The Task Force bases its recommendations on the following principles, which it takes to be fundamental to UC’s mission, stature, and excellence:
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MICHAEL T. BROWN
PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Michael,

As requested, I distributed for systemwide Senate review the report and recommendations of the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. All ten Academic Senate divisions and five systemwide committees (UCAADE, UCAP, UCACC, UCFW, and UCPB) submitted comments. These comments were discussed at Academic Council’s February 24 meeting and are attached for your reference.

We understand that the Task Force was charged with making recommendations for increasing the market relevance and equity of the published UC faculty salary scales, and for reducing the University’s reliance on off-scale supplements to achieve competitive compensation. The Task Force began its work before the current widespread health and economic difficulties, including high rates of unemployment, due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The report was completed shortly after the stay-at-home orders went into effect in California, and then it was referred to the Academic Council for review. It is the responsibility of the University to engage in regular evaluations of employee and appointee compensation, and this Task Force and its report is one such effort. We recognize that the timing of this report and our comments on it may appear insensitive to the broader social realities of today. However, we conducted our review in the spirit of due diligence and with the hope that the information we provide will be useful as we recover from the current situation.

The Task Force recommends moving UC to more competitive, transparent, and equitable salary scales that continue to be uniform across campuses, and that are adjusted annually so as to gradually eliminate or substantially reduce the need for off-scale compensation. It proposes two possible compensation models for achieving these aims: a comparison-based model focused on new hires, and a disciplinary-based model.

In general, reviewers agree that the report is a good starting place for considering the role of salary in recruitment and retention at UC. Many expressed support for the goal of increasing
UC’s competitiveness, for the principle of equity and transparency in faculty compensation, and for eliminating the “loyalty penalty” for long-serving faculty. Reducing UC’s salary gap with the “Comparison 8” group of institutions also remains a critical goal. Many agree that UC excellence is supported by the merit-based peer-review system that links rank and step to compensation through the published salary scales. Integral to this system is the principle that academic productivity and the merit review process, not outside offers or a faculty member’s negotiating skills, should determine rank, step, and salary. Reviewers also agree that the scales are no longer effective in preventing salary compression and inversion, and they point to the routine use of outside offers by faculty to secure off-scale raises. Given these principles and circumstances, many expressed support for returning the published scales to market reality and competitive relevance in order to preserve and support the integrity of the merit system.

Some reviewers believe that the proposed models would help support a fairer, more transparent, and more effective system of compensating faculty and recruiting new faculty to UC. However, many others noted concerns about potential adverse consequences inherent in both models. Prominent among these concerns is the potential effect of reducing or eliminating off-scale supplements on recruitment and retention. Many reviewers underscore the great value of off-scales in the highly competitive academic marketplace, and also note that off-scales help compensate for the deterioration of UC pension benefits for new hires relative to those hired into earlier pension tiers. In general, reviewers agreed that while it is preferable for off-scales to be the exception and not the rule, they nevertheless should remain available to campuses as a tool.

Reviewers differed on the role of off-scales in supporting equity and diversity. Several noted that recruitment and retention actions that rely on off-scale salaries can exacerbate gender and race differences among faculty salaries, but others observed that off-scale offers also help campuses recruit and retain diverse faculty, and that other factors are more serious contributors to salary inequities. There was broad agreement that retention actions contribute to the “loyalty penalty,” but also concern that the plan to phase in the new compensation system starting with new hires would exacerbate the “loyalty penalty.” These may be areas for additional study.

The proposal for disciplinary-based scales was not supported widely for several reasons. First, there is concern that discipline-specific scales would not be sufficiently fine-grained to account for the wide variation in compensation across fields and sub-disciplines. In addition, disciplinary-based scales might also have the effect of locking in lower scales for more diverse disciplines such as arts and humanities. Concern was also expressed that salaries for certain disciplines based on market comparisons with the private sector are inherently problematic because they ignore other, less tangible benefits of an academic position for individuals in fields with high rates of compensation outside the academy. These benefits include security of employment and substantial autonomy in professional and intellectual engagement and development. This approach comes with real costs to the university. It can promote faculty resentment and division across disciplines and, if left unchecked, could potentially “bankrupt the system.” These are other potential areas for additional study.

Reviewers were divided about the value of maintaining a systemwide salary scale, a principle articulated in the Task Force report. Many reviewers feel strongly that a common salary scale helps sustain UC as a system of ten excellent campuses. But others think the issues identified in
the report may be better addressed at each campus separately, rather than through a common systemwide scale, given individual campuses exist in different competitive markets. Several reviewers also observed that the recommendations could do more to address the significant cost of living differences across campuses, and similarly, noted that it would be useful for future models to consider total compensation, not just salaries.

Reviewers also emphasized the need for faculty involvement in decisions about off-scales and other compensation matters. We understand that on some campuses, the administration has control over off-scales, which further decouples salaries from the merit system, reduces transparency, and undermines faculty peer review, while on other campuses the Senate has oversight, or at least input, into off-scale decisions. Including faculty as part of the regular off-scale review process should be pursued as a best practice on all campuses.

Reviewers also believe the Senate would benefit from more data projecting the effectiveness of the new system in recruitment and retention relative to the use of off scales, its potential effect on the number of salary equity reviews, and additional study about practices that may address off-scale inequities more quickly than the two proposed models.

There was some support expressed for expanding the “Comparison 8” to other institutions with whom UC competes for faculty. We do understand that UCOP uses the Comparison 8 because it is recognized as the official measure for faculty salary comparisons by external state agencies such as the California Department of Finance. Finally, there was broad support for the recommendation to develop systemwide resources to assist faculty with housing costs.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Council

Cc:  Vice Provost Carlson
    Director Greenspan
    Chief of Staff to the Provost Peterson
    Academic Council
    Senate Directors
    Executive Director Baxter

Encl.
February 17, 2021

MARY GAUVAIN
Chair, Academic Council

Subject: Systemwide Review of the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Chair Gauvain;

On February 8, 2021, the Council of the Berkeley Division (DIVCO) discussed the Academic Planning Council Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales Report and Recommendations, informed by comments from our local committees on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations (BIR); Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA); Diversity, Equity, and Campus Climate (DECC); and Faculty Welfare (FWEL). The committee comments are appended in their entirety.

The report presents preliminary recommendations to adjust salary scales to market levels and reduce the use of off-scale components to exceptional cases, with the dual aims of increasing fairness and ensuring excellence. While expressing support for these dual aims, members of the Berkeley Divisional Council did not see that the preliminary recommendations would effectively enhance those aims at Berkeley, as articulated clearly in the comments from BIR and FWEL.

Several Berkeley DIVCO members asked for information about the challenges of the other divisions as regards salary scales, which I was largely unable to provide. We suspect that this may be one of the domains where differences between practice across the campuses are large, so that improvements for one mean new challenges for others. With longer discussion of the specific challenges of the different divisions, perhaps we can find solutions that will be more uniformly productive.

DIVCO also discussed that there is not yet an analysis of the cost of reform, and that the transition to the new scale would risk creating new inequalities. DIVCO members expressed concern about the longevity of the new scale, and expressed support for DECC’s observation that the report does not address factors beyond off-scale increments that lead to inequalities in salary. The Berkeley Division would want to see all these issues addressed in some detail.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Johnson-Hanks
Professor of Demography and Sociology
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

Enclosures

cc: Ronald Cohen, Vice Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
    Leslie Kurke, Chair, Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations
    Paul Fine, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
    Lok Siu, Chair, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Campus Climate
    David Hollinger, Co-chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
    Terrance Odean, Co-chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
    Jocelyn Surla Banaria, Executive Director, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
    William Lynch, Manager staffing the Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations
    Deborah Dobin, Senate Analyst, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
    Linda Corley, Senate Analyst, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Campus Climate
    Sumali Tuchrello, Senate Analyst, Committee on Faculty Welfare
CHAIR JENNIFER JOHNSON-HANKS  
BERKELEY DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: Proposal from Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force

We write in response to your request for comments on the proposal by the systemwide Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force regarding a revision of the procedure to determine systemwide faculty salary scales. The proposal presents recommendations to adjust salary scales to market levels, and reduce the use of off-scale components to exceptional cases, with the objectives of retaining and attracting the best faculty, increasing transparency, and diminishing the extent of inequity and of the “loyalty penalty.”

While we appreciate the objectives of the proposed recommendations, and the efforts of the Task Force, we do not find that the adoption of the recommendations presented as they stand would be beneficial for Berkeley. We note that there is substantial heterogeneity in market pressures across campuses, and even across faculty in the same discipline on the same campus, such that the use of off-scale components is essential for Berkeley to retain and attract the best faculty. We also note that at Berkeley there is a thorough review of off-scale salaries at multiple stages, with significant involvement of the Academic Senate. We are sensitive to issues of inequity and of the existing “loyalty penalty,” but believe that these issues may be better addressed at each campus separately rather than through a common systemwide salary scale without the use of off-scale components.

We encourage campuses with reduced faculty involvement in decisions on faculty compensation to work to increase that involvement.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Leslie Kurke  
Chair

LK/wl
February 3, 2021

PROFESSOR JENNIFER JOHNSON-HANKS
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

Re: CAPRA comments on Systemwide Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

At today's meeting, CAPRA discussed the report of the Systemwide Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. This memo addresses issues of academic planning, budget, and resource allocation, consistent with the charge of CAPRA.

UC-wide faculty salary scales are becoming increasingly irrelevant, as 99% of UC faculty are paid off-scale (i.e., they receive an off-scale supplement on top of their faculty salary scale). Twenty years ago, only 50% of faculty were paid off-scale. The prevalence of off-scale salaries has exploded because faculty salary scales have not kept up with the market-wide evolution of faculty pay (even after accounting for off-scale pay, UC faculty salaries are about 7.5% below market). Being paid off-scale makes pay less transparent and equitable.

The task force proposes to re-align the salary scales to better reflect market salaries based on a group of eight peer institutions to the overall UC system ("Comp 8"). New salary scales would be phased in slowly (only for new hires) to soften the budget cost.

The report is very preliminary, laying out the issues and showing some informative statistics. Nevertheless, it is far from delivering an implementable plan. Here are key missing pieces and areas that require more thought:

Cost of the reform: There is no analysis of the cost of the reform. The current system likely evolved from short-term budget constraints as a way to minimize costs of salary increases (giving market raises only to those who are at risk of leaving imminently because of an outside offer). It is reasonable to assume that the new scale would cost more but, without any analysis, we have no sense of how much more. We are also reminded of the recent Targeted Decoupled Initiative (TDI) and wonder if that paid for itself and/or reduced the number of retention cases; perhaps learnings from that experience could inform the current effort.
Transition to new scale: The report says that the new scales would apply to new hires only (as a way to save costs). This creates a risk of inequity that could last decades. A person hired just before the reform will be on the old scale while a colleague hired just after will be on the new, much more advantageous scale. The transition needs to be thought out more carefully. Even if existing faculty are retroactively transitioned to the scale, serious equity questions arise. For example, the scale proposes 10% pay increases at the Associate and Full promotion points. But that would disadvantage faculty who recently got promoted on the existing scales.

Phasing out off-scale salary: In the current system, off-scale pay carries over indefinitely (and even benefits from the annual systemwide regular salary increases). Any plan to reduce occurrence of off-scale pay would have to design a mechanism so that off-scale pay phases out (e.g., it does not benefit from annual regular salary increases, and off-scale pay phases out as one moves up the faculty salary scale). Another possibility could be tying cost of living increases to on-scale versus off-scale pay.

Longevity of the new scale: The report proposes an experimental scale that would be benchmarked against current starting salaries — which are presumably market based — and Comp 8 salaries. After the initial benchmarking, the scale would increase with “California CPI-U or other appropriate factors.” But the California CPI-U is unlikely to grow fast enough to keep up with market salaries. Thus, if the scale is not “marked to market” at a regular cadence, UC could end up back in the same situation after a decade.

CAPRA commends the task force on addressing the ongoing and increasing issues related to faculty salary scales, and the committee appreciates the opportunity to review the report. It is a good start but much work remains to be done before changes to the scales can be implemented.

With best regards,

Paul Fine, Chair
Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
The Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Campus Climate (DECC) discussed the systemwide Academic Planning Council’s Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations on December 10, 2020.

We appreciate the Task Force’s efforts to call attention to UC salary scales and the particular need to close the gap between UC on-scale salary and market rates set by “Comparison-8 institutions.” While we agree that it may be time to adjust the UC salary scales to reflect more accurately the current actual salaries of faculty, the report seems to be narrowly focused on off-scale compensation and does not address other factors that lead to internal salary inequities.

The Task Force recommends the elimination of the use of off-scale compensation. DECC understands that although off-scale compensation can create salary disparities, it plays an important function in faculty retention and in maintaining the research and teaching excellence of the university. We suggest that rather than eliminating its use, a cap or outer-limit be placed on off-scale compensation.

We also recommend the use of programs like the “Targeted Decoupling Initiative” or TDI to address faculty salary inequities. The recently published 2020 UC Berkeley Faculty Salary Equity Study shows the effectiveness of the TDI, when sustained over three academic years (2015-2018), in reversing salary inequities for women and underrepresented minority faculty. The program offers a targeted approach in addressing specific salary inequities.

DECC would like to take this opportunity to broaden the discussion and consider other factors inherent in the salary scale system that contribute to salary inequities, such as the slow advancement rate and the lack of headroom for Associate level professors, especially those in book-based disciplines. These concerns were raised in UCB’s 2015 Faculty Salary Equity Report, which stated “(t)here is no question that slow advancement
and loss of headroom affect the salaries of faculty members [within the Associate Professor rank], or that significant numbers of the affected faculty members are from book-based disciplines. We also know that book-based disciplines tend to have higher proportions of women and minority faculty compared with other segments of the faculty population” (p. 49). To address this, we recommend that a) administrators provide clearer communication on the expectations for promotion from Associate to Full Professor; b) administrators encourage departments to broaden criteria for advancement from Associate to Full Professor; c) the university provide support to assist women and URM faculty to advance through the ranks in a timely manner; d) we consider revising APM 210-1-D to broaden evaluation of research, teaching, and service to include explicit consideration of DEIB contributions for promotion and advancement.

Finally, as the Task Force Report noted, issues of cost of living vary widely across the UC campuses. At Berkeley, the rising costs of housing and childcare are critical issues that must be considered in any discussion concerning faculty salary equity.

DECC appreciates the work of the Task Force. We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this report.

Sincerely,

Lok Siu
Chair, Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Campus Climate

LS/lt
CHAIR JENNIFER JOHNSON-HANKS  
Academic Senate  

Re: Academic Planning Council Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales Report and Recommendations  

Dear Jenna,  

On December 14th the Committee on Faculty Welfare (FWEL) discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Report and Recommendations of the Task Force of the Academic Planning Council. While we appreciate the time that was spent by the Task Force to generate these recommendations, we find this to be a peculiar document that does not take into account differences between the campuses and offers a series of sweeping observations of dubious validity.  

We disagree with the report’s premise that off-scale salaries are pernicious. Perhaps this is an issue at other campuses, but at Berkeley decisions about off-scale compensation are regularized and go through a multi-layered process of review. Without the ability to provide off-scale competition, Berkeley would have no way to retain faculty being recruited by well-endowed universities. Moreover, while do not doubt that the current salary scales invite revision, we oppose any plan to impose a single salary policy across the ten campuses that would keep Berkeley from proceeding as we now do.  

We strongly encourage campuses with insufficient faculty involvement in salary-setting to work to increase that involvement. Rigidifying salary policy on a systemwide basis is simply a mistake.  

Sincerely,  

David Hollinger, Co-Chair  
Terrance Odean, Co-Chair  

DH/TO/st
February 17, 2021

Mary Gauvain
Chair, Academic Council

RE: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Mary,

The final report and recommendations of the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force were forwarded to all standing committees of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Nine committees responded: Academic Personnel Oversight (CAP), Faculty Welfare (FW), Planning and Budget (CPB), Undergraduate Council (UGC), and the Faculty Executive Committees of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES), the College of Biological Sciences (CBS), the Graduate School of Management (GSM), the School of Nursing (SON), and the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM).

Below, we structure our comments by the report’s primary recommendations.

Transparency, Equity, and Objectivity
Committees agree that improving these three principles in the salary system is highly desirable. How to implement and enshrine these three principles is, of course, the challenging part.

For example, it is not immediately obvious what type of “market-based” models are most appropriate. CAP argues that the report’s assumption of a unitary job market is untrue; the eight comparator institutions are either “wealthy and private” or “financially secure and public.” Less elite and financially secure state institutions are excluded, even though UC competes for faculty from these institutions. CAP also argues, as does UGC, that institutional comparisons should not be based just on salary, but on total compensation. As UGC notes, “We would not want to overcome one problem of a lack of transparency only to transfer it to another less transparent and understandable category of compensation.”

Annual Adjustment
CPB, FW, CAES, and CBS note that the report’s recommendations do not address cost-of-living differences. CPB suggests that UC look at federal models, which use a locality pay factor to offset geographical inequities.

Disciplinary Differences
Committees expressed various opinions about how sensitive salary scales should be to disciplinary differences. SON sees such modeling as important to help reconcile disciplinary differences within and
across roles and to help keep practice disciplines, such as nursing, competitive with the practice market. CAP, while noting that some salaries might partly be influenced by opportunities in the private sector, thinks that “a move to further expand the market-driven component of salaries by discipline would a) threaten to bankrupt the UC system and b) generate enormous resentment and division within the faculty.” In reality, this discussion would be better served by having more concrete modeling available, as the recommendations are unclear as to how the two proposed models for addressing disciplinary variances would work in practice.

Off-Scale Compensation Should be the Rare Exception
Committees agree that reliance on off-scale compensation should be reduced, but they caution about potential workforce impacts. CAES and CBS are concerned that reducing the use of off-scale adjustments as retention tools could lead to faculty departures. CAP concurs that this may be more acute for junior faculty, who by virtue of arriving at UC with less generous retirement benefits than senior faculty, are more inclined to seek employment offers at competing institutions and trade those offers for higher UC salaries. More data are needed to determine how systemic and costly this problem actually is and if it would be wise for UC to develop compensation structures that are competitive on grounds other than direct financial compensation.

Closing Thoughts
The Davis Division encourages the task force to read through all enclosed committee responses, which bring up many finer points and suggestions for further analysis. The report is a valuable starting place for considering the role of salary compensation and motivation at UC, but it should be augmented by further investigations into total compensation and modeling of what UC can realistically achieve moving forward.

The Davis Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Richard P. Tucker, Ph.D.
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
University of California, Davis

Enclosed: Davis Division Committee Responses

c: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
   Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
   Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
RE: RFC: Faculty Salary Task Force Report and Recommendations

The Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight (CAP) has reviewed and discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations. CAP members appreciated the opportunity to review this report. Although they did not think it was directly relevant to their role as the faculty advisory body in academic personnel, the off-scale approach effectively removes faculty (CAP) oversight from salary-based academic advancement.

CAP members applaud the report’s objective to promote more transparency and faculty engagement. CAP members support rewarding faculty with appropriate compensation. As a senate committee, CAP members had several comments about the report, specifically the assumptions that form the basis of the task force’s recommendations. Those comments are as follows:

- The report assumes that the academic job market is unitary, which is not true as it is segmented. Eight institutions chosen for salary comparison are of two types: a) extremely wealthy private institutions (Yale, Harvard, Stanford, MIT) and b) relatively financially secure state institutions (Michigan, Illinois, Virginia, SUNY). The analysis does not include second-tier and less financially secured state institutions (though SUNY arguably is in that category), such as the California State System or smaller state systems. It also does not include state systems where salary compensation relative to cost of living is probably more in line with UC compensation (i.e., Texas, North Carolina, Washington, Ohio, Indiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania).

- Compensation at institutions in the second category (relatively financially secure state institutions) is not and never will be comparable to the first category (wealthy private institutions). This is even more true if we examine total compensation. For example, many wealthy private institutions offer faculty members up to $250,000 in tuition benefits for each child. Many offer very substantial pre-tax contributions to equity-based retirement programs, for example through TIAA-CREF, which i) give faculty far greater ability to take advantage of competitive forces in the job market (since they do not have the “golden handcuffs” that UC’s defined-benefit system creates) and ii) yield massively greater returns over time.

- Institutions that UC genuinely competes for faculty are comparable state institutions, and second-tier state institutions, from which UC is able to recruit high-performing faculty. The report notes that UC salaries are currently 7.5 percent below the “market” rate established by comparison group of eight institutions. There should be a comparison with institutions with which the UC actually does compete and the comparison should not be based just on salary, but on total compensation.

- The report assumes that the academic job market is competitive. At the moment, in many disciplines, this is also not true, in two senses:
  - First, academic salaries are not and should not be considered competitive with private-sector compensation. Academic employment offers intangible benefits that make it “competitive” in other-than-salary terms—in particular autonomy, security of
employment, and opportunities for research and intellectual development. For this reason, salary scales are not, cannot be, and should not be radically differentiated by discipline. Of course, they are partly determined by opportunities in the private sector, and in pre-professional fields that is appropriate. But a move to further expand the market-driven component of salaries by discipline would a) threaten to bankrupt the UC system and b) generate enormous resentment and division within the faculty. Beyond that, it arguably is important to maintain a distinction between academic employment and employment in technical fields in the private sector, in order to avoid establishing a “revolving door” between industry and academia. Such a “revolving door” system could potentially compromise the intellectual autonomy of many disciplines within the university.

- Second, in many disciplines the academic job market is not very competitive under the current fiscal conditions, and will not be for the foreseeable future. On the contrary, it is a buyer’s or rather an employer’s market. Current UC compensation policy—specifically with respect to benefits—reflects this fact. The UC can attract outstanding early-career academics at a much-reduced salary cost today than it has been able to in the past. Arguably, the “tiered” structure of benefits (by year of hire) comes at a very high potential cost to the institution, because for the medium-term it will generate enormous generational resentment and financial (and moral) incentive for outstanding young faculty to leave.

- The two “experimental models of market-based professorial scales” presented in the report suggest that the task force did not take this problem into account. What those projected scales reveal is in fact that UC salaries at the lower ranks are much closer to “market” rates (as defined by the task force) than are salaries at the upper ranks. This is right and necessary, because non-salary compensation for more recent hires is very significantly lower than it is for those hired in earlier decades. To the extent that off-scale salary supplements have been used at least in part to compensate for the deterioration of UC benefits for more recent hires, they have been used entirely appropriately to address a critical problem for the institution.

- Finally, even disregarding the current fiscal environment, for senior faculty in the UC system the job market is not competitive under any circumstances, because UC’s defined-benefit retirement program creates an enormous financial disincentive for senior faculty to leave. This may in fact be one reason that salary compensation at senior ranks is so low relative to that for comparable ranks at many other institutions—senior faculty really cannot make a financially viable decision (or a credible threat) to leave.

- The report assumes that salary compensation is currently the most important factor in determining the UC’s ability to sustain its historic educational excellence which is debatable. This might apply to the UC Health System (a large percentage of UC’s work force) where staff and faculty tend to be more mobile. However, the more important problem—and looming crisis—is the UC system faces a relatively limited ability to make capital investments to keep its technical programs at the international academic and industry standard of excellence.
Particularly important here are investments in laboratory space and equipment. External reviewers of UC programs are frequently shocked by the antiquated nature of equipment in UC laboratories. Faculty are all too familiar with the fact that UC instructional space is creaking under burdened enrollments. These problems should—unfortunately for UC faculty—have first-priority claim on the UC’s constrained resources. In particular, since senior faculty for the most part cannot afford to leave (see point 2 above), it is arguable that there isn’t any urgent need to address the fact that their salaries are not competitive. However, UC will not be able to attract top job applicants at lower ranks if it cannot offer them up-to-date laboratory teaching facilities, or an adequately funded library system or for that matter adequate teaching space.

- The report assumes that the peer-review process is not influenced by implicit bias, whereas compensation decisions made by administrators are because of their “subjective and discretionary nature.” This sounds plausible in the abstract. However, there should be evidence in support of each assertion (that peer-review is not biased, and that administrative decisions are). The report presents no such evidence. Committee members would like to see evidence of the “pernicious” (as the report calls it) character of off-scale compensation in practice.

- The report asserts that “the current compensation model is not working.” Members did not see concrete evidence of this in the report. By what measures is it not working? Do we have evidence of failure to make strong hires? Do we have evidence of faculty leaving the UC system? Do we have evidence of bias in the use of off-scale salary supplements? Again, all of this may be true; however, in the absence of evidence, this assertion cannot be a basis for decision-making.

- The report assumes that “retention actions break the system” because such actions are a source of inequity and create a “loyalty penalty” for long-serving faculty. In contrast to the other assumptions identified in the report, which members did not see evidence to support, they agreed with the premise of this assumption. The problem is not only that such actions create enormous resentment among faculty members either not sufficiently accomplished, or not sufficiently skilled at networking, or simply not lucky enough to get lucrative external offers. The structure of benefits that has emerged in the UC system in recent years is also tailor-made to force younger faculty to seek employment elsewhere, or to trade offers of such employment for higher salaries at UC. However, given that the UC cannot and will not be able to compete with wealthy private institutions on a salary basis, these offers are the only mechanism available to retain outstanding faculty who get external offers from wealthier institutions. In recent years, the UC has abandoned the practice of making pre-emptive retention deals before faculty members received offers. CAP members were unclear whether this practice has actually led to a higher rate of loss of outstanding faculty and would like to see some evidence on this question. Since the academic job market is decreasingly competitive, it is a question whether the UC has paid a significant price for this new policy. If there is clear evidence that these retention actions “break the system,” then it would follow that the best thing that could be done for equity on the campus would be to abandon retention “deals” altogether.

Based on the committee’s analysis, CAP members recommend the following:
1) Evidence needs to be gathered and presented, to establish whether and in what specific ways (retention, bias) the current model is “not working.” Any dysfunction established by that evidence should then be addressed.

2) A “market”-based approach to UC compensation is not appropriate—particularly not one based on a) incorrect assumptions regarding the nature of the market and b) salaries only, without consideration of total faculty compensation.

3) Given that it is fiscally impossible for the UC to escape from its current retirement benefit program, the institution will need to develop a compensation structure and conditions of employment that are competitive on grounds other than direct financial compensation. This may require thinking “outside the box” established by market-based compensation models, by the inherited conditions of work at the UC, and by current cost-of-living considerations. Precisely because academic employment offers intangible and non-financial rewards, there are many things that the UC can do to retain faculty that are not related to direct financial compensation. Many or even most of those steps would come with financial costs for the institution; but those costs would be far less than the cost of raising the salary compensation of senior faculty by very substantial percentages (as at least one of the “experimental models” in the FSSTF report projects).

4) The APM’s injunction that salaries should be “on-scale to the greatest extent feasible” appears to be good reason to translate current off-scale salary supplements into regular step-determined salary. However, to the extent that off-scale salary has been used to create a more equitable compensation structure, the current 24 percent off-scale aggregate salary may actually be “the extent feasible.”

CAP members appreciated the opportunity to comment.
Richard Tucker  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has reviewed and discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations. The committee is supportive of the effort to promote greater transparency and equity in faculty compensation. As detailed in the report, the current UC salary scales system can only function by relying heavily on off-scale compensation to cover the gap between on-scale salary and market rates (p. 3). Off-scale compensation, moreover, is “discretionary and typically determined by an administrator, such as a dean” (p. 3). The report recommends revising the salary scales according to consistent principles that would be adopted at all campuses and would be based on market rates, sensitive to disciplinary differences (either by employing a comparison-based disciplinary model or a factor-based disciplinary model), and adjusted annually. Within this revised model, off-scale compensation would return to its intended use in relatively rare cases, since salaries would be calibrated according to the market to ensure competitiveness in terms of recruitment and retention.

If a realistic plan along those lines can be agreed upon by all parties with, crucially, a multi-year agreement to fund its implementation, this would be a great step toward restoring UC’s “power of one.”

While generally supportive of the report’s recommendations, CPB noted some complexities in terms of implementation that warrant further analysis and consideration:

- The report’s recommendations do not address cost-of-living differences, which can greatly vary across the ten campuses. Members suggested looking at federal models, such as the locality pay tables in the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, for possible methods to equitably address these disparities in the salary scale system by introducing a “location factor.”
- It was unclear how the two models proposed for addressing large disciplinary variances would work, in practice. It would have been helpful to have more tables modeling these variances so that the implications of these two methods could be assessed.
- There was some concern about the possibility of inversion occurring between academic year (9-month) faculty and fiscal year (11-month) faculty, in which fiscal year faculty may end up being paid less than academic year faculty.
- At UC Davis, the Step Plus system for merits and promotions, in practice, caps how much a faculty may be advanced for research productivity, which may not be the case at other UC campuses. The differences in how faculty are awarded merits and promotions could create inequities across campuses, even if all campuses are using the same salary scale system.

CPB appreciates the opportunity to comment.
Richard Tucker, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Professor Tucker,

The Faculty Welfare Committee reviewed and discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations. The committee is thankful to the Task Force for generating this valuable and timely document; we support the recommendations. However, concerns were noted about implementation and about adverse consequences to some faculty if implemented without supporting structures.

The committee agrees wholeheartedly with the task force report, that the current faculty salary scales are clearly inadequate. Now that off-scale has become such a critical component in overall compensation systemwide, the salary scales don’t serve the role intended. All committee members agreed that restructuring the academic scales in order to reduce the reliance on off-scale salaries, and thus increase equity, is a genuinely great idea.

However, significant concerns were raised about practical implementation and consequences. In particular, the implementation would be a major undertaking, with technical and social challenges, and thus would require multi-year effort and funding commitment from many decision makers. There also may be adverse consequences if implemented without supporting mechanisms. Namely, there is substantial differential in living costs at the different UC campuses, which perennially puts upward pressure on the salaries at those locations, which would have to be addressed by means other than off-scale. Those would ideally have to be in place before the switch to the proposed models.

The committee also discussed shorter term solutions to ameliorating gaps in off-scales and salary in-versions. One excellent example was the multi-year, 2014-2017 initiative at UC Davis to boost the off-scales of faculty with below average off-scale, in proportion to their distance from the average. The initiative was very well received and resulted in closing the gap for most faculty, especially increasing the salaries of those with earlier hire dates. But we noted that maintaining the momentum has been a major challenge with past efforts meant to decrease salary gaps and increase salary scales. In spite of great planning and wide support, prior efforts have fizzled out due to budgetary realities.

Putting in place persistent infrastructure with joint participation by the Academic Senate and the administration could help maintain the momentum. Some examples of helpful infrastructure could be:
a) Frequent monitoring and analysis of off-scales (semi-annually, or annually) coupled with yearly reporting to the Academic Senate and UCOP.

b) Joint senate/administration committees charged with regular i) off-scale and ii) faculty salary scales review and comparison.

c) Multi-year plans developed by the administration based on the above detailing the steps for addressing salary scale lags and off-scale based inversions. Such plans will have to be part of the regular budgetary process, with a clear priority.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this report. We hope this starts a broader discussion of longer and shorter term efforts to maintaining the excellence of our faculty and University.

Regards,

Vladimir Filkov, Chair
Faculty Welfare Committee
Richard Tucker
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Request for Consultation: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Richard:

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) reviewed the Request for Consultation (RFC) of the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations. We have three principal concerns, which we offer in an advisory capacity.

First, while UC salaries have lagged compensation for at least the last two decades, they must be considered in tandem with benefits to understand trends in overall compensation. Retirement benefits have eroded at a brisk pace in the last 10 years. This may introduce inequity across cohorts—one would have to observe salary differentials with comparison institution between and across cohorts to be certain.

More immediately, however, the continuing erosion of retirement benefits raises the painful question of whether any correction to the salary scales would be financed through additional reductions to benefits. We would not want to overcome one problem of a lack of transparency only to transfer it to another less transparent and understandable category of compensation. For the Davis campus, we would want to conduct this analysis also in view of any changes in off-scale occurring either temporarily or permanently in response to the change to step-plus.

Second, members noted that allocation of off-scale may be more subject to bias than salary scales for two reasons. Decisions about off-scale may be subject to latent or unintended bias of individual administrators allocating the compensation. In addition, off-scale compensation is often a result of competing offers both at the junior (even at the point of initial hire) and senior (retention) levels, which arise from outside institutions which may not be subject to the same oversight as UC hiring processes.

Finally, a member noted that while a large fraction of ladder-rank faculty receive off-scale compensation, they were not aware that this was common practice among instructors in the Academic Federation, raising an equity issue across the groups.

Thank you.

Katheryn Russ
Chair, Undergraduate Council
Dr. Richard Tucker  
Academic Senate Chair

We thank you for the opportunity of responding to the “Report and Recommendations” proposed by the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force of the UC Academic Planning Council. From the conclusion of the report: “The Task Force urges UCOP and Academic Senate leadership to take the necessary steps to make the faculty salary scales system more transparent and equitable, to institute annual adjustments, and to move faculty compensation away from off-scale pay as much as possible.”

We find that the Task Force Report and Recommendations are largely sound. The current system of widespread off-scale salary adjustments is untenable and lacking transparency, negatively affecting faculty morale. The proposal seeks to develop a unified salary scale reflecting broader market-based salaries that would be adjusted annually. The new scale would bring off-scale salary adjustments into the new scale over time, would improve transparency, and would improve equity among faculty. This is a promising step to adjust for the current lagging salaries of faculty overall, and especially of faculty who have remained at UC throughout their careers. Also, while a number of places have annual cost of living adjustments, based in part on inflation, this has not been part of the UC remuneration in a systematic and continuous fashion, so its introduction would help make planning more efficient and salaries fairer. The proposal to use the average salary of each tier seems like a fair way to approach the calibrator of salary scales. It remains to be understood how the new salary scale model will interface with the step plus peer review system currently in place for the UC Davis campus.

The one area of the report where we have some concerns regards the future use of off-scale salary adjustments. Although off-scale should generally be eschewed in the name of transparency, if nothing else, the use of off-scale adjustments will remain an important mechanism for retention or recruiting of top tier faculty. Key and outstanding faculty cannot be replaced easily nor economically. They often form nuclei that in turn attract more faculty in fields of considerable interest. Although we very much agree with the spirit of equity promoted by the report, this very conservative approach to not use off-scale adjustments except in very rare cases will with high likelihood lead to a large-scale exodus of faculty, and their resources, for more attractive opportunities elsewhere. Thus, the market-based salary scale will still need to be combined with an optional off-scale in order to maintain the competitiveness of the UC schools.

Housing costs are mentioned in the report but are not explicitly included in the salary recommendations. However, for many if not all UC campuses, housing is and will remain a significant hurdle in the requirement of talented junior faculty and, indeed, impacts the quality of life for the entire UC community. This should perhaps be integrated explicitly into the new salary scale discussion.

Sincerely,

Jorge Rodrigues  
Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee  
College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences

Edward Charles Brummer  
Vice Chair, CAES Faculty Executive Committee  
Professor – Plant Sciences

Russell C. Hovey  
Professor - Animal Science  
FEC Faculty Salary Subcommittee

Georgia Drakakaki  
Professor – Plant Sciences  
FEC Faculty Salary Subcommittee
February 4, 2021

Richard Tucker
Chair, Division of the Davis Academic Senate

RE: Faculty Salary Scale Task Force Report and Recommendations

The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) of the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) has reviewed the report of the Faculty Salary Scale Task Force.

