

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

*Robert M. Anderson*  
Telephone: (510) 987-9303  
Fax: (510) 763-0309  
Email: [Robert.Anderson@ucop.edu](mailto:Robert.Anderson@ucop.edu)

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council  
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200*

November 7, 2011

## **LAWRENCE PITTS PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT**

### **Re: Implementation of Health Sciences Compensation Plan at UCR's School of Medicine**

Dear Larry:

As you requested, I solicited input from UCFW and UCAP regarding the UCR School of Medicine's plan for implementing the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), guided by APM 670. At its meeting on October 26, 2011, Council conditionally approved the plan but discussed concerns raised by UCFW and UCAP.

First, the version of APM 670 upon which the plan is based is neither the existing one, nor the one out for review. Rather, the UCR plan references a draft iteration of the proposed revisions to APM 670 and thus will require amendment to align with the changes to APM 670 currently under review. More significantly, UCFW's letter outlines a series of broad concerns about balancing faculty rights and protections against the responsibilities of deans. The letter identifies critical issues that must be resolved in a final version of any implementation plan. UCAP echoes the concerns outlined by UCFW.

Nonetheless, recognizing the importance of having a compensation plan in place to facilitate faculty recruitment, Council concurs with UCFW and UCAP in recommending conditional approval of UCR's implementation plan. Council recommends that the implementation plan be reviewed again either when a new version of APM 670 is issued or within three years, whichever comes first.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Robert M. Anderson, Chair  
Academic Council

cc: Academic Council  
Executive Director Winnacker



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)  
William Parker, Chair  
[william.parker@uci.edu](mailto:william.parker@uci.edu)

Assembly of the Academic Senate  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 987-9466  
Fax: (510) 763-0309

October 24, 2011

**ROBERT ANDERSON, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

**RE: UCR SOM Participation in HSCP**

Dear Bob,

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) has met and discussed the proposed implementation plan from the University of California at Riverside School of Medicine to participate in UC's Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP, governed by APM 670). The committee has concerns, enumerated below, and as such, UCFW can only conditionally recommend approval of the proposed plan.

First, UCFW notes that the version of APM 670 UCR proposes to implement never emerged from the process developing a revised APM 670. As you know, APM 670 has been undergoing revision for several years, with the Senate and the administration alternating the authorship of drafts. The version enclosed for comment by UCR is neither the existing APM 670 nor the version of the APM 670 currently undergoing review; rather, it is a version that was never agreed to by the joint drafting task force. Consequently, UCFW is reluctant to proceed with a detailed review of the UCR SOM HSCP until the new version of APM 670 is adopted.

Second, many on the committee from campuses with health science programs assert that the complexity inherent to HSCP and the customs underlying its day-to-day functioning are not well understood by the Riverside division. Of particular concern was the perceived de-emphasis of formal Senate engagement in issues regarding academic and professional progress ("good standing" and revenue generation), grievance procedures, and the roll of the advisory group. Even if future revisions are made, changing a culture that began in less-than-ideal-circumstances is considerably more difficult than creating the best culture at the outset. Some examples of where greater faculty engagement is needed to avoid potential future problems are provided below.

The one-year term of the members of the Advisory Committee creates the possibility of rapid turnover of membership, loss of continuity and potential manipulation of members to serve a particular agenda. We recommend more careful consideration of the membership and terms of service on the Advisory Committee to ensure the accomplishment of the goals of "maintaining transparency and fairness in the plan implementation".

The guidelines for the creation of APUs and the assignment of HSCP members to the appropriate APU are important components of a fair and transparent implementation plan. The draft HSCP for the UCR

SOM provides significant authority to the dean for these important decisions with no apparent oversight or appeal mechanism.

Some members of UCFW were concerned with the creation of APUs with fewer than 10 members. While this may be necessary early in the development of the UCR SOM, the draft HSCP provides no guidance when this practice would cease.

The draft HSCP appears to contain inconsistent definitions of “good standing”. Section IV.E first assumes all members of the clinical practice plan remain in “good standing” until their capacity to earn income is impaired, while later in this section a list of criteria that must be met to remain in good standing extends well beyond the capacity to earn income. Several of the listed criteria such as “collegial interactions with others”, “meeting other requirements as determined by the department” and “fulfillment of ...duties as assigned” are ambiguous and subject to manipulation. The draft plan is not clear about the appeal processes available to the faculty should they be accused of violating a “good standing” criterion.

Still, UCFW has been told that UCR SOM is at a competitive disadvantage by not having in place a compensation plan to aid in recruitment and that all subsequent amendments to APM 670 will apply equally to all participants (regardless of when, or under which version, they joined HSCP). Nonetheless, given the lengthy history of revising APM 670 due to its clear importance, UCFW opts only to conditionally recommend approval of UCR SOM in HSCP under the current proposal. We recommend the UCR SOM implementation of the HSCP return for review following the approval of a revised APM 670 or three years, which ever comes first.

We look forward to all HSCP participants being governed by a single plan.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "William Parker". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

William Parker, UCFW Chair

Copy: UCFW  
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)  
Katja Lindeberg, Chair  
klindenber@ucsd.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 987-9466  
Fax: (510) 763-0309

November 3, 2011

BOB ANDERSON, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**RE: UC RIVERSIDE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE**

Dear Bob,

UCAP joins UCFW in their detailed concerns surrounding the UC Riverside School of Medicine's implementation of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan under the current UCR proposal. We also join UCFW in recommending conditional approval of UC Riverside School of Medicine in HSPC under the current proposal, as well as the UCFW recommendation that the UC Riverside School of Medicine implementation of the HSPC return for review following the approval of a revised APM 670 or three years, whichever comes first.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Katja Lindeberg".

Katja Lindenber, Chair  
UCAP