized this concern in our discussions about one of the programs expected to play a high profile role in the SPP.

More generally, the Council is increasingly concerned about the campus emphasis on top-down initiatives to build interdisciplinary programs at the possible expense of our core graduate programs. Alluding to the need to enhance UCR’s reputational rankings, the Proposal states (page 2) that the “establishment of a SPP will further this goal, as the large majority of AAU member universities in the country have professional public policy schools.” We believe that this statement misses the point: it is our impression that the elite schools first built their reputations on the development of strong basic disciplinary programs, which then provided a solid foundation on which to develop interdisciplinary programs and schools. Few (if any) of UCR’s core graduate programs are ranked in the top quartile of U.S. graduate programs. We believe that, at this stage, our highest priority should be on building strong core programs and worry that the emphasis on new interdisciplinary initiatives may be detracting from that critical objective.
(2) Especially in the light of the worries expressed in point (1), the Council is concerned about the extent to which the relevant department faculties have been consulted on the joint programs and joint appointments in the proposal. To be sure, the departments are well represented by membership in the Task Force, but we would like to see more evidence that the departmental faculties have had the opportunity to comment on these matters. The letters of support evince a considerable amount of individual interest in participation in the proposed policy programs, but there is little evidence that the departments targeted to be linked to the SPP have signed on to the joint programs and appointments. We would like to see explicit expressions of support from department faculties before going ahead with the proposed school.

A few comments on detail follow:

(i) *Timetable and accreditation.* We didn't see any discussion of the procedures or timetable for accreditation that the new school might seek. This is not a major issue, but perhaps it could be mentioned when the proposal goes forward.

(ii) *Curriculum.* (a) The total number of required hours of coursework is not clear to us. We understand the proposal to be suggesting an MPP curriculum of 78 hours: 52 hours of required core courses, 8 hours of thesis, 6 hours of required colloquium (assuming 1 hour/quarter), and 12 hours of electives (plus a summer internship). This would be a rather high number of hours for an academic MA but may be fitting for a professional MA. In any event, the overall hours ought to be clearly specified.

(b) The proposal highlights two required first year courses that deserve special mention (page 7), but only one of them is included on the list of core courses on page 7 (although both appear on the chart on page 8). Instead, the list on page 7 includes "American Political Institutions" twice. Is this a typo?

(c) The proposed doctoral program (page 10) contains two courses with titles identical to two MPH courses but described as "more rigorous". Are these, then, separate courses? Are they taught concurrently with different requirements? Clarification would be helpful, as the answers would have implications for faculty resources.

(iii). *Faculty workload.* In light of the large number of courses, electives, and students, an analysis of faculty workload might be useful, both during build-out and at full development.

On behalf of the Graduate Council,

R. Robert Russell, Chair
TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

FROM: Allen Zych, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Proposal for Establishment of a School of Public Policy

CAP has reviewed this report and supports the plan. It is estimated that twelve new faculty positions would reside in SPP, with about six FTE for joint appointments with other relevant campus units. Depending on which disciplines are involved different salary scales may become a factor. SPP is encouraged to look to other campuses for guidance.
November 30, 2006

Dear Tom,

On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Welfare, I write to inform you that our members have read the proposal for a School of Public Policy, and we find it thoughtful and well-crafted. We do not see any faculty welfare issues about which to be concerned. We wish the proposal well.

With best wishes,
John

John M. Fischer
Distinguished Professor of Philosophy
UC President's Chair
DATE: December 6, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR, RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: KIRIL TOMOFF, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

RE: PROPOSED SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Dear Tom,

The minority of members of COR who responded to the request to review the proposal for the School of Public Policy give the proposal their enthusiastic support. The following features of the proposal were considered especially strong: the proposed focus on regional policy to capitalize on the growing importance of regional policy globally and the apparent paucity of similar schools in the US and on the opportunities presented by UCR’s location in inland Southern California; the proposed concentration on the intersection of social and environmental policy; and the demonstrated synergies between the proposed school and existing faculty and programs already operating at UCR. This last area was most important from the perspective of the charge of this committee, research. There seems little question that the proposed school should improve the research environment for many potential collaborators already on campus.

Members also raised a few questions or areas of concern. Is 12 FTE, many split, enough to realize the ambitious goals spelled out in the proposal? Is there preliminary interest from outside institutions who may provide contacts for the School’s required summer internships and if so should not that be documented in the proposal? In other words, it is theoretically convincing that such a school would increase links between UCR and local, state, and regional policy institutions, but evidence of willingness to cooperate with UCR provided by such institutions would strengthen the proposal. Though respondents thought that the proposed curriculum appeared strong, they also suggested there should ideally be additional required coursework which would provide students opportunities to expand their knowledge about such topics as religious and ethnic diversity, religion in the public sphere, immigration, environmental history, the historical roots of contemporary policy issues, and so forth.

These questions or concerns did not outweigh the enthusiastic support with which the general idea to create a School of Public Policy and this specific proposal were both greeted. But again, only a small minority of COR members responded.
December 19, 2006

To:        Thomas Cogswell
            Chair, UCR Academic Senate

From:      David Crohn
            Chair, Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication

RE:        Proposed School for Public Policy

The Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication wholeheartedly supports the Proposed School for Public Policy. The proposed School represents an efficient and valuable evolution of existing University resources.

The library is well grounded in the fields that will comprise the new School, such as Economics, Education, Environmental Sciences, and Sociology, but The Committee believes that additional funds will be needed to develop, organize and deliver Library resources to the new school. The Committee therefore recommends that an initial $50,000 be allocated to the Library during the initiation of the School and that $50,000 per year be allocated to the library to maintain its collections in support of the new program.

The Committee does not, at this time, support the idea of an independent library for the proposed School. Because the proposed School of Public Policy will be highly interdisciplinary, it will draw on many resources that are already part of the University Library collection. Much would need to be replicated for a new Public Policy library and existing Departments would have difficulty accessing materials at such a facility. Instead, resources should be located at the Rivera and Science Libraries, as appropriate. External fundraising for an endowed librarian chair, as mentioned in the proposal, is a creative idea that would help to assure the excellence of UCR Library resources for the new school. We support this idea, with the understanding that the individual occupying the chair would report to the University Librarian.
REVISED

October 24, 2006

TO: E. A. NOTHNAGEL, CHAIR, EDUCATIONAL POLICY
    ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR, PLANNING AND BUDGET
    ROBERT RUSSELL, CHAIR GRADUATE COUNCIL
    ALLEN D. ZYCH, CHAIR COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
    HELEN HENRY, CHAIR, FACULTY WELFARE
    KIRIL TOMOFF, CHAIR, RESEARCH
    D. M. CROHN, CHAIR, LIBRARY

FM: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: PROPOSAL FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

Attached, please find a proposal for the Establishment of a School of Public Policy from the EVCP for your review. Policy requires that your committees review the proposal before submission to Advisory for endorsement and onward transmission to the entire faculty at the Winter Division Meeting.

I would appreciate receiving your response by November 30, 2006.
Memorandum

10 October 2006

TO:    Thomas Cogswell
       Chair, Academic Senate, Riverside Division

FR:    Ellen Wartella
       Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE: Proposal for a School of Public Policy

I am pleased to submit this proposal to establish a School of Public Policy to the Academic Senate for a recommendation.

Per our conversation, we will follow the sequential approval process defined in section III.B.1. of the University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units. This implies that the potentially lengthy system-wide review will not begin until the Senate has approved the proposal. I am grateful that you have offered to act expeditiously, and I understand that a recommendation might be possible during the November meeting. However, a careful review of the proposal that improves its chances of passing system-wide review is more valuable to me than saving a few weeks of time. Nevertheless, I thank the Senate for attempting to accomplish both.

