



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

December 9, 2011

**ROBERT ANDERSON, CHAIR**

University of California  
Academic Council  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607

**Re: Systemwide Review of Proposal to Revise APM 670, Health Sciences Compensation Plan**

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 Committees on Academic Personnel-Oversight (CAP), Faculty Welfare, and Planning and Budget. In addition, the Faculty Executive Committee from School of Veterinary Medicine commented.

The proposal to revise 670 received mixed response. The Committee on Planning and Budget found the proposal acceptable. CAP is concerned about the additional definition of “good standing” as it pertains to salary compensation. Faculty Welfare expressed concern regarding the composition of the Advisory Committee and the level of authority provided to the Dean concerning appointments to the Advisory Committee. The Faculty from the School of Veterinary Medicine opined that the requirement for approval by the Regents has been removed and authority lies solely with the President or the President's designee. The reasons and consequences of such a change are not obvious but perhaps should be clarified.

The proposed language appears to link the University-wide criteria for Merit Advancement and Promotions with the, heretofore, “member in good standing” criterion. This represents a change from long-standing practice whereby revenue generation is separated from academic performance. Further, the application of a metric that includes the vague term “negatively impact scholarship and teaching” may lead to multiple criteria regarding what constitutes scholarship that will vary by departments and lead to greater inconsistency throughout the University. The differential application of the new metric will lead to confusion and uncertainty for faculty members when CAP applies its own assessment of scholarship regarding a merit advancement or promotion. We recommend the language below in italics be eliminated from the new APM 670.

“All members of a clinical practice plan should be deemed in Good Standing until they encounter some circumstance in which their capacity to earn income is impaired. *A faculty member may fail to be in Good Standing only for conduct which significantly and negatively impacts the health sciences school's central functions of clinical care, scholarship, teaching, and University and public service.* Reasons for loss of Good Standing might include, for example, instances of misconduct, inability to generate salary support, refusal to participate in assigned duties, failure

to participate in mandatory training, loss of clinical privileges, or loss of licensure and/or credentials.”

Within UC Davis, the Advisory Committee plays an integral role in the placement of faculty within an Academic Personnel Unit (APU). APU placement largely shapes the compensation the faculty member receives. The principal problem with the proposed changes to APM 670 is the Advisory Committee needs more independence from the Dean. The Dean appoints more than half of the members to the Advisory Committee. If a faculty member is not satisfied with APU placement the recourse is appeal to the Advisory Committee. The decision making process in APM 670 gives too much authority to one person – the Dean. The problems with this plan would be substantially diminished if the Dean had less control over the membership of the Advisory Committee and key terms used in the evaluation of faculty, good standing stands out, were more clearly defined.

The concerns expressed are significant and require more information and a thorough review before the Davis Division is willing to endorse the proposal to revise APM 670.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Linda F. Bisson".

Linda F. Bisson, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor: Viticulture and Enology