



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Systemwide Review of APM 600 Series: Salary Administration

May 8, 2013

Proposed changes are in response to campus requests for update of the 600 series (salary administration) as described in the enclosed letter.

CAP Oversight Committee

May 13, 2013 2:48 PM

Response continued on next page.

May 8, 2013

APM 600 Review - Salary Administration

The Committee on Academic Personnel Oversight Committee (CAPOC) has reviewed the proposed changes to APM 600, SALARY ADMINISTRATION, and finds no issues in the proposed changes that affect policies within CAPOC's purview.

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, some of which are not clearly stated in the draft revision. CAPOC recommends clarification of the wording of 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."

This statement may need to be clarified in its statement that "the recruiting campus may offer the next higher step": this statement 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 presumably would be called upon to review the appointment on that basis. Furthermore, if the recruited faculty member were at a barrier step, e.g., Professor V or Professor IX, this wording would require clarification concerning the review process that would be followed 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 the following 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 above could be interpreted to 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. Clarification is needed.

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.

CAPOC recommends that wording of the above sections be revised to clarify their intents.

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

May 7, 2013 8:26 PM

No response at this time.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (MEDICINE)

May 13, 2013 2:54 PM

No response at this time.

Faculty Welfare

May 8, 2013 5:10 PM

Response of the Faculty Welfare Committee to the Proposed Revision of APM 600 series

The Faculty Welfare Committee did not object to most of the proposed revisions of the APM 600 series that specifies salary administration policies. One problem did emerge, however, 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. This policy can only be fairly implemented if every Department has clearly articulated its teaching load so that teaching responsibilities above that baseline can be identified and the faculty paid appropriately for their efforts.

Departments are supposed to have written policies that identify how many courses or units of instruction their faculty members normally teach in an academic year. Unfortunately, real world practice often does not conform to the written policy. Individual faculty members may have earned a reduced teaching load for teaching especially demanding courses or making large service commitments to the Department, University or profession. Some Departments will carefully specify their policy to account for all of these contingencies and then faithfully update it as conditions change. Other units may identify their Department’s general expectation of how much faculty are expected to teach and then list a few service commitments that would justify a reduced load. The Chair is given the implicit responsibility of using his or her judgment to address the full range of scenarios that would lead to a reduced load.

If APM 662 and 663 are enacted the Chair in the Department with the clearly defined teaching expectations will conform to these procedures for compensating faculty who teach more than their unit’s normal load. But these changes to the APM will give Department Chairs with loosely specified teaching expectations increased discretion to determine whether particular faculty members have earned reduced teaching loads or additional compensation for teaching more than the “normal” load in their unit. This policy will give greater discretion to the leaders of departmental units that do not conform to the spirit much less the letter of University expectations concerning faculty teaching loads.

Graduate Council

March 13, 2013 9:44 AM

No response at this time.