Overall, there was general agreement with the recommendations of this report. Importantly, there was agreement concerning the need for a reset in faculty salary scales to reduce the reliance on off-scale salary, that increased transparency and a market-based scale that is competitive with other institutions would be desirable, and that a ladder-based peer evaluation system was considered superior to alternatives where a small compensation committee or chair decides on merit increases.

However, concerns were raised with the assertion that "The adherence of all ten UC campuses to a single set of salary scales is a cornerstone of UC quality" and with the lack of detail concerning the logistics of implementation.

• It seems unrealistic to expect the same salary scale for the entire UC system, especially considering that cost of living and housing expenses vary widely. Cost of living adjustments were mentioned, but no detail for implementation was provided. It was suggested that cost of living adjustments could be campus-, or even individual-specific, perhaps based on zip code.

• Several were concerned with a possible negative impact on UC’s ability to retain faculty. If this system were to be implemented fully (i.e. salary changes by changes in step that only occurs via the standard review), then attempts at retention would not be able to involve changes in salaries. Does this mean that UC will no longer try to retain faculty? Or does this mean that UC will create retention efforts along different axes (e.g. offering retentions to improve labs, reduce teaching loads, provide post-docs or grad student stipends) potentially resulting in less transparency and that are potentially more pernicious?

• What is does "phasing in the new plan slowly" look like? Will there be two parallel systems as the current one is phased out? It is not clear how to make this work.

The CBS FEC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the report of the Faculty Salary Scale Task Force.
Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

FEC: Graduate School of Management Committee Response

February 5, 2021

The FEC of the Graduate School of Management has reviewed the report drafted by the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. We do not have comments about the specific recommendations, but would like to state that we support the University’s commitment to transparency and equity in compensation. Ensuring there is transparency both in the methodology for calculating salary scales and transparency regarding outcomes—include off-scale compensation decisions—is consistent with the University’s compensation principles.
We appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on the proposed salary scale report and recommendations. Our comments are based on FEC members’ review of the four Recommendations outlined in the report and discussion during our February FEC meeting.

As a basis for our comments, we suggest clarification of the various salary components as linked to salary scales (i.e., X, Y, Z) to ensure accurate understanding. In addition, implications for calculation of retirement benefits are important aspects of the full compensation picture.

- Transparency, equity, and objectivity. We fully support having transparency, equity, and objectivity in application of salary scales. These principles directly align with our school’s values and initiatives targeting diversity, equity, and inclusion.

- Annual adjustment. We support conducting a market analysis annually with adjustment to salary scales to ensure we are competitive. We encourage further explanation of the unit level impact of any adjustments and how this impact can be realistically addressed. A specific area of concern raised was transparency of methodology to create equity across faculty within a unit. In addition, we would like to better understand how retirement contributions align with the standardized salary scale (e.g., changes in retirement benefits based on hire date) and would appreciate elaboration on the contribution of benefits when performing market comparisons.

- Disciplinary differences. We see this as an important direction to explore to support equity and reconciliation of disciplinary differences within and across roles. While in theory this make sense, it will be important to address how this might be operationalized in various units with interdisciplinary faculty all working together to support the mission of a school. We would like to emphasize the need for practice disciplines – such as nursing – to be competitive with the practice market in order to recruit highly-qualified faculty.

- Off scale compensation should be the rare exception. While in theory this make sense, further elaboration on how this might be operationalized needs to be addressed, including justification of any exceptions at the unit level.
4 February 2021
RFC- Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

From the Executive Committee, School of Veterinary Medicine, UC Davis
Patricia Pesavento, DVM, PhD, DIP ACVP and Chair of Faculty

In general the faculty recognize the inequality and the complexity of the problem. I would point out that we feel that the greatest inequality is the "loyalty tax" where stellar faculty hires some time ago can have a lower salary than incoming Asst Profs. We recognize that the Veterinary School has reached into their own funds to try to correct this problem but that was some years back and the root of the problem was not corrected, and so the inequality builds. Not unique to the vet school are the vast spectrum of specialties, whose market value is quite variable.
I have listed bullet points from the discussion we had, but ultimately recognition of the problem is worthwhile, and certainly easier than finding new solutions that the task force has not considered. A few people gave feedback that a “one time” hiring bonus was more fair than an ongoing off-scale that is not accountable by our merit and promotion system.

- As opposed to the original intention of off-scale salaries, they are now relied upon to “correct” the basic problem that the UC salary scale system is no longer competitive. As a result, some people are left behind in salary (and the increasing “loyalty tax” trend), which is unfair and inequitable.

- These inequities need to be better understood (like a histogram/scatter plot type of report with ladder salary on one axis, then off scale on the other), so trends can be better identified (e.g. off-scale distribution by department by school, by discipline). The impact of other factors also need to be considered - like retentions, national salary comparisons, differences between disciplines, cost of living differences between campuses, other incentives (e.g. space, staffing), etc.

- The lack of transparency about off-scale salaries also needs to be addressed, as it leads to a perception of secrecy and inequality, and feelings of resentment among faculty.

- Simply tasking the college and schools to increase their salary scales can’t be done because it’s too expensive

One of the members of the SVM EC (Dr. Dickinson) has written a very thoughtful response to this request, and while I considered incorporating it in a general letter, in the end, the flow and content deserved inclusion. That response is here:

We determine clinical faculty salary based on comparison to a completely different are of employment (private specialty practice) where the job description and 3 of the 4
metrics for advancement and reward are not comparable (teaching, research, service). Faculty performing the same job they are employed to fulfill are therefore paid at wildly differing rates. The intrinsic understanding of the inappropriate and unfair nature of this situation has created and driven the non-transparent, guilt driven approach to clinical faculty salary at Departmental and Dean’s office levels. Granted this is a reflection of some very real issue with faculty hiring and retention and attempts have been made to address some of this issue. Hiding “real” faculty salaries at the recruitment stage and beyond is a reflection of the uncomfortable and guilt engendering feelings that administration likely deal with. Hiding these data cannot be good in the general or long term and is a reflection of the major issue underlying. There can be no justification other than one driven by inappropriate or unfair/inequitable logic, at least within the context of supposed reward structures of the actual job faculty are performing within UCD.

As in any relationship, parties deserve an honest account of their value. If the SVM is to perpetuate this model of salary determination, it owes its faculty the honesty to allow them to judge their value and worth in the SVM’s eyes as a member of the whole (all faculty) and determine whether they wish to be a member of that “family”. This issue is repeated at another level when we compare non-clinical faculty salary to basic science/non DVM faculty in the school who in general may have even less leverage in many instances.

Leveraging this “inequitable” system has additionally been inequitably applied. Some Dept chairs will advise/mentor some faculty in how to leverage/threaten the school with external job offers, and other will not. Some faculty find it professionally and ethically wrong to threaten their school, some do not. This opinion often changes with age, experience and resignation to the apparent inevitable end points. It was interesting that Surgeons and Radiologists were singled out...(based on the fact that they do in fact often have off scale salaries markedly out of step with their peers (based on the job they are actually doing). Neurologists have the ability to earn very comparable salaries in private practice, yet the salaries of the Neurology faculty at UCD are almost all at the lower ends of their comparable peer rank/step. This is likely a reflection of their ignorance of the nuances of the “hidden” salary process, and a reluctance to threaten their school (some would say naïve) rather than (hopefully) their worth. As example to the cynical/financial necessity driven nature of our current salary determination approach. During my career, I have been offered 2 prestigious appointments to head the clinical and research Neurology sections at 2 of the world’s prestigious institutions, The Royal veterinary College, and University of Berne. I declined both out of a determination that my career was best served at UC Davis and a loyalty to my school. I was advised by my Dept chair to leverage these offers to achieve a major off scale salary increase. I stated that I felt this was not an appropriate way to treat my School and colleagues. I stated that the offer of the positions in themselves should indicate the level of my efforts/value and threatening to leave unless I received a salary increase was inappropriate.

I requested that a salary increase be requested from the Dean’s office on these grounds and the request should be accompanied by a statement that “despite” the prestigious offer, I had turned down the position and wished to stay at UC Davis. The chair’s dismay and predictable outcome educated me to the realities of
covert salary determinations in our school. Generational and personal ethical/moral values should not be what determines a faculty member’s salary; this has to be wrong. If we are going to employ this methodology to determine faculty salaries it should be openly and universally explained to all faculty that to increase salary they must apply for alternative positions and leverage this with the School. We should not be doing so via back hall conversations to a selected few in the current manner. The system is broken, it is inequitable, and dishonest in its lack of transparency. We do not reward faculty for the job they do so much as the level of threat they can and are willing to bring to bear on the school.

Very general:
1) The overall findings of the committee are not surprising and the SVM is probably a poster child for many of the issues raised and many that are not. The report identifies most of the issues outlined above.
2) Encouraging to see there are no major gender/race based issues (in general and as much as can be determined in SVM given the limited data for some subgroups)
3) Transparency is identified as a key problem and is a major problem in SVM
4) SVM may be more aligned with School of Medicine in terms of salary comparisons to market rate (specifically for clinical faculty in comparison to specialty practice vs comparisons to academic institutions for non-clinical academic positions). The lack of distinction between I&R faculty, clinical faculty and also non clinical SVM faculty is a major limitation of the SVM data at the granular level and might uncover biases within the salary scales within SVM.
5) The loyalty penalty and detrimental effect of “older” faculty hires having lower salaries is a MAJOR issue. This may be a faculty and administrative generational issue. Do we or do we not blackmail our school, do we or do we not allow this to happen.
6) Fig 5.26 and 5.27 (main report SVM) are informative. The trend for 5.26 (increasing salary with rank) is predictable, however the degree of overlap (not discussed) between ranks (not even adjacent) is disturbing. As with other UC schools it is apparent off scale salaries do not reflect performance (this is not a surprise).
7) The proposed approach to addressing the “general” lag of salary relative to academic “market” levels while positive seems of limited value in addressing the major issues specifically within the SVM relating to salary inequity, transparency and process, particularly relating to clinical faculty. Removing (making exceptional) off scale salaries in the long term is raised. The devil will be in the detail, particularly as it relates to the specifics of the SVM.
8) Faculty deserve honesty in reporting of salaries both at the personal and input for recruitment levels. There are limited resources available and supporting recruitment for faculty where the impact of their hire in terms of diminishing resources for future hires is hidden does not seem appropriate.
9) There did not appear to be any discussion of how off scale salaries should/could be better linked to performance. Should faculty with disparate salaries be required to have appropriately increased service, teaching, performance requirements?
10) Again...as identified by the committee, transparency is a major issue.
11) Should the SVM (as has been previously tried with the assessment of the , X,Y,Z approach several years back ) individually look at how salary is addressed in an
independent manner similar to the medical school. There are major potential problems with this approach as were defined during that process)

P.A. Pesavento, DVM, PhD, DIP ACVP
February 5, 2021

Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Council

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

Dear Chair Gauvain,

At its February 2, 2021 meeting, the Irvine Division Senate Cabinet discussed the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report. The report was reviewed by the Council on Equity and Inclusion (CEI); Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (CFW); and the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB). Feedback from the councils is attached. The Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) declined to opine.

Members generally agreed with the Task Force’s recommendation that the UC move to more transparent and equitable faculty salary scales. At the same time, members felt that off-scale salary should remain an option in order to recruit and retain the very best faculty. There are also a number of concerns mentioned in the comments attached.

Shared among the councils was concern about the “loyalty penalty” for long-term faculty whose salaries have lagged behind those of colleagues who received retention offers; the plan to phase in a new compensation scale with new hires would only exacerbate this problem. This “penalty” may also have disproportionate impacts across race, gender and discipline. Further analysis of these issues will be required prior to implementation of new scales.

Another shared concern centered on cost-of-living, including housing costs. While there are various opinions for how to address this – from expansion of systemwide housing support programs to readjustment of all base salaries – it’s clear that addressing housing and other cost-of-living concerns should be considered along with new compensation scales.

Finally, it occurred to the colleagues that the UC might wish to explore the Irvine scale model. This is a local scale based on what faculty are actually paid on a given campus. An advantage of local scales, versus systemwide, is that they may be tailored to local conditions on each campus. That said, the Irvine scale also currently stands in need of revision.

The Irvine Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Jeffrey Barrett, Chair
Academic Senate, Irvine Division
C. Joanna Ho, Chair Elect-Secretary
   Kate Brigman, Executive Director
   Gina Anzivino, Associate Director and CEI Analyst
   Louis DeSipio, CEI Chair
   Julie Kennedy, CFW Analyst
   Terry Dalton, CFW Chair
   Michelle Chen, CPB Analyst
   Don Senear, CPB Chair
   Brandon Haskey-Valerius, Cabinet Analyst
January 19, 2021

JEFFREY BARRETT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

RE: Review of Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The Council on Equity and Inclusion (CEI) was asked to review the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and comment on the proposed recommendations. The Council discussed the report at its January 11 meeting.

The Faculty Salary Scales Task Force was charged with examining issues surrounding the salary scales, in particular excessive reliance on off-scale pay to achieve competitive compensation. In its report, the Task Force recommends that UC move to more transparent and equitable faculty salary scales that reflect market rates, that are adjusted annually, and that eventually eliminate or substantially reduce the need for off-scale compensation.

Members generally supported the Task Force’s recommendations. They agreed that having too many faculty paid off-scale – e.g. 99% of general campus ladder-rank and equivalent in 2019 – is problematic, and that transparency is critical. At the same time, they felt that maintaining the concept of off-scale salary was important in order to recruit and retain the very best faculty.

Members also recognized that recruitments and retentions relying on off-scale salaries can lead to inequalities that exacerbate gender and race differences among faculty salaries. They recommended that an annual equity adjustment pool be established to allow for targeted salary adjustments to reduce or eliminate salary gaps for faculty who have not had their salaries adjusted in response to outside offers.

Members additionally expressed some concern that efforts to eliminate salary inequities across the system by implementing a single set of salary scales may create other inequities. They noted that the cost of living varies significantly among some campuses, and concur with the Task Force that UC leadership should address these disparities with programs for housing support, for example.

Finally, members saw value in a model such as the Irvine merit scale. At the time of its establishment it was designed to adjust the salaries associated with each step to the mean salary for Irvine faculty at that step. To the Council’s knowledge, subsequent adjustments to the Irvine merit scale did not account for salaries earned by UCI faculty at that step.

The Council on Equity and Inclusion appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Louis DeSipio, Chair
Council on Equity and Inclusion

C: Joanna Ho, Chair Elect-Secretary
Kate Brigman, Executive Director
Gina Anzivino, Associate Director and CEI Analyst
Brandon Haskey-Valerius, Senate Cabinet Analyst
JEFFREY BARRETT, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC SENATE – IRVINE DIVISION  

Re:  FACULTY SALARY SCALES TASK FORCE REPORT

Systemwide Senate Chair Gauvain has forwarded for review the report and recommendations of the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force.

The Faculty Salary Scales Task Force was charged with examining the issues surrounding the salary scales, in particular excessive reliance on off-scale pay to achieve competitive compensation. The report offered recommendations to address the issues, including annual scale adjustments and transparency in compensation decisions. An assessment of these recommendations would be very helpful in charting next steps regarding the faculty salary scales as a tool to advance the goals and utility of UC’s rank-and-step system.

The Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (CFW) collected comments from members regarding this issue and would like to submit the following recommendations and concerns:

1. Salary scales are, in principle, a worthwhile tool for faculty, administrators, and the public at large. The current scales do not provide useful standards for implementation. For this reason, we need to consider ways to bring them to a point they can become a suitable guideline. A recalibration effort is required.

2. It was suggested that a first step should be to adjust the salaries of fairly advanced Associates and all Full Professors who are making less than those significantly below them in rank (to be defined). This situation has mainly been a result of outside offers (the loyalty penalty).

3. It has been argued that different California locations have significantly different costs-of-living, separate and apart from housing (which may or may not be available for faculty on a given campus). Rather that roll these cost-of-living adjustments into salaries, perhaps there can be multiplier effects for specific campus salaries. It was acknowledged that California as a whole is expensive, thus the base salaries for everyone should be adjusted up accordingly.

4. Some concerns were raised about the salary inequities across disciplines and within any given campus. While there is understanding that the UC must be competitive in salary offers, this does not require such a low bar for the less well-compensated disciplines. The salary differentials should not be factors of 3 to 4 times. The UC should agree to some minimum floor, higher than the current one.
5. A faculty committee should be formed on every campus to be called upon to sign off on retention offerings, in addition to new hire offers. In the short run, this group could also review career equity adjustments that need to be made.

Sincerely,

Terry Dalton, Chair
Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom

C: Kate Brigman, Executive Director
Academic Senate

Gina Anzivino, Assistant Director
Academic Senate
January 26, 2021

JEFFREY BARRETT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

RE: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

At its January 13, 2021 meeting, the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed the report and recommendations of the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force.

The Faculty Salary Scales Task Force examined the efficacy of the current salary scale system, and in particular the widespread use of off-scale pay. The report provided guidance on how to improve this system.

Key principles include:

- Faculty salary scales should be based on transparent and objective mechanisms that lead to equitable outcomes.
- Faculty salary scales should be adjusted annually according to a transparent mechanism that uses readily available measures of market levels.
- Salary scales should be sensitive to disciplinary differences.
- A new salary scale system should be structured so as to substantially reduce the need for off-scale compensation.

The Council found that the report appropriately describes and addresses the challenges of the current system. The proposed system would be fairer, more transparent, and more effective at compensating faculty and recruiting excellent faculty to the UC system.

The Council expressed the following:

- The plan to phase in the new compensation system starting with new hires would exacerbate the loyalty penalty suffered by long-term faculty who have not obtained retention off-scales as a result of seeking outside offers. This is one of the main problems ascribed to the current off-scale system.

It is unclear how the new compensation system would spread to those who are not new hires particularly as new hires progress through the ranks. There was concern that this would generate separate populations who would be either on the old scale plus off-scale on the one hand, and on the new scale on the other, while at the same rank and step, thus obscuring rather than enhancing transparency.

To address these two issues, the Council recommended increasing salaries for those current faculty who are currently closest to on-scale before or simultaneously with the phase-in for new hires.

- Subsuming off-scale pay into the new scale is considered preferable to maintaining the off-scale increment when implementing the new scale. Given
the cost of the latter, members judged higher odds of implementation of the former rather than the latter.

- The Council was not enthusiastic about the idea of discipline specific factors modeled by analogy to the HSCP. On the other hand, the current separate scales for Business, Economics Engineering & ICS and for Law was viewed as not granular enough to account for differences within schools and even within single, multi-disciplinary departments. Proliferation of such scales was not considered attractive. The extent to which these differences can be factored into scales vs. being dealt with by continued use of off-scale needs further consideration.

Overall, CPB supports the direction of the proposed revision to the salary scale system. Scales should be adjusted to the best extent possible to minimize the market component of off scale salary. The Council recognizes the difficulty of adjusting over the full range of ranks, merit steps, and disciplines. The gradation among and between disciplines is greater than what currently exists. Therefore, additional thought on implementation is needed.

The Council suggests as an alternative to consider, a factor-based approach assessed on an individual per discipline basis.

On behalf of the Council,

[Signature]

Don Senear, Chair

CC: Kate Brigman, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Gina Anzivino, Assistant Director, Academic Senate
Michelle Chen, CPB Analyst
February 18, 2021

Mary Gauvain  
Chair, UC Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Chair Gauvain,

The Divisional Executive Board, councils, and committees appreciate the opportunity to review the proposed revision to (Systemwide Senate Review) Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations.

Executive Board members support the general and equitable improvement of faculty salaries across the UC system. However, committees felt there are too many unaddressed variables to respond in a definitive manner. The complexities resulting from differing circumstances within and among campuses and schools are not addressed within the recommendations.

Per the attached responses from committees and councils, many members expressed concern about an implicit discontinuation or reduction of off-scale salaries, which they argue is an effective and important tool for recruitment and retention, particularly for underrepresented minority faculty members and in furthering gender equity. It was felt that reductions in off-scale salary components, currently an active proposal at UCLA, should not occur until the scales were to be concomitantly revised.

Sincerely,

Shane White  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate 
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate 
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate 
    Todd Greenspan, UCOP Director of Academic Planning
January 26, 2021

Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Review: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on December 15, 2020, the Faculty Welfare Committee discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations. Committee members offered the following comments.

The committee agrees with the recommendation that the salary scale should be updated to be comparable to other comparator universities analyzed in the report.

The committee strongly disagrees with the recommendation to eliminate the use of off-scale salary based on the following considerations:

1) Cost of living:
The committee notices that there were no representatives on the Faculty Salary Scale Task Force from UCLA and UCSF, both of which are located in areas with higher cost of living compared to some other campuses. Differences in cost of living among campuses are briefly mentioned but are said not part of the report of the task force. However, it is important to note that salaries and cost of living adjustment are not separate; they are intertwined. It is a significant issue for campuses at high cost of living areas, such as LA and Bay Area. The faculty needs to be able to afford to living in the vicinity area of the campus. The report reflects a rejection of this consideration and an underlying desire of equalizing campuses.

The committee believes that cost of living, including housing cost and childcare cost, is an important factor affecting the salaries. There is disparity on living and housing cost among the campuses. Off-scale salaries have been used to equalize cost of living. A transition to a system that tries to minimize the off-scales has to find a way to accommodate the cost of living. If it is considered separately from salary, as the report reflects, additional housing support for the faculty is needed, especially for areas with high cost of housing, such as LA and Bay Area, in order to maintain standards of quality in our faculty.

2) Differences among UC campuses:
The members note that not all UC campuses are in the same situation. Market values are not the same for campuses. The report talks about market values of academics, but under-appreciates the heterogeneity of the faculty across the UC campuses. It is not realistic to think that the salary scales can capture all the differences. Since there is heterogeneity, the campuses will need flexibility of the off-scale system. The current recommendation would reduce the ability of each campus to offer off-scale salaries. The committee members think that the recommendation needs to acknowledge differences among campuses and include considerations for all ten campuses.

3) Faculty recruitment and retention:
The committee notes that UCLA faculty salaries are among the highest across the 10 UC campuses. This creates contention with some other campuses. On the other hand, cost of living in LA is among the highest across the nation, which makes faculty recruitment and retention challenging to UCLA.

The majority of the UCLA faculty is on off-scale salaries. In many cases, off-scale salaries are used to recruit and retain faculty that other institutes try to recruit away or get offers elsewhere. The committee is concerned that the implementation of the recommended salary scales could negatively affect the ability of UCLA to recruit and retain faculty, which is essential to maintain the high-quality teaching and research statue of the campus. Off-scale allows more flexibility with recruiting packages. If off-scales are eliminated, what other approach can be used to recruit and retain faculty? Accelerated promotions, hiring at higher steps, etc. may have to be used, which could create new sets of issues related to equity and fairness.

On the other hand, the members recognize that eliminating off-scales could promote transparency and equity and eliminate loyalty penalty. People who like to stay at UCLA and don't seek other offers usually don't get extra off-scale salaries. The committee recommends establishing a career equity review mechanism at each campus to ensure equity and transparency in compensation.

4) Funding resource:
Members raised several questions. 1) Would the new salary scale be campus-wide adjustment? 2) Where does the fund come from to adjust campus and discipline differences? 3) Is this self-funded or from 19900 funds? Adjusted scales are linked to the retirement system, which is not addressed in this report. Current off-scales are generally from 19900 funds. If these will be built into scales, then it could be neutral in terms of contributions to retirement system.

If you have any questions, please contact us via the Faculty Welfare Committee’s interim analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Huizing Li, Chair
Faculty Welfare Committee

cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Academic Senate
Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Elizabeth Feller, Interim Analyst, Faculty Welfare Committee
Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee
February 8, 2021

Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Item for Review: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on January 25, 2021, the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) had an opportunity to review and discuss the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations.

Members offered the following comments:

The report implies that UC is a homogenous institution, when in reality it is composed of very different campuses, located in distinct areas, populated by very different faculties facing dramatically different living costs. This is a cause of inevitable tension. Members appreciated that the report acknowledged the variance in housing costs across campuses, but worried that the limited solutions proposed were vague and likely impractical.

Members stated that our campus is lagging behind compared to our counterparts outside the UC system. Changing the scale would not fix that problem. Several faculty criticized what they considered to be an under-appreciation of the variation in salaries across fields. The scales system recognizes those differences to a degree by establishing several scales, but a those several scales are clearly not sufficient to accommodate the contemporary variation in market competitiveness across the many fields.

Members specifically questioned how professional schools such as Medicine and Law are expected to remain competitive without competitive salaries. Members stressed that disciplines are unique and not easily comparable in terms of salaries.

Changing the off-scale compensation does not eliminate concerns about bias. Administrators would still make decisions—which could be seen as arbitrary and biased—whether conscious or unconscious. The single largest benefit of having scales is having predictability. This proposal would only work if the points in section III (“Findings”) are addressed. As a campus, we would need to see detailed data and not only averages. How this will play out at UCLA? What would this mean at a campus and at a systemwide level? Would it have an effect on recruitment and retention? This is ultimately hard to interpret and assess without UCLA-specific data.
Members noted that the task force did not include UCLA representatives. There may also be equity differences that may be difficult to explore and could be masking a challenge that we are facing as an organization and university. Members suggested simulating for diverse populations.

Because the report indicated than nearly all faculty salaries in the UC system are already off-scale, the main benefit of the scale is no longer to set salaries, but rather to offer a predictable sense of the rate at which salaries will increase if faculty perform well. The proposal to revise these scales (along with a proposal by UCLA Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel to systematically reduce off-scale salary percentages) threaten to undermine this predictability to the detriment of faculty welfare.

If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at groeling@comm.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Tim Groeling, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc:  Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
     Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
     April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
     Elizabeth Feller, Principal Policy Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
     Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
February 2, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Andrea Kasko, Chair  
Graduate Council

**Re: Systemwide Senate Review: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations**

At the Graduate Council meeting on January 15, 2021, the *Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations* was presented as an information item. Although the Graduate Council was not required to opine on this issue, members offered the following observations for your consideration:

Members agreed that while faculty salary scales should be based on transparent mechanisms that lead to equitable outcomes, members noted that salary disparities and lack of competitive salaries will negatively impact the UC’s ability to recruit the best faculty, especially at a time when the UC is committed to increasing faculty of color (Latino/a, African American, Asian/Pacific Islanders); diverse faculty certain to be sought after by top private and public research universities. As well, this will impact graduate education and the research enterprise.

Although the recommendations in the report do not directly address cost of living and housing costs, members agreed that housing remains a critical issue that needs to be addressed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the Graduate Council analyst, Estrella Arciba, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu.
February 12, 2021

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair, Academic Council

Re: Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

The report and recommendations were prepared by the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. As noted in Provost Brown’s letter, the Task Force was charged with examining the issues surrounding the salary scales, in particular, excessive reliance on off-scale pay to achieve competitive compensation. The report offers recommendations to address the issues, including annual scale adjustments and transparency in compensation decisions.

The Merced Division Senate and School Executive Committees were invited to comment on the report. Comments were received from the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA), the Committee for Diversity and Equity (D&E), the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF), the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA) Executive Committee. All comments are appended for your consideration.

CAP noted that off-scale salary adjustments provide the needed flexibility in recruitment and retention offers and expressed concern that their removal may put pressure on CAP to make appointments or accelerations at higher rank/step and increase its caseload. CAPRA’s concerns related to the implementation process, estimating the true costs of a transition to the proposed salary scale models, and the need to proceed in an equitable manner. D&E noted the tension between equity and the need to compensate faculty appropriate to their disciplines. FWAF and UGC found the arguments presented in the task force’s report to be sound, and support the task force’s recommendations. SSHA Executive Committee urged that, given that faculty of color and women are disproportionately represented in some departments over others, any groupings be broadly defined to avoid having the salary scales replicate existing racial and gender bias.

At its January 25 meeting, Divisional Council asserted that the UC salary scale system is a strength and a weakness. While it is a good thing that faculty can advance through the ranks and steps with almost-guaranteed salary increases, it is difficult to compete with offers from other institutions. Also, pre-retention measures are difficult. Divisional Council supports the proposal conceptually but is concerned with the implementation’s costs.

The Merced Division thanks you for the opportunity to review and offer comments on this report.
Sincerely,

Robin DeLugan
Chair, Divisional Council
UC Merced

Cc: DivCo Members
   Hilary Baxter, Systemwide Senate Executive Director
   Michael LaBriola, Systemwide Senate Assistant
   Director UCM Senate Office
January 15, 2021

To: Robin DeLugan, Senate Chair

From: Ashlie Martini, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

CAP reviewed the systemwide Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and offers the below comments.

Deans sometimes recruit new faculty hires who are unlikely to be approved for a certain rank/step (e.g., a tenured position) because, for example, they do not have enough teaching experience. Off-scale salary adjustments are sometimes used in such cases to recruit the faculty member. If this option is removed, there may be pressure on CAP to recommend appointing the candidate at the higher (but difficult to justify) rank/step. This, in turn, would likely lead to the EVC/Provost overriding CAP more often, which could erode CAP’s sense of responsibility in the long run.

Similarly, deans and the EVC/Provost will still have to make retention offers. If they cannot easily use off-scale salary adjustments, then they will likely request that the faculty member be accelerated and submit a hastily assembled file for CAP review. How quickly can CAP be expected to act? Would CAP need to see official job offers, or is “hearsay” sufficient? How would CAP evaluate a faculty member’s strategic importance to the campus? Again, pulling CAP into such situations may prompt the EVC/Provost to disagree with CAP more frequently and, ultimately, dilute CAP’s importance while increasing CAP’s workload.

Under our current system, an assistant professor who does not go up for tenure but instead moves to an overlapping step (e.g., from assistant IV to assistant V instead of associate I) sacrifices almost nothing in terms of salary ($100 difference); the same goes for associate professors who go to high associate levels rather than full professor. Under the new system, the pay raise associated with promotions is implemented only when the faculty member actually moves to the higher rank. This change might result in a larger number of candidates going up for promotions with relatively weak cases.

Salaries, in general, are still below market and there will be issues if any new policy leads to more salary inversion between new and existing faculty. We strongly encourage the approach of looking across the board at salary scales and raising all of them to be consistent with comparable research universities.

We appreciate the opportunity to opine.

Cc: Senate Office
January 15, 2021

To: Robin DeLugan, Chair, Division Council

From: Patricia LiWang, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)

Re: Systemwide Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

At its December 15 meeting, CAPRA reviewed the faculty salary scales task force report. We offer the below comments.

The UC system’s rank and step salary scale system has decayed over the years as salary scales have not kept up with the comparator institutions and alternative career opportunities. The result is that a much larger fraction of faculty now receive off-scale salary, and the variance in salaries is higher than before.

The proposal encourages very substantial increases in salary scales overall; greater differentiation of salaries across disciplines via the introduction of either additional salary scales by disciplines or disciplinary group, or disciplinary factors; and decreased reliance on off scale salaries.

The proposal is largely silent on the actual logistics of how the transition to a new system would occur. This is problematic, since the last time something like this was attempted within the UC, it largely failed due to its implementation:

1. The amounts by which the salary scales were adjusted were much more modest than proposed here, while at the same time health care and retirement deductions increased rapidly.

2. Faculty with off scale adjustments were in theory denied the regular salary increases designed to implement the new policy, in order to increase equity. However, many senior faculty could and did successfully negotiate to preserve their off scale salaries. Junior faculty were less likely to achieve this however, and many saw their spending power decline as deductions and copays for retirement and health care costs increased while off scale salary was reduced in lock step with cost of living increases. When the system was abandoned, those formerly junior faculty had salaries that had...
largely stagnated, and some were in the position of hiring new junior faculty who were immediately paid as much or more than them.

3. Past implementation assumed that faculty with off scale increments to their salary were receiving a competitive salary already, while for many this was not true. At the same time, the primary purpose of off scale salaries is to enhance retention of faculty who are more market competitive. Informing the market competitive faculty that everyone but them are receiving raises, is counterproductive and not particularly effective.

CAPRA suggests that the mechanics by which the new system is phased in are as much or more important than the actual levels of the new salary scales and need a good deal more consideration before recommending a change of this magnitude. The actual net cost of the program will be strongly influenced by the details of its implementation.

We appreciate the opportunity to opine.

cc: Senate Office
January 15, 2021

To: Robin DeLugan, Senate Chair

From: Committee for Diversity and Equity (D&E)

Re: Report and Recommendations of the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force

The Committee for Diversity and Equity has reviewed the report and recommendations of the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. The report highlights the pernicious effects of off-scale salaries on equity. The practice around awarding of off-scale salaries varies by campus, which itself presents equity concerns given that the overwhelming majority of UC faculty rely on such off-scales in order to make up for the fact that the salary scales lag so far behind that of our competitors. Of particular concern is that some campuses, including UC Merced, award off-scales solely at the discretion of the Provost/Dean. This undermines the process of peer review of merit and excellence that is built into the scale system. Additionally, leaving off-scale decisions to administrators reduces the transparency of the personnel process and opens spaces for inequalities to fester.

Reducing the regular reliance on off-scale salary by raising the salary scales to market rates would be a positive step for equity and transparency. While we would not expect off-scales to entirely disappear, the goal should be to return them to the original purpose of rewarding exceptional achievement rather than a routine part of a faculty salary package.

As a campus specific process, D&E recommends following the example of some UC campuses in ensuring that there is a significant faculty role in reviewing and recommending off-scales, via CAP or an alternative mechanism.

The other major recommendation of this report, that we should adopt some form of disciplinary based scales (two options are given), is more complicated from a diversity and equity point of view. Given that average off-scales vary significantly by discipline, formalizing this into disciplinary scales would serve the goals enumerated above in ensuring more transparency and equity within each discipline/department. However, it is also generally true that the disciplines that are routinely awarded larger off-scales (particularly on the STEM side) tend to be significantly less diverse than disciplines with lower off-scales (particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences). Disciplinary scales would have the effect of institutionalizing these differences in a way that has potentially troubling implications for diversity and equity. A counterpoint to this is that these differences in compensation by discipline already exist and that handling them via disciplinary scales is more equitable than the current off-scale system.
There is no easy solution to this dilemma short of ensuring that all of our disciplines are broadly representative in their demographics, but concerns about the diversity implications of moving to disciplinary scales should be fully explored as part of a broader discussion about this issue.

D&E would also recommend that Black faculty members, who shoulder a disproportionate service workload, be compensated, and that service in general be valued in career assessment, such as by awarding of half-step. The recommendation to give consideration for service work in career assessment was made at the UC Merced campus years ago, and now is an opportune moment to realize this recommendation.

The Committee for Diversity and Equity appreciates the opportunity to opine.

cc: D&E Members
    Fatima Paul, Executive Director, Senate Office
    Senate Office
January 14, 2021

To: Robin DeLugan, Chair, Divisional Council

From: Carolin Frank, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF)

Re: Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

The Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF) has reviewed the Report and Recommendations of the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. FWAF found the analysis to be very focused, and supports the Task Force’s recommendations as stated in the document.

FWAF appreciates the opportunity to opine.

cc: Senate office
January 13, 2021

To: Senate Chair DeLugan

From: Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

UGC reviewed the Report and Recommendations of the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. In this report, the Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales is addressing two related issues:

1. The UC faculty salaries lag those in analogous institutions, thus threatening the UC’s competitiveness.

2. The UC system is becoming over-reliant on off-scale salary adjustments, which results in increasing inequity and decreasing transparency. Currently, 99% of ladder rank faculty have an off-scale adjustment, up from 50% in 1999 (which is also around the last time UC salaries overall were competitive with Comparison-8 schools).

The Task Force proposes that the UC system institute a multi-year phased plan to make base salaries competitive and decrease the use of off-scale adjustments. Promotions of current faculty would include automatic salary increases to move us toward this goal, and new hires would be brought in on a new proposed scale.

In the spirit of transparency and equity, marked-based disciplinary differences in the new scale would be reflected through standard multipliers of base salary, rather than individual off-scale adjustments.

The Task Force argues that this multi-year phased plan should be initiated now, and that using austerity as an excuse to delay could have a deleterious effect on the UC system’s competitiveness.

Overall, the arguments presented in the report are sound, and we would deem the proposal worthy of support.

We thank you for the opportunity to review this item.
To: Robin DeLugan, Chair, Merced Division  
From: Susan Amussen, Chair, SSHA EC  
Re: Salary Scales

The SSHA Executive Committee reviewed the proposed revision of the salary scales. We agree with the goal of this proposal to move us away from dependence on off-scale to achieve competitive salaries. 

In terms of salary scales tied to departments, we noted that faculty of color and women are disproportionately represented in some departments over others. Therefore any groupings should be broadly defined to avoid having the salary scales replicate existing racial and gender bias.
February 16, 2021

Mary Gauvain, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Mary,

Thank you for the chance to provide feedback on the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force report. The Riverside Division discussed the report in individual committees and in our Executive Council you can see which follow.

While the exploration of these scales is important to describe the competitiveness of UC Salaries, there were many areas that are impractical to imagine how a reduced use of Off Scale would be implemented. One perspective raised was that even within a single department, and certainly within a college, there are market driven variance in salary ranges. The challenges in meeting these coupled with the difficult time to be discussing any advocating for faculty salary increases given the current budget pressures made this a difficult proposal to envision concrete actions in the short term.

Sincerely yours,

Jason Stajich
Professor of Microbiology & Plant Pathology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director of the Academic Senate
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate
January 7, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
    Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Yinsheng Wang, Chair
    Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

CAP reviewed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations on Dec. 14, 2020. While CAP noted that the report and recommendations are somewhat short of details, CAP strongly endorses the recommendations about taking the necessary steps to make the faculty salary scales system more transparent and equitable, to institute annual adjustments, and to move faculty compensation away from off-scale pay as much as possible.
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, & INCLUSION

February 1, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Xuan Liu, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

CoDEI reviewed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations at our meeting on January 21, 2021. The Committee views the equitable faculty salary scales to be critical to UC’s excellence and unanimously supports the recommendations.

We appreciate the efforts of the task force to address the salary scale at UC and look forward to actual implementation of more transparent and equitable faculty salary scales.
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

January 29, 2021

To: Jason Stajich
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Patricia Morton, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare


At its meeting on January 19, 2021, the Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations. The CFW finds the report makes many valid points about problems with the current use of off-scale pay including the ways it increases inequity both within campuses and across the UC system. We agree that its use is not transparent in the hiring and retention processes and may undermine the peer review system. We agree that UC faculty salaries should be brought to the level of faculty at comparator universities.

Nevertheless, we do not find the recommendations realistic, particularly as they are based on the restoration of State funding.

We recommend the establishment of systemwide protocols for review and approval of off-scale compensation and an increase in transparency in awarding off-scale compensation from departments to UCOP. At minimum, each campus should have a faculty committee that reviews and approves off-scale compensation; for example, UC Berkeley has a Budget Committee that fulfills this role.

We call for a study of off-scale compensation to determine if it produces inequities and, if so, of what type. Using the information from such a study, campuses can bring disadvantaged faculty to appropriate salary levels.
January 22, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Katherine Kinney, Chair
      Committee on Planning and Budget


The Committee on Planning & Budget (P&B) discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and recommendations at their January 19, 2021 meeting. P&B felt that if unified salary scales will be implemented, unified funding on each of the campuses needs to occur. There were differing opinions regarding the principle of equity at the heart of the proposal. One group of committee members strongly supports repairing the system-wide scale as an important step toward reestablishing equity and transparency. It was noted that the salary scales were fundamental to building UC’s preeminence as a public research university. Other faculty forwarded a market-based understanding of equity as an impediment to recruiting the best faculty. They believed that competition with private sector institutions in a number of fields made such a uniform approach, or even the model allowing for various scales by fields, unworkable. It was separately noted that continuing to use Harvard and MIT as comparison schools seems unrealistic as the resource gap has grown so large.
February 16, 2021

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Susannah Scott, Chair
       Santa Barbara Division

Re: Systemwide Review of the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The Santa Barbara Division broadly distributed the task force report to most councils and committees in order to draw upon a diverse pool of faculty perspectives. Responses were submitted by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom and Awards (CFW), Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE), Graduate Council (GC), Council on Research and Instructional Resources (CRIR), and the Faculty Executive Committees of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE), College of Engineering (ENGR), Bren School (BREN), College of Creative Studies (CCS), and the College of Letters and Science (L&S).

The responding groups indicated support for the goals of greater transparency and equity. However, the councils and committees also raise a substantial number of conceptual, operational, and practical questions and concerns, detailed in their individual responses (attached). Generally, the lack of detail regarding the proposed salary scale plan and the process by which it would be implemented made it difficult to give an informed consideration of the recommendations and models contained in the report.

Several key areas of concern that were raised by multiple groups include the need for a mechanism by which to recognize extraordinary achievements, potential effects on recruitment and retention, impacts on underrepresented faculty, cost-of-living differences among the campuses, and implications for the UC budget. These are just a few of the issues which would require more thorough examination before the Senate can seriously consider major adjustments to the salary scales.

We thank you for the opportunity to opine.
TO: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Ruth Finklestein, Chair
       Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Faculty Salary Task Force Report

CAP has reviewed Faculty Salary Task Force Report and Recommendations as well as the Letter to Academic Council on Faculty Salaries. A stated goal of the new system would be to make off-scale compensation unnecessary and therefore rare. Two models were proposed to identify appropriate market levels that reflect disciplinary differences. These disciplinary differences are not defined, leading to concerns re. whether Implicit and explicit biases will rate certain disciplines more “worthy.”

CAP supports the principle of fixing the scales, but is concerned by the details of the transition. The task force recommends phasing a new system in gradually, probably beginning with new hires to reduce the need for substantial off-scale to create a competitive offer. It is not clear how long the phase-in period would require, but presumably this would vary among faculty depending on their rank/step and frequency of review cycles. Initially, this would create a two-tiered system in which some faculty (especially long-serving faculty with a “loyalty penalty”) would remain below the new base, possibly for multiple cycles. Furthermore, retention offers are currently restricted to increases in off-scale, making removal of off-scale supplements an unrealistic goal.

The committee notes that the report states that “off-scale pay for current faculty would be subsumed into on-scale compensation,” suggesting that salary gains made through multiple cycles of accelerations in off-scale would be eliminated. Many years of the current system have led to a culture in which accelerations in off-scale are the norm, rewarding activities exceeding expectations. If the suggested changes were to be implemented, the committee would like to know how achievements resulting in partial step increases in salary would be rewarded in this system. Finally, it is not clear how the transition timing will affect eventual retirement pay, again especially for long-serving faculty with a “loyalty penalty.”

Cc: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
To: Susannah Scott  
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Douglas Steigerwald, Chair  
Council on Planning & Budget

Re: Faculty Salaries Task Force Report

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) has reviewed the report of the Faculty Salaries Task Force. The report addresses problems with, and makes recommendations for, UC's faculty compensation salary scales. It pinpoints many problems and concerns with the current model as a model and with the current salary levels relative to the market and UC's Comparison-8 institutions.

The Council on Planning & Budget sees the problems with the model as structural and the relations with the market as financial / budgetary and will address them separately.

Structural problems

Per the report, the current model suffers from a lack of transparency, predictability, and objective mechanisms; multiple problems traceable to off-scale compensation; and other problems. The imbalances caused by off-scale have reached the point that as of 2019, 99% of ladder rank and equivalent faculty had some off-scale component to their pay (page 3).

CPB has several concerns and questions about these structural problems.

1) The report refers to off-scale amounts as "discretionary and typically determined by an administrator, such as a dean" (page 3) and says they are "not subject to faculty review on some campuses" (page 3). Why is off-scale salary compensation not being reviewed by campus entities such as the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)?

2) The report states that "UC is not revealing the actual cost of faculty salaries and is therefore inadequately conveying its fiscal needs to the State" (page 3) and "Publishing salary scales that do not reflect real compensation conditions can also affect public perception of the University: for example, legislators taking the scales at face value might misunderstand what it costs to recruit and retain UC-quality faculty, potentially contributing to State underfunding." (page 11). How and why is UC not revealing the actual cost of salaries? Is UC only reporting base salaries without off-scale?
3) The report labels retention actions as "breaking the system" due to off-scale salaries given as retention incentives and a consequent "'loyalty penalty' for faculty who do not seek outside employment and therefore do not receive retention remuneration" (page 3). Retention incentives can include not just off-scale remuneration but accelerations to higher steps, partner hires, and other bonuses. Is the Task Force recommending that all retention incentives be eliminated?

Financial / budgetary problems

As of the latest data (October 2018), UC faculty salaries lagged those of its Comparison-8 institutions by 7.5% (page 1). The report states that "salary scale levels have not been predictable in many years. Rather, every year the Academic Senate has to consult with UCOP Administration on salary levels, which must then compete with other University funding needs." and "There is no clear policy for annual adjustments to the salary scales that reflect market rates and that can be relied on when discussing faculty compensation with the Regents and the State." (page 3). Moreover, salaries "calibrated to a highly competitive market" are needed to attract, hire and retain first-class faculty (page 2).

CPB has concerns about these budgetary problems:

1) Under any of the proposed readjustments to the salary scales, what increase in funding would be required? CPB would appreciate a budget analysis to understand the implications of any new salary scale, especially given current restrictions.

2) Are salaries compared with or without offscale amounts? Are comparisons with other campuses adjusted for differences in cost of living? Some of the Comparison-8 institutions are in locations with very high cost of living, others in locations with 10% as much cost of living.

Task Force recommendations

Broadly, the Task Force "strongly recommends that UC take the long view of stabilizing the salary scales system" and "urge[s] UC leadership to seize the opportunity this crisis [the covid pandemic] presents to establish a long-term plan that will progressively implement salary scales that are transparent, competitive, and equitable at all levels, that are adjusted annually, and that progressively decrease off-scale increments" (page 2). More specific recommendations (page 4) are:

A) Faculty salary scales should be based on transparent and objective mechanisms that lead to equitable outcomes.

B) Faculty salary scales should be adjusted annually according to a transparent mechanism that uses readily available measures of market levels.

C) Salary scales should be sensitive to disciplinary differences.

D) A new salary scale system should be structured so as to substantially reduce the need for off-scale compensation. The new compensation system should be phased in over time.
Two experimental models for mechanisms to address recommendations A) and C) are described in the report's appendices. These mechanisms would establish base settings at the assistant professor III level; establish salary increase increments of 2%, 2.5%, or 3% within steps; set salary increases of 10% at promotion from assistant to associate professor and from associate to full professor. The "comparison-based" model #1 would base scales "on compensation rates in similar disciplinary groupings at Comparison-8 institutions", while the "factor-based" model #2 would use scales "closest to their market-based comparators; annual adjustments would be made to track salaries at the Comparison-8 institutions" (page 4). The Task Force did not recommend one of these models over the other.

