WILLIAM JACOB  
Academic Council Chair  
University of California  

RE: Davis Division Response: APM 600 Revisions  

The proposal was forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees and Faculty Executive Committees from the Schools and Colleges. Detailed responses were received from the committee of Affirmative Action & Diversity, and the Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight.

Affirmative Action & Diversity recommends the following revision to the definition of Regent's Professor:

Page 2 (290-4a)  
“The Regents’ Professor’s achievements in agriculture, banking, commerce, engineering, industry, labor, law, medicine, policy, human rights or any other non-academic field in the humanities, arts, sciences or professions are equivalent to those on which appointments to regular University professorships are based.”

Page 3 (b Regent’s Lecturer)  
“The Regents’ Lecturer’s achievements in agriculture, banking, commerce, engineering, industry, labor, law, medicine, policy, human rights or any other non-academic field in the humanities, arts, sciences or professions are equivalent to those on which appointments to regular University lectureships are based.”

Committee on Academic Personnel  
“The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the documents pertaining to the second round of revisions to APM 600. Those sections previously of most concern to CAP are 510-18-c, d and h. We are perplexed to note that none of these sections is included in the materials now circulating, in either redlined or ‘final’ form. Thus, we are unable to offer any comment. We reiterate, however, our previous – Oversight (CAPOC) reiterates their concern about barrier steps and about the role of Senate approval in promotions and advancements.” Included with the proposed changes to APM 600 were draft changes to APM 510, RECRUITMENT – Intercampus Transfer. CAPOC notes that these previously addressed concerns are not in the materials now circulating in either draft or final form. CAPOC finds in Section 510-18, “Rank, Step and Salary,” policies that directly affect CAPOC’s function. CAPOC has recommended 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