RE: Systemwide Review of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program

Dear Shane,

The Executive Board of the UCLA Academic Senate discussed the Systemwide Review of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) at its meeting on November 16, 2017. The Executive Board solicited comments from standing committees of the Senate, as well as the Faculty Executive Committees, to maximize faculty feedback. The individual responses from the various committees follow this summary.

The Board discussed the recommendations of the Task Force to determine whether the NSTP should be: (1) discontinued, (2) continued as an extended and/or expanded trial, or (3) made permanent. All of the committees except one felt that the program should be continued on a trial basis and expanded to include other UC campuses (the current trial is restricted to UCLA, Irvine, and San Diego). Everyone acknowledged and appreciated the goals of the program to recruit and retain outstanding faculty, which is a continuing challenge given UC’s salary structure compared to other top public universities. However, these same committees raised a number of concerns that were not alleviated by the analyses presented in the Task Force report.

The most widespread concern was that the NSTP might contribute to even greater salary disparities along race, ethnicity, and gender lines (see the Committee on Diversity, Equity & Inclusion memo.) Increased faculty time devoted to securing grants, gifts, and other sources of extramural funding to boost one’s salary over time could also erode faculty involvement in teaching and service, leading to disparities in faculty workloads. The Faculty Welfare Committee registered the most concerns about the NSTP, arguing that “this program will contribute to yet more unequal compensation for faculty and declining faculty involvement in undergraduate education, without substantially increasing faculty retention.” Similarly, Graduate Council worried that the program would create a two-tiered class system”. And despite the Report’s assurances otherwise, some committees and Board members were concerned that the NSTP could undermine the merit review process and efforts to reduce salary gaps and lags via normal mechanisms. During the next trial period, it will be important for the Task Force to gather systematic data documenting the positive aspects of the NSTP and assuring that these benefits outweigh its costs.

Finally, there was general agreement not in favor of the proposed name change to General Campus Compensation Plan. Board members and committee members felt that such a name confuses the core salary structure of the university and the additional compensation currently allowed through the NSTP. Supporting a name change, the Engineering FEC suggested “a name which clarifies the role of this program and differentiates it from the primary scale-based compensation.”

The committees were thoughtful in their comments and the Executive Board urges you to read through the various responses. As always, the Executive Board appreciates the opportunity to opine. Please feel free to contact me should you any questions.

Sincerely,

Sandra Graham
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

cc: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Susan Cochran, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
Joseph Bristow, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
Michael LaBriola, Principal Policy Analyst, Systemwide Academic Senate
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate