April 26, 2013

Robert Powell
Chair, Academic Council

**Re: Revisions to APM Section IV**

Dear Bob,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine upon the proposed revision to the 600 series of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM Section IV). This matter was reviewed by the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) as well as the Executive Board. I am attaching the response from CPB, which the Executive Board endorses. I will also take this opportunity to elaborate on some of our concerns.

- **APM 661.** CPB noted that “In APM-661, the date for establishing the pay rate for summer teaching is June 30th of the calendar year, in spite of the fact that the course could begin on July 1, when a salary increase could become effective. Revision to accommodate being paid at the rate in effect at the time of teaching should be made.”

- **APM 662-17.b.ii.** The proposed language reads, in part "For fully online courses, hours will be determined by course units under the assumption that campuses will ensure online courses provide unit workloads equivalent to the same or similar in-person course formats according to Senate Regulation 760 [hyperlink added]. Each unit for an online course will be assumed equivalent to one "podium" hour per week. Thus, a three-unit lecture/discussion/laboratory course would count for three hours each week…”

But the language proposed for APM 662-17.b.ii is, in fact, incompatible with SR 760, which assigns unit values to courses based on hours of student effort, not podium hours per week. SR 760 states “the value of a course in units shall be reckoned at the rate of one unit for three hours' work per week per term on the part of a student, or the equivalent."

Since there is no correspondence between units and "podium" or lecture hours, units and lab sessions, units and total contact hours, etc., the proposed language must be revised. Units are strictly based on student workload. At UCLA and presumably on most campuses, the course approval process is the mechanism through which faculty describe and evaluate workload and ensure that the units assigned align with the work expected.
• **APM 664.** Finally, members are concerned that there is no limit indicated for consulting on University projects. It is not clear why this particular category of additional compensation is exempt from limits when every other category of additional compensation states clear limits. It is also not clear how such consulting appointments are made.

Although UCLA does not support the revisions of APM 661, 662-17.b.ii, and 664 for the reasons indicated, we raise no objections to the other modifications. Indeed, we concur that the APM must be updated for consistency with the anticipated UC Path.

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

Sincerely,

Linda Sarna  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

CC:  Jaime R. Balboa, Ph.D., Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate  
Martha Winnacker, J.D., Executive Director, UC Academic Senate
April 12, 2013

Professor Linda Sarna  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Revisions to APM Section IV: Council on Planning and Budget Review/Response

Dear Professor Sarna,

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed the proposed revisions to Section IV of the APM at our meeting on April 1, 2013. We also had the opportunity to gain the perspective of Vice Chancellor Goldberg on the proposed changes and she provided answers to our questions.

With upcoming implementation of UC Path, there is a clear need for the AP M-600 Series to be updated to provide consistency in handling salary administration across campuses. In addition, some updates are included to which are beneficial, such as increasing the values for the start-up packages for intercampus transfers (510-19) which have not been adjusted since 1997. However, a number of opportunities for needed corrections were missed, and a few changes appeared inappropriate.

In APM-661, the date for establishing the pay rate for summer teaching is June 30th of the calendar year, in spite of the fact that the course could begin on July 1, when a salary increase could become effective. Revision to accommodate being paid at the rate in effect at the time of teaching should be made.

Due to the difficulties in providing competitive salaries for faculty, the limit of earning no more than 20% of the annual salary rate through additional compensation/University Extension (APM 663-18. a.iii) should be reexamined and raised.

There was considerable concern over the definitions for time limitations for additional teaching in 662-17.b.i and ii. Defining the units for an online course unit as a function of “podium” hours is inconsistent with the way units are assigned for regular courses.
It is also unclear what the limit is of online course supplementation in a hybrid course before it is considered an online course.

Finally, despite clear limits on additional compensation in all other sections, there is no limit indicated in Section 664 for consulting on University projects. It is not clear why this category of additional compensation is exempt from limitations, while other categories are limited in either time or percentage of pay, nor is it clear how these consulting appointments are made. CPB would like more clarity in this section.

CPB was appreciative of the concern and efforts of VC Goldberg to carry these issues forward.

Sincerely,

Neal Garrett
Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Jan Reiff, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
    Andy Leuchter, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget