



CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
RIVERSIDE DIVISION
UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING, RM 225

MARY GAUVAIN
PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0217
TEL: (951) 827-5538
E-MAIL: MARY.GAUVAIN@UCR.EDU
SENATE@UCR.EDU

November 18, 2011

Robert Anderson
Professor of Economics and Mathematics
UC Systemwide Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Bob:

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF APM 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan)

The UCR Senate Committees on Academic Personnel and Faculty Welfare and the Executive Committee of the Division of Biomedical Sciences reviewed and commented on the proposed revisions to APM 670. Their responses are attached and a summary of their comments, with explicit description of the detailed comments from the Division of Biomedical Sciences (for which the page and line numbers refer to the *Draft – Clean Copy* version), is below. Editorial suggestions have been forwarded in a separate cover to Martha Winnacker.

1. We recommend that any committee that reviews or hears a case regarding a Plan Member suspected of not complying with APM 670 include a majority of Senate members.
2. Regarding proposed 670-2c (p.2), we prefer the original version that includes the statement, "...as well as generation of income", which recognizes contributions regardless of whether they produce income.
3. Regarding proposed 670-6d, it is critical that all Advisory Committee members are elected from members of the Academic Senate and not appointed by the dean. The deans have administrative authority of the schools and it is important that their advisory committee speaks with an independent voice.
4. Regarding proposed 670-10b, the meaning of the word "only" (p.5, line18) is unclear and seems to contradict the prior sentence. In following line, it is unclear how a significant impact would be defined, we recommend the following revision: "A faculty member may also fail to be in Good Standing for conduct which negatively impacts the health sciences school's..."

5. On p. 9, line 10, the meaning of the term “memorialized” is unclear, if the intent is to have this information recorded in writing this should be stated directly. Also, the next paragraph, beginning with the line “Determination of and responsibility for...” should be added to the preceded paragraph.
6. Regarding proposed 670-18a, last paragraph, we suggest noting that in some cases off-scale salary may be warranted.
7. Page 27, the section beginning with “The school procedures may allow departments...” is confusing. If the school can set more restrictive limits than 21 days, how can the limit at the same time be no less than 21 days?

Sincerely yours,

Mary Gauvain
Professor of Psychology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Sellyna Ehlers, Director of UCR Academic Senate office



November 3, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: 
Marylynn V. Yates
Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Comments on proposed revisions to APM 670 – Health Sciences Compensation Plan

CAP discussed the proposed revisions to APM 670 – Health Sciences Compensation Plan on October 12, 2011. We have no comments on this proposal.

November 4, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Irving Hendrick, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Systemwide Review of APM 670

Although it is not the case at UCR, the Committee is aware that the University has considerable experience with health science compensation plans. We are further aware that this history is long on the discretion of deans. The proposed revisions to APM 670 constitute a marked improvement in shared governance within health science schools.

With specific reference to 670-6d, we believe that further strengthening of health science Senate faculty roles are in order, first by the election of *all* Advisory Committee members, understanding that the Advisory Committees may include a significant minority of clinical faculty. Since deans have administrative authority, it does not seem reasonable that they should have a role in appointing up to half the persons who advise them. The advisory prerogative belongs to faculty who are members of the Academic Senate, much as is the case with the way the administration and Senate operate on other issues aside from courses and curricula.

With regard to monitoring and enforcement under APM 670, it is noted that the Dean may take appropriate corrective action in cases where a department chair or the dean has reason to believe that a Plan member has not complied with the school Implementing Procedures or Guidelines on outside professional activities. The Committee has no problem with this so long the procedure for hearing and resolving disputes about corrective action involves a hearing by a committee which includes a majority of Senate members.

November 1, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Senate
Riverside Division

From: Daniel S. Straus, Chair
Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee

RE: **Systemwide Review of Academic Personnel Policy 670, Health Sciences Compensation Plan**

The BMSC Executive Committee reviewed this document. We have the following comments. Page numbers refer to the Draft Clean Copy. We have also suggested editorial changes in the Draft Clean Copy (Word version, attached).

Page 2, 670-2c: We prefer the original version, "...as well as generation of income". The previous version recognized people's contributions whether or not they produced income. The new version says that the encouragement is only to recognize those activities that generate income.

Page 5, line 18, 670-10b: Meaning of the word "only" is unclear: as written this sentence seems to contradict the preceding sentence. Also, in the next line it isn't clear how a significant impact would be defined. We recommend changing to: "A faculty member may also fail to be in Good Standing for conduct which negatively impacts the health sciences school's..."

Page 9, line 10: "memorialized" If intended meaning is "in writing", say "in writing": "...the faculty member's salary must be jointly agreed to in writing by the Chairs..." Also, it seems that the paragraph beginning "Determination of and responsibility for the faculty member's salary..." should be part of the preceding paragraph.

Page 10, 670-18a, last paragraph: In some cases off-scale salary may be warranted. Examples include making a competitive recruitment offer to an excellent job candidate, and recommendation for off-scale salary coming from CAP, in order to give an additional ½ step to a faculty member with an outstanding merit or promotion file.

Page 11, 670-18b, first paragraph: A few changes are suggested in the document to improve the clarity of the definitions of X and X': see marked up Clean Copy, page 11.

Page 27: "The school Procedures may allow departments or organized research units to set more restrictive limits, but such limits shall not be less than 21 days of compensated outside professional activity." This section is confusing. If the school can set more restrictive limits than 21 days, how can the limit at the same time be no less than 21 days? Or, have we misread this?

Page 34: “Compensation established in accordance with the specialized Health Sciences Salary Scales (commonly referred to as X compensation) shall not be reduced as a corrective action unless the Plan member is placed, by Chancellorial exception, on the fiscal year salary scale.”

If this is intended to mean base salary, it should read:

“Compensation established in accordance with the specialized Health Sciences Salary Scales (commonly referred to as X + X' compensation) shall not be reduced as a corrective action unless the Plan member is placed, by Chancellorial exception, on the fiscal year salary scale.”

X is not correct here because X is defined earlier in the document as Scale 0, also called the fiscal year salary scale.