Thus far the proposal has generated support from many campus groups and individuals. The Public Policy Task Force included members from key Senate committees, such as Graduate Council, Committee on Research, Committee on Education Policy, and Committee on Faculty Welfare. The proposal also has been presented to and informally reviewed by other Senate committees last spring. Finally, letters of support have been included from multiple center directors; senior-level faculty; and deans from GSOE, BCOE, AGSM, and CHASS. I look forward to the Senate’s advice and partnership to advance this important proposal.

cc:    Chancellor Córdova
       Vice Chancellor Bolar
       Interim Dean Deolalikar
       Assistant Vice Chancellor Hull
       Professor Warren

enc:   Proposal for the School of Public Policy
UC RIVERSIDE

PROPOSAL FOR A

SCHOOL OF

PUBLIC POLICY

Submitted October 2006
Task Force on Public Policy

Anil Deolalikar, Department of Economics (CHASS) (Co-Chair)
David Warren, Department of Psychology (Emeritus) (CHASS) (Co-Chair)
Michael Allen, Department of Plant Pathology (CNAS)
Steven Bossert, Graduate School of Education (GSOE)
Shaun Bowler, Department of Political Science (CHASS)
Scott Coltrane, Department of Sociology (CHASS)
Paul Green, Graduate School of Education (GSOE)
Glenn Hatton, Department of Cell Biology and Neuroscience (CNAS)
Helen Henry, Department of Biochemistry (CNAS)
Ruth Jackson, University Librarian
Shankar Mahalingam, Department of Mechanical Engineering (BCOE)
Bryce Mason, Office of the Vice Chancellor/Provost
Kathleen Montgomery, Department of Marketing and Management (AGSM)
Thomas Patterson, Department of Anthropology (CHASS)
Ellen Reese, Department of Sociology (CHASS)
Kirk Williams, Department of Sociology (CHASS)
Charles Whitney, Departments of Creative Writing and Sociology (CHASS)
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1. Introduction and Objectives

We propose the establishment of a professional School of Public Policy (SPP) at UCR. The SPP will offer a professional Masters of Public Policy (MPP) degree, a doctoral degree (PhD) in public policy, as well as a doctorate degree in cooperation with a number of existing departments and programs on campus. Beyond the cooperative doctoral programs, the SPP will develop close working relationships with programs, departments, and schools, in order to serve as the institutional framework to facilitate UCR's scholars in better exploring the policy implications of their research as well as analyzing the effects of existing policies and programs on households, communities and society at large. The SPP will draw upon multiple disciplines and address multiple challenges that public officials face at the regional, state, national, and global levels.

**Mission.** The SPP will have three broad mandates: (i) to train a cadre of students in rigorous policy analysis skills, so that they can pursue careers in local, state, and national governments and in non-profit organizations; (ii) to facilitate research by multidisciplinary teams at UCR on substantive public policy problems that cut across traditional subject boundaries; and (iii) to disseminate key policy research findings to policymakers and administrators.

**Distinctiveness.** Two major themes will define the intellectual character of UCR's SPP and will serve to distinguish it from policy schools at other universities in the country.

**Intersection of Social Policy and Environmental Policy.** The SPP will focus on a range of social policy issues, particularly those associated with population growth and movement. A high quality of life depends on social systems that enhance the health, education, employment, and cultural development of its members. These systems become challenged under conditions of demographic change, such as population growth and migration. UCR's SPP will address this broad range of social policy issues related to population growth and movement. At the same time, demographic and other societal changes create stresses on the physical and biological environment, and it is vital to accommodate these changes in ways that maintain and enhance the health of the environment. Many public policy schools focus on social policy issues (e.g., health, education, immigration), and some specialize in environmental policy issues. But, to our knowledge, few schools combine these two areas in an interactive and mutually-informing way. This integrated social-environmental focus will distinguish UCR's SPP from most policy programs in the country.

**Importance of Regional Policy.** Most public policy schools specialize in some combination of international, federal, state, and municipal policy. Like these other schools, UCR's SPP also will offer students appropriate curricular experience at these levels. However, it is becoming increasingly evident that key policy issues transcend

---

1. Although not a public policy school, the Bren School of Environmental Science and Management at UC Santa Barbara comes closest to the approach of integrating science, management, law, economics, and policy in the study of the environment.
these traditional jurisdictional boundaries. For example, water and air quality are not well managed within city, county or even state boundaries, nor are issues of immigration, transportation systems, or population growth management. Councils of government such as the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) have emerged to provide a transcending framework to deal with these issues. On a larger scale, alliances such as the European Union (EU) have been formed to deal with economic and social issues that transcend state and national boundaries. “Regional” is the general term applied to these relationships that do not correspond to the traditional structure of jurisdictions based on political or geographic boundaries. Current public policy structures have not generally adapted to the needs of regional policy. UCR’s SPP will specialize in regional relationships and will be a leader in the development of the field of regional policy analysis and policy-making.

Naturally, UCR’s SPP will focus on the policy problems of our own region – Southern California/Northwestern Mexico – given that (i) UCR has strong expertise in the study of socio-cultural, ecological, and geological processes in this region, and (ii) this region offers an unrivaled laboratory for analyzing the social and ecological impact of population growth and movement. Even more importantly, the Southern California/Northwestern Mexico region has great significance in terms of its relevance for comprehending emerging issues in other regions of the United States, as well as at the global level, because many of the problems facing our region – rapid population growth, ex-urban sprawl, and stresses on the natural and social environment – are common to other mega-regions around the world, such as the Arizona Sun Corridor, the Cascadia Mega-Region, the Shanghai-Jiangsu mega-province, and the Hyderabad-Bangalore Corridor. Thus, a distinguishing characteristic of UCR’s SPP would be to emphasize the larger linkages that our region has with the rest of the world, and to compare explicitly our region with other world regions. This "think locally, act globally" mind-set will pervade the research and curricular programs of the SPP.

2. How a School of Public Policy Will Further UCR Goals

The SPP will assist UCR in achieving several of its most important overarching goals.

Enhancing UCR’s Reputational Rankings. UCR is seeking to improve its rankings and have the profile of an AAU member university. The establishment of a SPP will further this goal, as the large majority of AAU member universities in the country have professional public policy schools.

Graduate Student Population. UCR is vigorously seeking to improve the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students. The establishment of the SPP, with its graduate student population of 30 doctoral and 150 MPP students (at maturity), will provide significant progress toward this objective.

Professional Schools. One of the Chancellor’s key goals is to offer expanded professional education in areas that respond to the needs of the state and region and that help
to stimulate a knowledge-based economy. The SPP is an excellent example of such a professional school. Because of its intended programmatic themes, the SPP will also complement and enjoy synergies with the other professional schools that are currently under development at UCR. The health care system is challenged by population growth and is thus an important aspect of the social-policy component of the SPP; the potential synergies with a UCR medical school are thus clear. As well, there are legal aspects of the entire range of social/environmental policy issues that the SPP will address. A close relationship between the SPP and UCR's intended law school will enhance the agenda of both schools in mutually-supportive ways.

**Closer Ties with the Community.** Another of the Chancellor's key goals is to forge closer ties with the community, to be responsive to regional issues, and to coordinate with local and community organizations in pursuing common goals for prosperity and sustainability of the Inland Empire through technology transfer and attraction of highly-skilled jobs and industries. The establishment of the SPP will further this goal in three ways: (i) it will bring the world-class research of UCR faculty to bear on the policy problems facing the region; (ii) it will engage in a two-way policy dialogue with policy makers and planners in the region; and (iii) it will create a pool of students trained in rigorous policy analysis to pursue careers in local and state government agencies and regional policy organizations.

**Expand Opportunities for Students.** The Chancellor's key goals call for the campus to expand opportunities for learning and personal growth for all students, undergraduate and graduate. The SPP will fulfill this goal at the graduate level, complementing the undergraduate program in public policy which is currently under review by the Committee on Education Policy. Students are increasingly interested in explicit pre-professional and professional training, and relate well to curricula that are connected to real-world issues and problems. Thus, the availability of both graduate and undergraduate programs in public policy will considerably increase the attractiveness of UCR to prospective students.

**Investing in Areas of Strength.** As noted earlier, UCR has an impressive array of assets in social and environmental policy-related areas. A relatively modest investment of additional resources will help UCR to be "recognized for its distinction among all research universities in selected areas which exhibit quality and momentum," thus addressing another of the Chancellor's key goals.

3. **Synergies with Other UCR Strengths**

UCR presently has a substantial array of assets that will interact with and help to build the strength of the SPP. For example:

- The Graduate School of Education is building a focus in higher education policy – in particular, policy relating to California's extensive network of community colleges – and is dedicating significant resources to this mission.
• Several faculty in the Department of Environmental Sciences are engaged in computer modeling of air, water, and soil quality interactions and their implications for human populations and ecosystems.

• The campus is engaged in a major new Health Sciences Initiative, which will have health policy as an important focus.

• The Center for Conservation Biology conducts research on the conservation and restoration of species and ecosystems that form the natural heritage of Southern California – issues that a very clear policy focus.

• Several faculty members in the Departments of Political Science, Economics, Sociology, and Anthropology are engaged in research on important problems facing societies and the solutions to these problems. These faculty members provide policy advice to local, state, national, and international agencies. Further, these departments have recently hired additional faculty members whose research is directly in the area of public policy.

• The mission of the Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development is to conduct and disseminate research on issues of suburban growth and the impact of this growth on social, environmental, and transport systems.

• The Presley Center for Crime and Justice Studies works with the criminal justice system in and around Riverside on the many challenges of youth violence prevention.

• The Air Pollution Research Center conducts basic and applied research into photo-chemical air pollution and its effects on plants.

• The Environmental Research Institute seeks to provide policy makers with models that can forecast the impact of various social and environmental policy decisions.

• The Biotechnology Impacts Center provides a forum to identify relevant policy issues, acts as a clearinghouse for credible information on those issues, and initiates research that addresses the potential benefits and consequences of the genomics revolution.

• The University of California Center for Water Resources is headquartered at UCR and sponsors water-related research, including the conservation, development, management, distribution, and utilization of water resources.

• Among its other mission components, the Center for Environmental Research and Technology (CERT) conducts research that seeks to improve the technical basis for environmental regulations and policy.
All of these organizations and groups of faculty are potential contributors to, and support for, the proposed SPP. Given the presence of these existing assets, the SPP will be able to create a remarkable critical mass of policy-related expertise with the addition of a relatively small group of additional faculty FTE.

4. **Main Features of a UCR School of Public Policy**

We envision a School of Public Policy that is actively engaged with existing areas of the campus, one that is integrated with the campus rather than standing alone. These relationships will involve faculty, students, and research. All students, whether Master’s of Public Policy (MPP) or doctoral candidates, will choose a substantive area of concentration to accompany their core study in public policy, and they will take appropriate courses in that concentration, either in the SPP or in other academic departments at UCR. Their research projects will have a policy theme but will be grounded in the methods – both analytical and empirical – of their particular discipline. This task will be made easier by the fact that several faculty in the SPP will hold joint appointments with departments in the other colleges. In addition, currently-appointed faculty at UCR who have strong policy-related research and teaching interests will have adjunct and courtesy appointments in the SPP. The themes of the SPP will, as appropriate, both shape and be shaped by the research and teaching interests of other units at UCR.

We envision an allocation of 12 new faculty FTE for the SPP. Approximately one-half of the FTEs would be used for appointments fully in the SPP. The other half would be split appointments that would be shared with other departments and colleges where there are actual or potential synergies and where it is desirable to add faculty strength with a policy focus without distorting the unit’s existing academic plans. The multidisciplinary approach of the SPP would enable joint appointments with disciplines such as economics, political science, law, sociology, social psychology, environmental science, and demography, where a public policy focus would be consistent with the academic planning ambitions of the discipline. The use of joint appointments would not only raise the faculty headcount of the SPP but would also tightly integrate the SPP with other programs on campus. In addition, it is anticipated that some existing enrollment-driven FTE positions will be designated by deans/departments as public policy-related. In all, a headcount of 20-25 faculty is envisioned for the SPP. This would place UCR’s proposed SPP roughly equivalent in size to the public policy schools at UC Berkeley (25 faculty) and UCLA (28 faculty), but significantly larger than Cal State Sacramento’s Department of Public Policy and Administration (13 faculty) and much smaller than the University of Southern California’s School of Policy, Planning, and Development (40 faculty).
5. Proposed Curriculum

The mainstay of the SPP will be a Master's program in public policy (MPP) and a smaller public policy doctoral program. In addition, an undergraduate major and minor in public policy, situated in the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, has already been approved (to be offered as of Fall 2006), and will have a close relationship to the SPP. We anticipate considerable demand for all of these programs (see Section 6 below).

A. Master's in Public Policy (MPP)

The MPP degree will be offered as a two-year, full-time program consisting of a core curriculum, a policy internship in the summer following the first year, a second-year policy analysis project, and elective courses (including but not limited to those offered by the SPP).

The program will focus on the practical and applied aspects of policy-making and policy implementation, and attempt to develop student skills in

- Identifying human, social, and environmental problems that are amenable to policy interventions;
- Examining techniques for developing policy options and evaluating their social consequences;
- Choosing among a variety of alternative policy interventions based on their relative benefits and costs; and
- Developing strategies for the successful implementation of public policies once they have been adopted.

More specifically, the curriculum will be designed to develop the following skills in students:

- written and oral communication skills,
- knowledge of the organizational and bureaucratic structures involved in program development and implementation,
- an understanding of political institutions and processes, as well as ethical issues, associated with policy formulation and adoption,
- skill in application of economic analysis to questions of economic trade-off and policy choice and efficiency,
- familiarity with cost-benefit analysis and other applications of quantitative analysis and modeling, as well as the use of statistical software,
- an understanding of social science methodologies for dealing with problems of data collection, analysis, and program evaluation, and
- the ability to apply legal analysis where appropriate to the creation and implementation of public policies and to recognize the role of courts and administrative law in program development and implementation.
(i) **Core Courses**

The core courses are meant to provide training in the fundamental concepts and research methods of the discipline of public policy. These courses will emphasize practical applications of analytical skills and encourage students to “learn by doing” through numerous exercises and projects conducted in teams and individually. Fieldwork activities will also be a part of the core curriculum, involving real clients, written reports, and oral presentations of the reports. In addition, students will be required to attend colloquia with outside speakers that will explore in detail many of the policy issues covered in the core courses. A sample course-plan for a typical student enrolled in the MPP program is shown below.

The core courses will include:

The Policy Process (4 courses)
- Introduction to Policy Analysis
- American Political Institutions and Processes
- Policy Formulation and Implementation
- Integrated Policy-Making and Problem-Solving at the Regional Level

Institutional Context (4 courses)
- Political and Organizational Aspects of Public Policy
- American Political Institutions and Processes
- Working with Legislatures
- Ethics, Law, and Public Policy

Policy Methods (5 courses)
- Applied Microeconomics for Policy Planners
- Applied Policy Statistics
- Public Budgeting and Finance
- Monitoring and Evaluation of Programs and Policies
- Decision Analysis, Modeling, and Quantitative Methods

Two required courses to be taken in the first year deserve special mention. One of these will introduce students to the interactions among population growth, environmental stress, and societal institutions, and the implications of these interactions for policy planners. Another course will introduce students to the concept of mega-regions that transcend traditional city, county, and state (sometimes even national) boundaries, and the problems of integrated policy-making and problem-solving for these mega-regions. As noted earlier, UCR’s SPP will be specializing in these two niche issues, and it will therefore be important to introduce students early in their Master’s program to this way of thinking and problem-solving.
Sample Coursework for the Master’s Program in Public Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Organizational Aspects of Public Policy</td>
<td>Introduction to Policy Analysis</td>
<td>American Political Institutions and Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Microeconomics for Policy Planners</td>
<td>Ethics, Law, &amp; Public Policy</td>
<td>Applied Policy Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia/Seminar</td>
<td>Colloquia/Seminar</td>
<td>Colloquia/Seminar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Second Year | | |
|-------------|| |
| Policy Formulation & Implementation | Public Budgeting & Finance | Working with Legislatures |
| Decision Analysis, Modeling, & Quantitative Methods | Elective 3 | Monitoring & Evaluation of Programs & Policies |
| Elective 2 | Advanced Policy Analysis (Thesis Independent Study) |
| Colloquia/Seminar | Colloquia/Seminar | Colloquia/Seminar |

(ii) Elective Courses

MPP students will specialize in one of four areas: environmental policy, health policy, higher education policy, and social policy (e.g., immigration, crime prevention, and urban development). In the first year itself, students will have to take one elective course that will introduce them to critical issues in their chosen area of specialization. In the second year, students will take two more elective courses in the same area. Most elective courses in the four specialization areas will be offered in the SPP, but students, in consultation with their advisors, will also be able to choose electives from a limited number of courses offered by other UCR academic departments.

(iii) Internship, Colloquia, and Thesis Requirements

In both years of the program, students will need to attend talks sponsored by the SPP Policy Seminar Series. The Series will feature occasional (about 3–4 per quarter) lectures and seminars by outside speakers – typically, policy makers, administrators, and researchers – on important and timely policy issues facing the region, the state, the nation, and the world.

To translate the analytical skills learned in the classroom, MPP students will also be required to do an internship during the summer between the first and second year of study. Students will be assisted by the Career Advising Office in the SPP to find positions as apprentices to policy practitioners in local, state, federal or international government agencies; non-profit organizations; private-sector corporations and consulting firms; and public affairs firms. For instance, a student could work as a summer intern in the Riverside City Manager’s or Mayor’s office, the Riverside County’s Economic Development
Agency or Environmental Health Office, or with a nonprofit organization working in a policy area.

Finally, during their second year, students will be required to do a thesis project, which will involve identifying a real policy problem of the student’s choice and then working with a real client on addressing this problem with field work, data collection, and data analysis. The project will consist of a written report as well as an oral presentation of the thesis findings. The thesis project could follow from the summer internship and could possibly lead to a position with the client agency upon the student’s graduation.

The MPP program discussed above will also be offered to mid-career students (typically, policy professionals already working in the public sector who are seeking to strengthen their analytical and quantitative skills and move into positions of greater responsibility). Mid-career students will have an opportunity to “stretch” the two-year program over three or even four years, and will be exempted from the summer policy internship. In addition, they will have the option of reducing academic year course loads or shorten the total duration of the program by taking summer classes offered by the SPP.

B. Ph.D. in Public Policy

There will be two types of students that will be interested in the doctoral program offered by the SPP. The first will be students who wish to pursue teaching and/or research careers in public policy programs at other universities or at policy think-tanks (such as RAND, Public Policy Institute of California, or the Urban Institute). The second type will include students who are primarily interested in an existing doctoral program, such as the ones offered by the Departments of Environmental Sciences, Anthropology, Political Science or Economics at UCR, but who wish to pursue an additional specialization in public policy. These students might have an interest in pursuing a career in a specialized policy agency, such as the United States Forestry Service, California Environmental Protection Agency, or the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The SPP will offer a Ph.D. in Public Policy program for the first type of student and a Ph.D. Minor in Public Policy for the second type of student. The latter program is explained in more detail below.

Students enrolled in the Ph.D. in Public Policy program will select, upon acceptance into the program, a work advisory committee consisting of three members of the faculty participating in the graduate program to assist in the planning of an individualized curriculum. While extensive customization will be possible, we sketch out below a generic curriculum for the doctoral program in public policy.

In their first year in the program, students will typically follow a core course curriculum, which will include courses in research design, institutional perspectives, public policy processes, applied microeconomics, applied policy statistics, policy analysis and evaluation, and a data analysis practicum. While some of the core courses will be the
same as those taken by MPP students (e.g., Ethics, Law, and Public Policy; Political and Organizational Aspects of Public Policy; Integrated Policy-Making and Problem-Solving at the Regional Level), others (e.g., Applied Microeconomics and Applied Policy Statistics) will be taught at a more rigorous (doctoral) level. In addition, doctoral students, like the MPP students, will have to attend the occasional colloquia/seminars offered by the SPP Policy Seminar Series.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Coursework for the Doctoral Program In Public Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fall</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Microeconomics*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Organizational Aspects of Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy Processes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics, Law, &amp; Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Policy Statistics*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Policy-Making and Problem-Solving at the Regional Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Qualifying Examinations (Summer)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Inter-Disciplinary Research*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elective 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis Practicum*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elective 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Preparation of Dissertation Proposal)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Field Examination (Early Summer)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral Qualifying Examination (Dissertation Proposal Defense) (Late Summer)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colloquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Year (Dissertation Research)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Year (Dissertation Research, Final Examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth Year (optional) (Final Examination)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Doctoral-level courses

Following demonstration of professional competence in the core areas, as evidenced by the successful completion of the core qualifying examinations at the end of the first year, students will specialize in an area of concentration, such as environmental policy, education policy, health policy, or social policy. In the second year, students will take five elective courses in their chosen field, as well as take courses to continue building their analytic and methodological skills. The elective courses can be taken from among the courses offered in the SPP or from other academic departments or programs at UCR.² Students will continue to enroll in the policy seminar/colloquia course. Toward the end of the second year, students will take a comprehensive field examination to test their knowledge in their area of concentration.

² For instance, the Department of Environmental Sciences currently offers only a few courses that would be suitable for a student pursuing a doctoral degree in Public Policy with a specialization in environmental policy (e.g., a course on Environmental Management). A number of additional elective courses in environmental policy would need to be created and offered by the SPP faculty.
During the spring and summer quarters of the second year, doctoral students typically will establish a dissertation committee and prepare a dissertation proposal in consultation with the committee. The dissertation committee will normally be composed of three faculty members, at least one of whom should be from outside the SPP. Before the beginning of the third year (i.e., late summer after their second year), students will need to pass an oral qualifying examination, which will cover the dissertation prospectus and subject matter related to the student's field of concentration. The student’s dissertation committee will offer this examination. Upon successful completion of the oral qualifying exam, students will advance to candidacy.

The third and fourth years of the program will be spent researching and writing the Ph.D. dissertation. The entire program of study will be complete when the dissertation is finished, under the direction of the dissertation committee, and the student passes a final examination defending the dissertation. This will typically take place at the end of the fourth year or during the fifth year in the program.

C. Ph.D. Minor in Public Policy

As noted earlier, a minor field in public policy will also be offered by the SPP for doctoral students in other departments and programs at UCR who wish to add a specialization in public policy. In this case, students will have to complete all the requirements of their home doctoral program and, in addition, (i) take a cluster of courses in the SPP; (ii) successfully attempt a written field exam that covers basic concepts in policy analysis and methodology; and (iii) include at least one faculty member from the SPP on their dissertation committee. The course cluster will include courses in policy analysis, public policy processes, applied microeconomics, and applied policy statistics. The cluster of courses required for the minor will naturally differ for students from different departments, since some departments already require their students to take some of the courses required by the public policy minor. For instance, a doctoral student in economics wishing to pursue a minor in public policy will not need to take a course in applied microeconomics or applied policy statistics in the SPP since he/she would have already taken these courses as part of the doctoral program in economics; however, a student in environmental sciences will need to take both of these courses as these are not required by that program. Thus, the cluster of courses required for the Ph.D. minor in public policy will be customized for each individual student. Sample programs for doctoral students in Environmental Sciences, Economics, and Anthropology who wish to add a policy minor to their degrees are shown in Appendix A.

D. Executive MPP Program and Certificate Courses

In addition to the mid-career MPP option (already discussed in A above), which will allow working professionals to stretch the regular two-year MPP over three or four

---

3 Note that, at UCR, the oral qualifying examination committee is composed of five faculty members, one of whom is outside the student’s home department. Typically (although not necessarily so), the doctoral dissertation committee, which administers the final (oral) examination to the student, is a subset of the oral qualifying examination committee.
years on a part-time basis, the SPP will also offer an Executive MPP (EMPP) program, which will be a fast-track degree program for experienced and busy professionals working in government, non-profit, and community agencies. The EMPP will be a 15-month program that will include three week-long residential seminars and nine three-day weekend modules (Friday-Sunday once a month during the academic year). Each module will be self-standing, and will cover advanced concepts in policy analysis and methodology. In between the on-campus sessions, students will be given advanced readings and homework assignments which they will have to submit online and which will prepare them for the subsequent module. Owing to its fast-track status, the EMPP will be attractive to senior professionals in the field — typically, senior managers and directors from federal, state and local agencies, city managers, police professionals, senior foundation employees, NGO leaders, and elected officials. It is important to stress that like other public policy schools with EMPP programs, UCR’s EMPP will include the full set of requirements for the MPP in all their rigor.

In addition to the Executive MPP, the SPP will also offer a few non-degree certificate programs for professionals working in or with the public sector who are interested in career-enhancing training outside of a formal degree program. These certificate programs will be offered in specific areas, such as Methods of Policy Analysis, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Environmental Policy, among others.

6. Market Demand for Policy Programs

Nationwide, there is vigorous and growing student demand for policy programs at the Master’s level. Indeed, the MPP/MPA is the fastest growing degree program in the United States in the last ten years. The table below shows 2001-05 data on applications, admissions, and enrollments in about 30 comparable MPP/MPA programs in the country. Between 2001 and 2005, the number of applications has increased by 50-60 per cent, even after controlling for the number of graduate programs reporting enrollment statistics to the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM).

Obviously, the main reason for the enrollment increase is a robust labor market for MPP/MPA graduates. MPP/MPA graduates are used to perform a number of functions and services throughout the policy-making process — from feasibility studies, to budget analysis, to implementation, and finally to evaluation. The MPP degree provides a student with a set of research, analytical, and management skills that are transferable across sectors and across issue areas. According to the U.S. News & World Report on Colleges and Universities, students find MPP programs particularly attractive for this reason — the generality of the degree allows professionals to more easily transfer between different positions and careers. According to Newsweek magazine, the Master of Public Policy is a true “generalist degree.” It provides students with public policy analysis and management tools that help to navigate them into and out of different careers and job opportunities.
Among some of the job positions that MPP graduates typically occupy are:

- Policy analyst for state or local governments;
- Advocates for policy interests in the state legislature and in city and county governments;
- Governmental relations officers for private-sector firms;
- Local government administrators, including city/county management and budget and personnel analysts;
- Program administrators in state and local governments and community-based organizations.

The table below shows the trend in MPP/MPA job placements over the last two decades. Local governments absorbed nearly a third of all MPP/MPA graduates in 2000, as they did in 1977. State and federal government agencies account for another 30 percent of graduates. Thus, approximately two-thirds of all MPP/MPA graduates are employed in government agencies of one type or another. In recent years, the non-profit sector has sharply increased its recruitment of policy graduates, and now accounts for 16 percent of all MPP/MPA graduates.

The demand for MPP/MPA graduates is projected to remain strong into the future, particularly as one-half of all current federal employees will be eligible to retire in the next five years, according to the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. At the same time, with the trend in population movement from cities to exurbs, there will be strong growth in the number of smaller towns and communities hiring professional managers.
Trends in placement of MPP/MPA graduates, by sector, 1977-2000 (% of total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Government</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Sector</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Graduate Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to home country</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or Unclassified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**TOTALS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Question was not asked this year
** Includes University, International, and Unknown

Source: National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA)

Despite being the largest state in the country, there are only a few institutions in California that offer graduate programs in public policy or public administration. These include five public universities (UC Berkeley, UC Los Angeles, California State University at Sacramento and at San Bernardino, and California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo), two private universities (Pepperdine and University of Southern California), and one non-university entity (RAND). Of these, only four have separate Schools of Public Policy or Affairs – UC Berkeley, UCLA, USC, and Pepperdine. Cal State Sacramento and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo offer the graduate program in public policy through the Department of Public Policy and Administration and the Department of Political Science, respectively. Cal State San Bernardino offers an MPA program through its College of Business and Public Administration. RAND’s Pardee Graduate School only offers a Ph.D. program in public policy – not a MPP program.

More importantly, there is not a single graduate policy program in the Inland Empire region – one of the fastest growing regions in the United States. As noted earlier, this region faces major environmental and social challenges in managing its rapid growth and represents a natural laboratory for studying the effect of population growth and movement on the natural and human ecosystem. The policy problems facing this region are also similar to those faced by many rapidly-growing mega-regions around the world. The absence of a rigorous policy program in this important region is thus a major lacuna in the professional education system. We anticipate very strong demand for the MPP and the doctoral degrees to be offered by UCR’s SPP.

---

* The program offered by the College of Business and Public Administration at Cal State San Bernardino is more focused on public administration than on public policy.
7. **Resources**

**Faculty FTE.** The proposed SPP assumes the allocation of 12 faculty FTE (of which one will be occupied by the dean). Approximately half of these will support faculty located wholly in the SPP while the others will be used for joint appointments with relevant departments or schools. The joint appointments will be made with appropriate departments in areas that will contribute strength to the SPP as well as furthering existing or developing departmental academic plans. Generally the joint appointments should be made at the tenured level. The deployment of faculty FTE will take place over a period of approximately six years.

**Staff FTE.** Based on comparisons with comparable schools, a support staff of 7 FTE is envisioned when the SPP is mature.

**Space.** Options for housing the SPP will initially include existing campus space. The new and release space associated with two College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS) buildings currently in construction will provide the opportunity to reprogram and reassign space within CHASS to SPP on an interim basis. In the long term, the development of the SPP will be accommodated on the West Campus. At present, the campus 2007-12 State-funded Capital Improvement Program includes the West Campus Professional and Graduate Center at a total project cost of $37.5 million. Initial state funding for the design phase of the project is assumed in 2009-10, and State funds for the construction phase are assumed in 2011-12. Occupancy of the facilities is anticipated in 2013-14.

This proposed complex would encompass approximately 51,000 assignable square feet, including space for a School of Public Policy and the Graduate School of Education. In addition, the West Campus Professional and Graduate Center would provide seminar and conference spaces, general assignment class rooms, and support and pre-function areas as shared resources for both Schools.

**Financial projections.** A financial model has been developed for the SPP and is attached in Appendix B. The model is being constructed according to the following key assumptions.

- Fund sources include Marginal Cost of Instruction (MCOI), professional school fees, and revenue generated from executive and other self-supporting programs.
- MCOI and professional school fees associated with SPP students will be allocated to the SPP.
- Revenues generated from SPP executive programs will be allocated to the SPP.
- The SPP will not draw upon campus resources beyond the fund sources noted.

---

5 The Office of Academic Planning and Budget at UCR helped prepare these financial projections.
As Table 1 in Appendix B demonstrates, the SPP will be self-supporting at full build-out, with both revenue and expenses amounting to approximately $2.9 million per annum. However, in the start-up phase (lasting the first six years), expenses will exceed revenue. The cumulative shortfall during the start-up phase will amount to $3 million. As the chart below shows, tuition from the executive MPP program as well as from professional development courses will contribute a little more than one-quarter of total revenue at full build-out.

The shortfall of $3 million will be met through an active fund-raising effort. Indeed, fund-raising for the SPP is part of the campus’ upcoming comprehensive seven-year capital campaign. It is expected that there would be two types of gifts to the SPP. The first would be a gift of $20 million from a potential donor to name the school. The second would include gifts to support the following programs and buildings:

- Naming opportunity for the building(s) housing the SPP
- Naming opportunities for rooms within the building (classrooms, conference rooms, etc)
- Naming opportunity for the SPP library
- Named library endowed fund $50,000 each
- Chair SPP library librarian $1 million
- Endowed chairs: Dean $3.5 million, Distinguished professorships $1.5 million each, Faculty researchers $1 million each
- Endowed visiting professor (prominent scholars/researchers on a short-term basis) $350,000 each
- Endowed faculty excellence fund (to enable promising junior faculty to do research) $100,000 each
- Named graduate fellowships $200,000 each
- Named distinguished lecturer fund $100,000 each

The UCR fund-raising program has experienced significant growth in the past year. The program expects to achieve 100% growth in funds raised by the end of this fiscal year. Gifts for student support have increased by over 200 donors in this fiscal year alone. Because the School of Public Policy touches so many areas on campus, all of

---

6 The Office of Development at UCR helped prepare this part of the proposal.
which are growing in their donor bases and in their broad-based philanthropic successes, the campus is confident that we can fund this endeavor.

In addition to the gifts, we expect the proposed School to be actively supported by program research grants from foundations and federal grant agencies. Foundations such as the Haynes, Hewlett, and Packard Foundations make grants for research on major economic, social, and environmental problems of Southern California — areas of important concern for the SPP. Likewise, the National Science Foundation supports research on the "... dynamics of human action and development, as well as knowledge about organizational, cultural, and societal adaptation and change" via its Human and Social Dynamics program grants. Some of the UCR faculty who would be part of the proposed School of Public Policy have already received NSF HSD funding in the past, and we expect them to apply for more funds from this competitive program under the auspices of the SPP. Finally, given its strong interdisciplinary focus, the SPP would be ideally suited to seek funding from the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) program of the NSF, which supports innovative new models for graduate education and training in collaborative scientific research that transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries.
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1. Doctoral Degree in Environmental Sciences with a Minor in Public Policy

Students pursuing a doctoral degree in Environmental Sciences currently have to take one course from each of #1 and #2 below and two courses from #3:

1. Transport and Fate of Chemicals
   CHEM 246/ENSC 200/ENTX 200 (Fate and Transport of Chemicals in the Environment)
   ENSC 202 (Principles and Application of Environmental Modeling)

2. Interactions and Cycling in the Biosphere
   ENSC 208/ENTX 208/SWSC 208 (Ecotoxicology)
   ENSC 232/SWSC 232 (Biogeochemistry)

3. Environment Policy and Management
   ENSC 201 (Environmental Management)
   ENSC 206/POSC 206 (Environmental Law and Policy)

Students are also required to enroll in a seminar course CHEM 257/SWSC 257 each quarter and give an oral presentation at the annual student seminar or retreat. The elective courses prescribed by the student’s course work advisory committee depend on the research interests of the student.

Students wishing to pursue a doctoral degree in Environmental Sciences with a minor in Public Policy will have to fulfill all of the above requirements and, in addition, take the following four courses offered by the School of Public Policy:

1. Policy Analysis
2. Applied Microeconomics
3. Applied Policy Statistics
4. Conducting Inter-Disciplinary Research

Before the start of their third year, students will also have to successfully complete a written field examination in public policy. At least one member of the student’s doctoral dissertation committee will have to be drawn from the faculty of the SPP. Students will have to meet all the existing examination requirements of the Department of Environmental Sciences.
2. Doctoral Degree in Economics with a Minor in Public Policy

Students pursuing a doctoral degree in Economics have to complete the following core sequence:

1. Economic Theory
   ECON 200A, 200B and 200c (Microeconomic Theory)
   ECON 201A, 201B and 201c (Microeconomic Theory)
   ECON 212 (History of Economic Thought) or ECON 213 (Methods in Economic History)

2. Quantitative Methods
   ECON 205A (Econometric Methods I)
   ECON 205B (Econometric Methods II)
   ECON 205C (Econometric Methods III)

In addition, students have to complete coursework in either two major fields (consisting of three courses each) or one major field and two minor fields (consisting of two courses each). At the end of the first year in the program, students have to take two cumulative examinations – one in microeconomic theory and another in macroeconomic theory. The quantitative methods requirement is satisfied by obtaining a "B" average in the sequences ECON 205A,B,C. Students are also required to enroll in a seminar course ECON 289 in each quarter.

Students wishing to pursue a doctoral degree in Economics with a minor in Public Policy will have to select Public Policy as a major field and take the following three courses in the SPP:

1. Policy Analysis
2. Public Policy Processes
3. Conducting Inter-Disciplinary Research

Before the start of their third year, students will also have to successfully complete a written field examination in public policy. At least one member of the student’s doctoral dissertation committee will have to be drawn from the faculty of the SPP. Students will have to meet all the existing examination requirements of the Department of Economics.
3. Doctoral Degree in Anthropology with a Minor in Public Policy

During their first year, doctoral students in anthropology have to complete the year-long seminar sequence, ANTH 200A, ANTH 200B, and ANTH 200C (Core Theory in Anthropology). Students must acquire a basic understanding of three of the four subfields (socio-cultural anthropology, biological anthropology, archaeology, and linguistics). To fulfill the breadth requirement, students must take at least two courses in two of the subfields outside their subfield of specialization. At least one course in each of the two subfields must be a graduate-level course. For students not specializing in socio-cultural anthropology, one of the subfields selected for the breadth requirement must be socio-cultural.

In addition, students must demonstrate competency in a qualitative or quantitative methodological skill such as GIS, lithic analysis, statistics, or hieroglyphic analysis. The choice of methodological skill is generally determined in consultation with the student's advisor.

Students wishing to pursue a doctoral degree in Anthropology with a minor in Public Policy will have to fulfill all of the above requirements and, in addition, take the following three or four courses offered by the School of Public Policy:

1. Policy Analysis
2. Applied Microeconomics
3. Conducting Inter-Disciplinary Research

Before the start of their third year, students will also have to successfully complete a written field examination in public policy. At least one member of the student's doctoral dissertation committee will have to be drawn from the faculty of the SPP. Students will have to meet all the existing examination requirements of the Department of Anthropology.
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APPENDIX B

BUDGET
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## UCR SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY
### START-UP REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE RECAP
*(All Costs Stated in FY 2005-06 Dollars)*

### STUDENT FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>START-UP YEAR 1</th>
<th>START-UP YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>YEAR 6</th>
<th>FULL BUILD-OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Marginal Growth (100% Allocated to Instruction)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 361,195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,270,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Fees ($MCC/D)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 547,100</td>
<td>$ 1,058,675</td>
<td>$ 1,185,940</td>
<td>$ 1,224,205</td>
<td>$ 1,270,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School Fees (Net of Financial Aid)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 35,670</td>
<td>$ 259,000</td>
<td>$ 365,750</td>
<td>$ 409,040</td>
<td>$ 424,270</td>
<td>$ 438,800</td>
<td>$ 438,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive MPP Tuition</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 125,987</td>
<td>$ 278,972</td>
<td>$ 349,965</td>
<td>$ 391,961</td>
<td>$ 405,959</td>
<td>$ 419,958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Courses</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 158,200</td>
<td>$ 158,200</td>
<td>$ 158,200</td>
<td>$ 158,200</td>
<td>$ 158,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 630,862</td>
<td>$ 1,419,672</td>
<td>$ 2,033,793</td>
<td>$ 2,455,741</td>
<td>$ 2,696,224</td>
<td>$ 2,925,508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>START-UP YEAR 1</th>
<th>START-UP YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>YEAR 6</th>
<th>FULL BUILD-OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$ 283,500</td>
<td>$ 707,088</td>
<td>$ 1,153,188</td>
<td>$ 1,340,686</td>
<td>$ 1,554,688</td>
<td>$ 1,681,688</td>
<td>$ 1,841,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Operational Support</td>
<td>$ 450,500</td>
<td>$ 612,651</td>
<td>$ 864,098</td>
<td>$ 918,999</td>
<td>$ 991,899</td>
<td>$ 1,091,899</td>
<td>$ 1,239,699</td>
<td>$ 1,481,699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive MPP</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 24,853</td>
<td>$ 104,253</td>
<td>$ 219,753</td>
<td>$ 316,953</td>
<td>$ 361,353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Courses</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
<td>$ 160,000</td>
<td>$ 160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$ 283,500</td>
<td>$ 810,552</td>
<td>$ 1,320,333</td>
<td>$ 1,842,725</td>
<td>$ 2,392,851</td>
<td>$ 2,802,841</td>
<td>$ 2,904,841</td>
<td>$ 2,925,507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANNUAL SURPLUS/(SHORTFALL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>START-UP YEAR 1</th>
<th>START-UP YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>YEAR 6</th>
<th>FULL BUILD-OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Surplus/Shortfall</td>
<td>$ (283,500)</td>
<td>$ (681,486)</td>
<td>$ (443,048)</td>
<td>$ (256,066)</td>
<td>$ (207,100)</td>
<td>$ (164,216)</td>
<td>$ 21,568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE MPP TUITION</td>
<td>$ 597,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COURSES</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 797,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXECUTIVE MPP PROGRAM COSTS</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Compensation</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging &amp; Meals</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Officer III</td>
<td>5,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant III</td>
<td>9,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Overhead</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Overhead</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXECUTIVE MPP PROGRAM COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 361,353</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COURSES</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Compensation</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging &amp; Meals</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COURSES COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 160,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 521,353</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET REVENUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 275,647</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# UCR School of Public Policy
## Student and Faculty FTE Start-Up Model

### Enrollment - FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year Cohorts</th>
<th>Start-up Yr -1</th>
<th>Start-up Yr 0</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>Yn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 - Masters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 - Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 - Masters</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 - Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 - Masters</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 - Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 - Masters</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 - Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 - Masters</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 - Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 - Masters</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 - Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTE By Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTE Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.56</td>
<td>135.56</td>
<td>160.56</td>
<td>175.56</td>
<td>180.56</td>
<td>185.56</td>
<td>185.56</td>
<td>185.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marginal Increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.56</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>5.00</th>
<th>8.00</th>
<th>10.00</th>
<th>12.00</th>
<th>12.00</th>
<th>12.00</th>
<th>12.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTE</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UCOP FTE Allocation @18.7 -1

|              | 0    | 0    | 4.31 | 7.25 | 8.59  | 9.39  | 9.66  | 9.92  | 9.92  |
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### UCR SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY
STATE FUNDED PROGRAM REVENUE AT FULL ENROLLMENT
*(Stated in FY 05-06 Dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES:</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Marginal Growth (100% Allocated to Instruction)</td>
<td></td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>8,471</td>
<td>$ 1,270,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Fees (@MCOI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>438,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School Fees (Net of Financial Aid)</td>
<td></td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>419,958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL** $ 2,129,508
## UCR School of Public Policy

### State Funded Program Faculty Start-Up Budgetary Plan

*(All Costs Stated in FY 2008-09 Dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT FTE</th>
<th>0.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERMANENT OPERATING BUDGET</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FACULTY FTE &amp; SALARIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$201,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY TEACHING/RESEARCH SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$237,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING ASSISTANT- SAL &amp; FEE REMISISSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL PERMANENT FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMULATIVE PERMANENT BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,401,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Start-Up One-Time Funding

| FACULTY Initial Complements/Setup @ $31,500 |  |
|  | $407,500 |
| TOTAL FACULTY ONE-TIME FUNDING |  |
|  | $407,500 |

### Grand Total Annual Funding

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Does not include funding for summer salaries.*
APPENDIX C

LETTERS OF SUPPORT

FROM UCR UNITS

AND FACULTY
Dear Anil and David,

I would like to convey my support for the proposed School of Public Policy. I believe the establishment of the SPP will enhance the reputation of UCR, particularly since its focus is on graduate education and training. The school will also benefit Bourns College of Engineering because of its focus on integrated social-environmental issues. In particular, it will help our Center for Environmental Research and Technology (CE-CERT). As you know, a main emphasis of CE-CERT has been to develop partnerships among industry, government, and academia in basis for regulations and policy, a creative source of new technology, and a contributor to a better understanding of the environment. In other words, CE-CERT conducts research that seeks to improve the technical basis for environmental regulations and policy.

I wish you and your colleagues the best, and look forward to collaborating with you.

Best regards,

Reza Abbaschian
Dean, Bourns College of Engineering
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521
September 29, 2006

To: Chancellor France Cordova
From: Anil B. Deolalikar, Interim Dean
Re: Support for a UCR School of Public Policy

I am writing to express my strong support for the establishment of a School of Public Policy (SPP) at UCR.

As you can imagine, there are strong synergies between public policy and management. Many business schools, including ours, offer courses on management of non-profit organizations, including government agencies. Indeed, if I am not mistaken, AGSM started out at UCR some thirty years ago as a school of public and business administration!

AGSM is currently in the midst of creating several new programs, such as a self-supporting executive MBA program, a Ph.D. in marketing, and MA programs in financial management and accounting. In addition, the highly-popular undergraduate major in business administration will soon be shifted from CHASS to AGSM. I see the opportunity for AGSM to partner with the SPP in many of these activities. For instance, our faculty could help co-teach specialized courses in the proposed SPP in such areas as management and organization of public entities, application of operations research and decision-making theory to policy-making, government budgeting and accounting, and risk management in public agencies. Our proposed executive MBA program would complement the executive MPP program being proposed by the SPP. Finally, some of the courses required for the undergraduate major in business administration could be shared with those required for the newly-developed public policy major.

AGSM is open to the establishment of cooperating faculty appointments and, if needed, even joint appointments with the SPP.

In closing, I strongly endorse the proposal to establish a School of Public Policy at UCR. There will be significant benefits to AGSM from having such a professional school at UCR. Likewise, the presence of AGSM will facilitate the development of a first-rate public policy program at UCR.
To:        Anil Deolalikar  
           Director, Public Policy Initiative

From:     Georgia Warnke  
           Professor of Philosophy and  
           Associate Dean, College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences

Re:        School of Public Policy

I am writing to express my support for the proposed establishment of a Graduate School of Public Policy at UCR. Under Professor Deolalikar’s leadership, the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences has recently initiated a public policy major and minor at the undergraduate level. One of the distinctive traits of this new program is its attention to normative issues. While many public policy professionals simply assume the adequacy of a utilitarian ethical approach, UCR’s program understands the need to attach questions of public policy to broader moral and ethical reflection.

This attention to normative concerns will also distinguish the Graduate School of Public Policy. The gain for the campus will be cross-discipline research not only between the School and the Social Sciences but also between the School and the Humanities. Philosophers and cultural critics will have the opportunity to discuss real life issues in the environment, health care policy and the like while students in the School of Public Policy will be able to take advantage of on-going reflection on questions of moral action, moral psychology and questions of the good life.

UCR’s location in a diverse section of the country and in a region undergoing all the growing pains of suburban sprawl and environmental worries, the establishment of a School of Public Policy is a natural step for us. I endorse the proposal whole-heartedly.
June 13, 2006

Anil B. Deolalikar
University of California, Riverside

Dear Professor Deolalikar:

The Center for Conservation Biology strongly supports the proposal to establish a School of Public Policy for the University of California, Riverside. Since its inception in 1998, the Center for Conservation Biology has been involved in the several activities related to threatened and endangered species in the region. These include mitigation efforts for many governmental and private organizations. Our largest outreach program involves the review of the Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and developing monitoring protocols for the MSHCP and the Coachella Valley MSHCP, which encompasses hundreds of thousands of acres, almost two hundred species, and billions of dollars.

I initially was interested in this idea as a part of our outreach program here at the CCB. We have intentionally avoided taking a public stand on issues, or addressing the specifics of policy decisions. Our goals here at the Center are to provide the science only, and allow the policies to develop as they may. Nevertheless, the biggest problem with this approach is that the staff at all level of government, from local to federal, is comprised of individuals with degrees in planning (spatial structure of roads, suburbs, sewers, etc.), economics, or other social-policy-oriented disciplines. All of these levels of staffing are almost completely unprepared for the enormous conservation and environmental implications to their decisions. Even with a few "scientists" on staff (generally MA-level folks—such as Fish and Game, or Forest Service)—they are rarely really part of the real decision process. In addition, there are many NGOs, think-tanks, and other groups advising on policy. Again, they have expertise on either social science, or on science, but without any training on integrating the two.

From an outreach perspective for the CCB, when we present the needs to the planners, generally they have no idea if or how to proceed, because they have little or no understanding of even the basic issues. I don't believe that having the CCB comment directly is a good idea, but having an entity like the proposed school would make a good linkage.

The focal areas are appropriate for our programs, both topically and regionally. Every development between the San Gabriel Mountains and La Paz Mexico will run into an endangered species issue. At the CCB, we have expertise in the topic and the region. We are expanding our research program into the Baja California Peninsula in collaboration with research stations in the States comprising Baja California. Our collaborations with the San Diego Zoological Society (managers of the Wild Animal park— and CRES—the Center for Research on Endangered Species) expand our local research and outreach program, also within the region identified for concentration.

I do believe that we could develop courses appropriate for The School of Public Policy in environmental and conservation issues. I especially also support the idea of a minor in policy for CNAS students, from the School, upon taking a couple of courses in policy and economics focused toward our students. This could well strengthen their vitae as they apply for the highly competitive positions in teaching and research institutions.
Norm Ellstrand, Professor of Genetics

Dear David et al.:

Thanks for sharing the proposal. It is skillfully drafted.

A) I think that what's been written regarding the Biotech Impacts Center is accurate. I anticipate some limited synergies between that Center and the new School. Whether or not the School stimulates stronger interactions depends on the faculty who become involved and how they become involved.

B) As a scientist involved in research that informs the evolution of policy, I would be pleased to contribute to the School to the extent that such contributions are of mutual benefit.

Norm Ellstrand
Professor of Genetics
June 5, 2006

Dr. David Warren
Director, Edward J. Blakely Center
for Sustainable Suburban Development

Dear Dave,

I am strongly supportive of a new School of Public Policy for UCR. My own research has shifted largely into water resources management, and I would benefit greatly from the presence of a policy school. I am currently working on a book on global water issues and plan to develop a course on the subject matter. I also am involved in research on modeling the fate of the Salton Sea, and estimating the pollutant loading of California watersheds, both topics with huge policy implications.

