



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Systemwide Review: Proposed Revision to APM 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan)

November 28, 2011

Enclosed is a request for systemwide review of proposed revisions to APM 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan). The proposed revisions clarify certain principles such as authority levels, and add language to provide guidelines for the assignment of Academic Programmatic Units and to bring APM - 670 into conformity with APM – 700). These changes were proposed after a targeted “management consultation” with Senate committees with jurisdiction in this area and administrators.

Administrative Partners (DANN TRASK)

November 30, 2011 2:51 PM

No response at this time.

Affirmative Action & Diversity

November 9, 2011 9:39 AM

No response at this time.

CAP Oversight Committee

November 10, 2011 11:27 AM

Proposed Revision to APM 670

(Health Sciences Compensation Plan)

The draft of the APM 670 Health Sciences Compensation Plan includes new language that provides an additional definition of “Good Standing” as it pertains to salary compensation. The new faculty salary plan language now 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. CAP recommends 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.”

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (AGRICULTURE)

December 3, 2011 11:56 AM

No response at this time.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (VETERINARY MEDICINE)

October 12, 2011 7:14 AM

Review by our faculty finds that the proposed revisions have changed little from past iterations with one exception. 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.

Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

October 24, 2011 4:43 PM

No response at this time.

Faculty Welfare

November 28, 2011 4:38 PM

Response continued on next page.

Submitted on behalf of 2011-12 Faculty Welfare Committee Chair Stuart Hill.

The Faculty Welfare Committee believes that additional changes should be made to the health sciences compensation plan, especially the composition of the Advisory Committee. The remuneration each faculty member receives under this proposal directly depends on the APU to which a faculty member is assigned. The Advisory Committee plays a central role in determining the criteria for being placed in a particular APU and whether specific faculty have been assigned to the most appropriate APU. APU placement will largely shape the compensation faculty receive.

The principal problem with APM 670 is that the Advisory Committee needs more independence from the Dean. The Dean appoints at least half of the members of the Advisory Committee and has virtually no constraints on which individuals can be selected. A faculty member who disagrees with his or her assignment to a specific APU can only appeal that decision to the Advisory Committee, half of whose members are chosen by the Dean. To maintain a given level of compensation a faculty member must also remain in "good standing" with the expectations of the APU to which that person has been assigned. The criteria for good standing, however, are not at all clear. Unfortunately, the Dean is given the discretion to determine when faculty are in or out of compliance with this ambiguous standard. And if a faculty member questions the Dean's judgment, this proposal would send them 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.

Planning & Budget

October 24, 2011 4:43 PM

CPB has reviewed the proposed revisions to APM 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan)CPB agrees with the proposed revisions.

Research

October 24, 2011 4:43 PM

No response at this time.