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October-November 2011

UCSF faculty are reviewing the changes to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan in the proposed revisions to APM 670. Important issues currently under discussion include the following:

1. **Compensation Limit on Occasional Outside Professional Activities**
   The proposed changes to APM 670 would increase the amount of compensation a faculty member could earn before being assessed (“taxed”) by their department from $20,000 to $40,000 or 20% of an individual’s HSCP salary scale per year.
   
   UCSF faculty concerns:
   a. Current inconsistencies between APM 670 and departmental implementation of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan should be remedied so that faculty are not assessed/taxed on income earned up to the limit established in the APM. For example, some departments at UCSF currently assess all outside professional compensation.
   b. Could faculty be allowed to submit all outside professional compensation if they choose? For some faculty, submitting all compensation helps smooth gaps in grant funding for their salaries.
   c. The threshold for assessment/taxation should be systematically adjusted upward, perhaps subject to review every four years and/or tied to an index such as the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

2. **Time Limit on Compensated Outside Professional Activities**
   Proposed revisions to APM 670 retain the limit of 21 days of outside activities. However, “day” is purposely left undefined. UCSF Academic Affairs recommends referring to APM 025 for the definition of “day”, however that definition is equally vague.
   a. Request clarification of a “day” of service for UCSF faculty.

3. **Categories of Income from Occasional Outside Activities Which May Be Retained**
   The outside activities from which faculty members may receive compensation continue to be restricted. This creates problems for UCSF faculty who need to engage in certain activities not available to them at UCSF so they can maintain their licenses or accreditations. However, there is also concern that if UCSF faculty engage in activities too similar to those for which they are employed at UCSF, they will compete with UCSF and possibly compromise UCSF brand equity. Furthermore, UCSF faculty engaging in outside activities may expose them and UC to liabilities.

4. **Governance of plans, process is largely delegated to Chancellor, who can delegate to Deans.**
   - This largely retains current practice
   - Do we want language to assure larger faculty role, such as by changing the percentage of persons appointed to compensation plan oversight groups by Deans/Chairs vs. by faculty?

Additional Items for Discussion
- Retain original philosophy
- Delegate authority to the President or designee (removing the Regents from the language)
- Requirement of Schools or Departments to define “good standing” for faculty