UCR has significant strength in environmentally related disciplines, and could well become a major leader in environmental policy research. The presence of a school of public policy will assist greatly in achieving that goal.

Sincerely,

Bill Jury
Distinguished Professor of Soil Physics
----- Original Message -----  

From: "Shankar Mahalingam" <shankar@engr.ucr.edu>  
To: "Anil B. Deolalikar" <anil.deolalikar@ucr.edu>  
Cc: "David H. Warren" <david.warren@ucr.edu>  
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 11:25 AM  
Subject: RE: New version of SPP proposal  

Anil/Dave,  

The proposal looks very good. I am impressed with the level of thought apparent in the proposal. It is apparent that such a school is necessary and timely. I endorse it fully and wish you success in getting it approved.  

-Shankar  

------------------------------------------------------------------  
Shankar Mahalingam  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
University of California  
Riverside, CA 92521  
Tele: 1 (909) 787 2134  
Fax: 1 (909) 787 2899  
e-mail: shankar.mahalingam@ucr.edu  
web page: http://www.me.ucr.edu/people/mahalingam.html  
------------------------------------------------------------------
Director of the Institute for Research on World-Systems
Dear Dave,

I am very attracted to the possibility of a School of Public Policy at UCR and have valued the opportunity to be involved in some of the preliminary planning and discussions. My own research in health care management and delivery is inherently linked to public policy decisions, and I would be very interested in contributing to the formal development of a School of Public Policy, through research collaborations and teaching/course development.

Kathleen
Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, for the Department of Economics

David and Anil,

The Department of Economics supports the establishment of a School of Public Policy. The contribution of our department to the PP School is twofold:

(i) teaching in the PP curriculum: we will offer the foundational Economics courses in the proposed Master's and Ph.D. programs; we will also be able to direct dissertation work and to contribute to the advanced training of graduate students.

(ii) research: there are clear synergies between the research agendas of many of our faculty and the socio-economic issues that are in the domain of a PP School. It can be said that every faculty in the Economics department will be able to contribute to the development of the research mission of the PP School. From the economic theorists, who build the micro and macro foundational analysis, to the applied economists, who deal with focused questions, i.e. labor, development, growth, health, nutrition, etc, to the econometricians, who develop empirical methods, all of us can potentially contribute to the mission of a PP school.

We are open to the establishment of cooperating appointments and, if the need arises, to joint appointments between PP and Economics.

If you need further elaboration, please let me know. With best wishes,

Gloria
Mindy Marks, Department of Economics

Anil and David,

Consider this note to be an expression of my willingness to participate wholeheartedly in the proposed School of Public Policy. I am already serving as co-editor of the newly launched policy brief series "Policy Matters" which will presumably be housed in the Public Policy School. In addition, I teach three policy related economic electives (Health Economics, Labor Economics, and Women in the Economy) which could easily become courses in a policy school. I have also developed a graduate level empirical methods course which would work well in a policy school.

Finally I conduct applied research and may be able to support research assistants from a Masters program in public policy.

Sincerely,

Mindy Marks
June 6, 2006

Professor David Warren
Director, Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development
B110 Highlander Hall
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Dr. Warren:

I am pleased to offer my support and the support of the Department of Psychology for the planned UCR School of Public Policy. Such a School could be an important asset to each of many academic departments as well as the campus as a whole, through useful collaborations between researchers interested in basic issues and experts on the implications of those issues for public policy. The Department of Psychology can participate through its research interests in areas such as aging, child development, and cultural influences on thinking, learning, and behavior. The plan for the School presents a clear and compelling vision and I look forward to seeing its fruition.

Sincerely,

David C. Funder
Professor and Chair
June 8, 2006

David H. Warren, Director  
Edward J. Blakely Center for Sustainable Suburban Development  
University of California, Riverside  
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear David:

I am writing in support of the proposal to create a School of Public Policy at The University of California, Riverside. This School would clearly be in alignment with the Presley Center for Crime and Justice Studies. One of the primary objectives of the Center since its inception has been informing legal policy and criminal justice practice in California by new developments in criminological research. This component of the Presley Center mission surely falls squarely in the public policy arena, meaning a connection between the Center and the School of Public Policy could be a natural fit.

Moreover, as a member of the Criminology and Socio-Legal Studies specialization committee in the Department of Sociology, I know that many of the graduate students in this specialization work in the Presley Center or the CDC funded Academic Center of Excellence in Youth Violence Prevention, which is a partner with the Presley Center and the Department of Psychology. I can easily envision graduate students in the School of Public Policy having an emphasis in crime and criminal justice and thus taking courses in this specialization. We could entertain the possibility of creating a special course focusing on criminal justice policy and perhaps explore ways of providing internships, independent study or research assistantships if available for graduate students in Public Policy through the Presley Center.

In short, a relationship between the Presley Center and the School of Public Policy could be mutually advantageous and possibly generate synergies for criminal justice policy relevant scholarship that otherwise would not be possible.

Best wishes in your effort.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Nash Parker  
Professor of Sociology and Director
June 6, 2006

Professor Anil Deolalikar
Department of Economics
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521

Dear Professor Deolalikar:

I am writing this letter in reference to the proposed School of Public Policy here at the University of California, Riverside. I would like it to be known that I am very interested in participating in this School on a variety of levels if possible. First, if there are opportunities to be affiliated with the School in a manner similar to that of Cooperating Faculty between departments, I would very much be interested in such. Second, I would be interested in serving as an advisor to students in this School since I believe many of their interests would overlap with my research areas. Third, I believe that some of the courses I currently teach or plan to teach in the future would serve the general interests of those students in the School who have an interest in public policy issues surrounding the environment. Finally, and at the very least, I would certainly be interested in collaborating and interacting with the faculty in such a program since much, if not most, of my research is motivated by public policy concerns.

Sincerely,

Kurt A. Schwabe
Associate Professor of Environmental Economics and Policy
Department of Environmental Sciences
Hi Anil and David,

I am sending this email to support the development of a School of Public Policy. In the brainstorming sessions you have held and proposal, there are clear links to interdisciplinary participation from multiple departments including ours for both courses and research opportunities. As part of the environmental and resource economics group, I'll participate where there is potential to overlap on mutual topics of interest such as water. There are multiple dimensions of the water problem, including both human and ecosystem impacts; both water quantity and water quality issues; both problems and solutions; and both science, policy and management.

Because of our environmental and resource economics group interest in hiring a Risk Analyst/Health Economist, and a Land Use Planner, there's potential that these positions and the courses which could be taught by individuals tied with the Public Policy School and study of policy and research issues in public health and land management. Analysis of risk is becoming an increasingly important component of regulatory policymaking for environmental and other issues.

Sincerely,

Linda Fernandez
Chuck Whitney, Department of Sociology

Gentlemen:

I am delighted to offer a statement of interest and support to the School of Public Policy, and I look forward to advising you in the future as the School moves closer to realization.

With very best regards,

D. Charles Whitney
offer many opportunities for synergy with members of the political science department.

Because the proposed school does not seek to replicate existing schools within the region but, instead, promises to pursue an innovative, research driven profile with a concern for quality the Department of Political Science strongly supports the proposal.

Shaun Bowler  
Chair, Department of Political Science  
UC Riverside  
Riverside, CA 92521  
http://www.politicalscience.ucr.edu/people/faculty/bowler/index.html  
tel. (951) 827 5595  
fax (951) 827 3933
Please let me know if I can lend any further support to the effort to establish a school of public policy at UCR. My office number is 951-827-3833, and my email address is kevin.esterling@ucr.edu. Thank you for considering this letter.

Sincerely,

Kevin M. Esterling
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Dear Anil and David,

Thank you for trying to make the School for Public Policy a reality at UCR. From what I remember at the last meeting, issues of environmental management, sustainable growth, and demographic diversity are among the research and teaching priorities for the school. As a faculty member, I look forward to teaching graduate courses in the proposed school and am happy to help out in other ways as well. As you know, the Policy Brief series will be up and running next year. Once established, the SPF would be a perfect home for the journal and other similar endeavors.

Best,
Karthick