December 8, 2023

James Steintrager
Chair, UC Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Proposed New APM - 672, Negotiated Salary Program

Dear Chair Steintrager,

The divisional Executive Board (EB) appreciated the opportunity to review the proposed new APM - 672, Negotiated Salary Program.

EB reviewed the proposal and divisional committee and council responses at its meeting on December 7, 2023. A majority of members voted for a motion to decline to endorse the proposal and to express serious reservations to turn this pilot into a permanent program. Further, the motion requested greater evidence of the pilot’s impact, and expressed concern about the use of self-supporting graduate and professional degree program (SSGPDP) monies, the false analogy between health sciences compensation (HSCOMP) and this pilot program, and the danger that any trial program may lead to a permanent one.

Rationale for the Program
Members noted that the proposal did not address the rationale for continuation. It appeared that the main argument is that people who benefit from it, like it. Members observed that there have been repeated calls for data about whether the pilot program has been effective. They cautioned that the program should not be used as a tool for the university to avoid contributing its expected share to faculty salaries.

Inclusion of SSGPDPs
Members expressed concern about the inclusion of SSGPDPs as a legitimate funding source for this program as well as the general notion that individuals could use their time spent with a SSGPDP to justify a salary boost. They emphasized the concern of using state resources for a salary increase in the context of SSGPDP monies.

Equity Concerns
Some members expressed concern about salary equity related to this program not only within the division but also across the university system where implementation has been uneven. Several members noted that it is a false analogy to equate this proposed program with HSCOMP, the latter of which has to be done that way because of the division in function between the faculty and clinician roles. A few members noted that the pilot offers a useful mechanism to help the university remain competitive as well as to potentially provide equity between those faculty who are eligible for the HSCOMP and those who are not.

Trial Programs
Members noted that the divisional Senate was opposed to the initial proposal and subsequent pilot. They expressed concern that this pilot program served as a back door for Administration to implement a program over the objections of the Academic Senate. Members cautioned about the potential for “bait and switch” of having a trial or pilot program in the future.

Lastly, members noted that the current program has extensive paperwork requirements. They observed that there is a lot of administrative effort on both the divisional and systemwide level for a relatively small number of well-compensated faculty. They questioned whether it was a good use of university resources. A member noted that it would be better to raise the base salary scales.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Andrea Kasko
Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc:   Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
      Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
      April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate