



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Revised School of Medicine Health Sciences Compensation Plan

February 22, 2013

In accordance with the recently revised APM 670, the School of Medicine has revised the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. Divisional Academic Senate review and comment is a requirement prior to submitting of the plan to the Office of the President. The turn around time is short because the campus is unable to comply with the original deadline of January 31, 2013. It has been granted an extension to February 28, 2013.

CAP Oversight Committee

February 15, 2013 9:01 AM

Response continued on next page.

**UC DAVIS: ACADEMIC SENATE
Committee on Academic Personnel - Oversight**

February 13, 2013

Revised School of Medicine Health Sciences Compensation Plan

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the revised School of Medicine Health Sciences Compensation Plan. Of the factors that relate to CAP's activities, CAP notes that an unsatisfactory performance rating during a five-year review, an action on which CAP provides recommendations, would lead to loss of "good standing" that will impact a faculty member's access to the Compensation Plan. CAP would like to make clear that such five-year reviews are based on parameters specific to research, teaching and service, and do not include additional factors that take into consideration the dollar value of any faculty member to the department, school or university.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: HACCS)

February 5, 2013 11:46 AM

No response at this time.

Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

February 21, 2013 11:40 AM

No response at this time.

Faculty Welfare

February 22, 2013 4:42 PM

Response of the Faculty Welfare Committee to School of Medicine Revised Compensation Plan

The Faculty Welfare Committee supports the Revised Compensation Plan from the School of Medicine. The initial plan did not allow for significant faculty input. The Dean could choose most of the members of the Compensation Advisory Committee. The new plan provides that six members of this key advisory committee will be chosen by faculty ballot across three subfields of the School of Medicine and four members will be selected by the Dean. We endorse the revised plan with this critical change.

Graduate Council

February 5, 2013 12:56 PM

No response at this time.

Planning & Budget

February 21, 2013 11:39 AM

CPB reviewed the revised School of Medicine Health Sciences Compensation Plan. **CPB believes that the section “h) Good Standing Criteria” is unacceptable as written.** CPB notes that there is no statement of due process and no appeal process outlined in the document when faculty are found in violation. This bypasses academic freedom and due process, as well as the presumption of innocence. In fact it could be characterized as containing the basis for a potential abuse of administrative power. **CPB strongly recommends that the draft plan be sent back to the originating unit to be rewritten. The revision should conform with the normal UC range of permissible faculty behavior, and with faculty expectations of being allowed to exercise academic freedom and freedom of expression.** Furthermore, CPB strongly believes that the criteria in the document should be limited to things that can be measured objectively.

See below for some specific examples on pages 18-20 (in blue font):

1. “Plan Participants should meet Department/unit guidelines regarding productivity in research, teaching, patient care, mentoring, and University service as defined by their series, rank and step.” When did mentoring and university service become compulsory for faculty? The merit and promotion system already addresses adequacy of service for all faculty.
2. “Meet the Faculty Code of Conduct and other UC rules and regulations. Examples to be considered include reports of inappropriate conduct or complaints filed with the Chair, Associate Dean for Academic Personnel, Vice Provost, or other School, Health System, or campus administrator from colleagues, staff, students, patients, or members of the community,....” This is based on being reported, not on whether or not the complaint is adjudicated to be valid? There is no due process here.
3. “5. Must work collegially with others. Who will be judging this criterion?”
4. “6. Attend at least 50% of department/health system meetings involving compliance issues.” If someone is a Ph.D. in a clinical department with no patient care responsibility, why should they have to do this? The term “faculty member” seems to be equated with “clinician” here.
5. “7. Satisfy other requirements as determined by the department and described in the department’s compensation plan.” This is awfully vague. Who will make this decision and how will it be made?

Finally, CPB appreciates the opportunity to comment, however, the committee does not appreciate the short turnaround time provided for response. It appears that the draft plan was held up in the School of Medicine for quite some time and then suddenly it was sent to the Academic Senate for consultation with a request for an expedited response.

Research

February 21, 2013 11:40 AM

No response at this time.