BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE ONE SHIELDS AVENUE DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502 TELEPHONE: (530) 752-2231

May 20, 2013

Robert Powell, Chair
Academic Council
UC Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 11th Floor
Oakland, California 94607

RE: Systemwide Review of APM 600 Series: Salary Administration

The proposal was forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees and Faculty Executive Committees within the schools and colleges for comment. Detailed responses were received from the Faculty Welfare Committee and Committee on Academic Personnel - Oversight.

The Davis Division of the Academic Senate does not object with most of the proposed revisions to the APM 600 series. However, one problem did emerge in APM 662 and 663 that deal with the possibility that faculty members could earn extra compensation from teaching courses in addition to their "normal" or "approved" departmental teaching load. To fairly implement this policy, every department must clearly articulate its teaching load so that teaching responsibilities above that baseline can be identified and the faculty paid appropriately for their efforts.

If APM 662 and 663 are enacted, as currently written, department chairs will not have a foundation upon which teaching expectations can be defined and specified when determining whether particular faculty members have earned reduced teaching loads or additional compensation for teaching more than the "normal" load in their unit. Unequal implementation may result in nonconformity with UC policy.

For this reason, we do not support the latitude the changes to APM 662 and 663 give departmental leaders over faculty workload, and suggest revisions limit potential abuse of faculty welfare.

Included with the proposed changes to APM 600 are draft changes to APM 510, RECRUITMENT – Intercampus Transfer. CAPOC finds in Section 510-18, "Rank, Step and Salary," policies that directly affect CAPOC's function. CAPOC recommends clarifying the following sections:

510-18-c.: "The recruiting campus may offer advancement and/or a salary increase of no more than one step, or the equivalent of one step, above the transferee's current

salary. If the transferee's current salary is an off-scale salary, the recruiting campus may offer the next higher step along with the same off-scale dollar amount."

The statement that "the recruiting campus may offer the next higher step," could refer to the salary equivalent of a step, not necessarily the actual professorial step, or it could refer to a professorial merit step, in which case CAP would review the appointment. Furthermore, if the recruited faculty member were at a barrier step, e.g., Professor V or Professor IX, this section requires clarification concerning the review process for proposed advancement to Professor VI or Above Scale.

510-18-d.: "An offer which includes a promotion is permitted if the advancement and salary increase conform to the requirements set forth in this policy." This statement would include section 510-18-f.: "In response to the offer, the home campus may counter-offer a rank, step and/or salary equivalent to that of the recruiting campus."

Taken together, the two sections could imply that a candidate can be promoted and advanced in rank without the review and approval of CAPOC on either the home or recruiting campus, thereby bypassing the requirement for such review set forth in APM-220-I. Please clarify to limit this interpretation.

510-18-h.: "If the home campus review results in a salary increase and/or advancement, the recruiting campus may offer a salary, rank and step equivalent to the increase even if the increase is more than one step above the salary at the time of the initial recruitment record."

This statement specifies that the salary may be more than one step above that at the initiation of the recruitment, but does not indicate that the rank and step might be more than one step higher.

We recommend revising the above sections to clarify their intent and avoid future confusion of misinterpretations before moving the proposed revisions forward.

Sincerely,

Bruno Nachtergaele, Chair

Davis Division of the Academic Senate

Professor: Mathematics