CPB has several questions and concerns about these models.

1) The "factor-based scales determined by a multiplier" in model #2 would set 25 different salary levels within each step, all but the lowest of which (judging by the example of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan) would be above the salary level of the next higher step. Would not the amounts above the basic salary at a step not just be off-scale supplements under a different name?

2) The report's discussion of model #2 states that it "would allow flexibility for both large and small groupings of disciplines" (page 5). How so? Why cannot model #1 be used for any size of disciplinary grouping?

3) The final page of the report mentions the modeling of an Academic Year Business/Econ/Engineering scale, Fiscal Year scales, and a Professor-Law School series scale. Where are these models to be found? Why are they not presented in the report?

Conclusion

CPB endorses the Task Force's recommendation B) and agrees with the principle C). Moreover, salary scales may need to account for cost-of-living differences across campuses, as well as disciplinary differences. We feel that A) is too vague and undefined to take as a principle.

CPB does not endorse recommendation D). In fact, CPB disagrees with the Task Force’s view that off-scale compensation is a problem. Off-scale provides a needed flexibility to the salary system, allowing rewards for a wide variety of activities and incentives for retention.

Although the Task Force was not mandated to address diversity, equity, and inclusion, CPB requests that any discussion of UC's faculty salary scales consider effects on diversity, equity, and inclusion. We close with a question: How can salary inequities be addressed and redressed with an inflexible salary scale system?

cc: Shasta Delp, Academic Senate Executive Director
February 8, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Lisa Parks, Chair
       Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards

Re: Review of Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom, and Awards met on February 3, 2021 to discuss the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report. Council members’ comments on the report are provided below.

The council appreciates the report’s emphasis on the need for greater transparency in conveying on- and off-scale faculty salaries to the state of California and in attempting to address equity concerns; however, several issues and questions arose during our discussion of the report.

First, the council agreed the report does a fine job of identifying a series of problems and issues with the current situation, yet found a lack of detail regarding phasing in a new faculty salary scale and the processes by which it would be implemented. Given this, the council recommends off-scale salary be maintained until further information about implementation is provided and reviewed.

Second, the council suggests it is crucial to consider faculty recruitment and retention issues as part of the faculty salary scale discussion. It is one thing to establish a new scale, but the moment that scale is implemented, new recruitments and retentions will most likely distort it. The recommended annual salary scale adjustment may help to mitigate off-scaling, but there are other issues to consider. Retentions come with other financial amenities that are not registered in the salary scale, including startup funds, GSR and postdoc support, summer salary, housing allocations, and more. Thus, a more comprehensive discussion of recruitment, retentions, and faculty salary scale is needed to pursue transparency and equity goals.

Third, while council members value long-term UC faculty service, salary discussions should not be reduced to institutional loyalty or disloyalty. Council members deemed the language of “loyalty penalty” unhelpful and potentially divisive. Some UC faculty members entertain outside offers simply because they cannot afford to pay rents, mortgage payments, childcare, or other living costs in their areas. Other faculty refuse recruitment offers for various reasons and often end up unfairly underpaid relative to their colleagues. This is an important and complex issue that warrants further investigation. It might be useful to conduct a local study that compares salaries of faculty at equivalent levels within academic divisions and analyzes differentials between those with and without retentions or “loyalty.” It might also be helpful to correlate this data with gender, race/ethnicity, and discipline.

Fourth, the council sought further discussion and clarification of “market rates.” Appendix C provides a proposal for market-based faculty salary scales, but it also reveals that market rates “at higher steps of the Professor Series were so much higher than current averages that an alternate scenario was modeled.” The need to reign in or recalibrate raised questions about the model. The council also
wondered whether market rates take into account faculty options of working in the privatized workforce vs public higher education and related salary differentials.

Beyond this, the term “market rates” can sometimes be used to undermine wage increases and/or demonize labor organizing. It seems odd to center this term as the heart of what is presented as a positive or progressive salary justice initiative. In this context, it might be more useful to replace this term “market rates” with clearer and more substantive designations such as “raising salaries to meet those of other top R1 research universities that recruit from our faculty, and matching the salary levels of private sector professions that value and recruit from our faculty’s research and technical expertise,” and “looking for structural models with particular reference to those universities and private-sector entities who are exemplars of race/gender pay equity.”

Emphasis on “market rates” tends to privilege faculty from certain disciplines and backgrounds. What, beyond annual adjustments, can be done to remedy structural inequalities based on gender, race/ethnicity, and discipline in the new faculty salary scale system? Given the issues mentioned above, perhaps there is a need for a review of overall faculty compensation packages rather than an analysis of the salary scale alone.

Finally, the council appreciates the paragraph on housing, and encourages further discussion of the faculty salary scale in relation to housing and cost of living inequities across the UC system. Tying salary scales to accurate and automatic cost of living adjustments and affirming the principal of equity across the UC system might be more urgent priorities than dismantling the off-scale system.

The Council appreciates the opportunity to comment on the report and looks forward to further discussion of these vital issues.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
February 9, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Melissa L. Morgan, Chair
    Committee on Diversity and Equity

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE) reviewed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report at its meeting of February 8, 2021. Overall, CDE thought that normalizing salary scales to be more equitable and consistent is a good idea in theory, but some members had some concerns. Off-scale salary was used in the past to address equity gaps in pay. New salary scales could help prevent these types of gaps from occurring, but eliminating off-scale salary would remove an important recruitment and retention tool, especially for underrepresented faculty. Less transparent, “back-door” deals would likely start occurring to try to recruit or retain exceptional faculty. The Committee thought that calibrating salaries could be done, but perhaps with off-scale kept as a tool in certain situations.

The Committee felt strongly that cost of living and housing costs need to be explicitly addressed in salary scales (while there was brief mention it was not incorporated into the proposal). Current salary scales are quite disproportionate with living expenses in many areas with UC campuses. Salary scales should not be uniform across all campuses. This disproportion also impacts some faculty more than others. Most impacted are junior faculty, those with children and childcare needs, and underrepresented faculty who may have more debt and less wealth, which limits where they can accept a position and afford to live. Therefore, CDE felt it is impossible to entertain recalibration without specifically taking this into account.

Members also wondered about the public perception of increasing UC faculty salaries and the inequities between faculty and non-Senate faculty and staff.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
February 8, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Tamara Afifi, Chair  
Graduate Council

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

At its meeting of January 25, 2021, Graduate Council (GC) reviewed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report. Overall, the Council thought there was insufficient detail about what the two proposed options would look like if implemented. Members were unable to discuss how these would actually work in practice, and suggest that more information be provided in order for faculty to make informed comments.

The current reliance on retention offers to gain competitive salaries is pernicious and wastes faculty time that could be better spent on research and teaching. The UC system does not live in a vacuum, though, and departments are constantly fighting to retain faculty. Younger faculty members will continue to be disappointed with their compensation and the sluggishness of advancement, and will become harder to retain. The state needs to start viewing UC as a research university system and fund accordingly.

The current academic personnel process is time consuming and subjective. A simplified process, taking equity into account, would be advantageous. Graduate student mentoring should be a part of the academic personnel process, as it is an extremely important aspect of faculty responsibilities. The Council was not in favor of eliminating off-scale salary, as it is an important tool to use to reward faculty going above and beyond what is expected. The Council did not see how either of the proposed options would reduce the loyalty penalty, unless the goal is to eliminate retention salary bumps. This could actually exacerbate the salary equity problem.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
February 8, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Forrest Brewer, Chair
    Council on Research and Instructional Resources

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The Council on Research and Instructional Resources reviewed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report at its meeting on February 5, 2021. The Council noted that this endeavor is undertaken in the spirit of promoting salary equity and transparency. While few would argue the value of achieving this goal, the proposed policy would enact sweeping changes, eliminating off-scale salary increments entirely and replacing the salary levels according to an ad-hoc rule based loosely on average salaries at comparable universities, uniform across all 10 UC campuses. Council members identified issues within the report as detailed below.

The criticism of off-scale salaries per se is fundamentally flawed. There are numerous reasons faculty acquire off-scale pay, the foremost being recognition for work above and beyond what is necessary for a step promotion. This proposal seems to imply that any difference in pay among faculty at the same step or rank is a problem, but this is simply not true. Different faculty members have periods of particular success in their careers, and these periods should be acknowledged. Particularly in the humanities and other book disciplines, faculty are rewarded for extensive publication, but they are also rewarded for teaching, mentoring, diversity work, special attention to professional organizations, service to the university, etc. Without the possibility of off-scale, these faculty members would have no access to merit increases. In fact, parts of the personnel system at present are heavily organized around the concept of off-scale. If it were to be done away with, a fundamental revision of the personnel process would be necessary, and would not necessarily deal with the remaining inequities without a great deal of thought. This report stops short of providing a path forward to address this issue. Likewise, while higher on-step faculty salaries would make initial offers of employment less dependent on off-scale, the council did not see how they would help with retention issues, since any counter-offer would likely have to include a higher salary, which would almost certainly involve off-scale.

The council wanted more information regarding certain logistical complications for existing faculty that would arise from the deployment of new scales. Would faculty be assigned to new ranks by their current (including off-scale) salaries or would they be assigned new ‘average’ salaries based on their current rank, independent of their current off-scale? Either assignment has issues. If assigned by salary, many professors likely would be shifted in rank, potentially past promotions. Indeed, if the new salary scale is higher (as proposed), several members would have lowered ranks. If assigned salary by rank however, would some professors then lose off-scale increments that were awarded for extraordinary effort? In the likely case that the new scales would not be set to the levels proposed, the scheme would be a
disaster, eliminating the potential for competitive salaries in competitive fields or for extraordinary candidates.

The proposal makes the case that off-scale salary increments promote inequity and aren’t transparent because they are made at the sole discretion of administrators and therefore muddy the public accountability of the salary system. These claims are misleading: peer review is required in personnel and retention cases and while final determinations are made at the AVC level, many campus entities are consulted. This is not to say that inequities don’t exist or that they should be tolerated. But the notions of equity, transparency, salary scales and promotions are distinct issues that this proposal purports to mutually address with a single average solution. In particular, salary actions may indeed be the final decision of the AVC, but require positive actions by the department (who writes the case), the dean (who must approve the case) and CAP (who independently verifies the rationale for the action). Moreover, the opportunity for inequity still exists based on departmental inaction or malfeasance, or similar issues at the dean’s level; removing off-scale compensation with the promise of an equitable on-scale average does not address inequity issues that would appear as simply failure to advance in rank.

Finally, the notion that salary should be uniform across the campuses, despite vast differences in cost of living is undefended. The proposal says that campuses have programs for low cost housing and loan assistance, but these programs vary greatly across the campuses and (at least at Santa Barbara) access to university faculty housing is indeed in the hands of administrators without faculty recourse.

The rank and step system for promotion by peers is indeed a laudable feature of the University of California. However, the current faculty salary scales are hopelessly uncompetitive in many fields compared to high-end public and private universities with whom the UC competes for faculty. Off-scale has been and is being used to offset this issue. Unfortunately, a change in the blanket flat scale by rank doesn’t solve inequity; while it might solve issues in some areas, it would likewise create new issues by stymying mechanisms by which to reward excellence. The current system is far from perfect, but a scheme that levels salaries by responsibility rather than productivity also seems inequitable.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
January 22, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Carolyn Sattin-Bajaj, Vice Chair
   Faculty Executive Committee, GGSE

Re: Report and Recommendations from the Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales

The Faculty Executive Committee of the Gevitz Graduate School of Education has reviewed the report and recommendations made by the Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales. The FEC appreciates the work the Task Force put into developing the report and recommendations. The FEC concurs with the Task Force's argument about the need for increased transparency in the salary scales and the importance of bringing them into alignment with peer institutions. The FEC also believes that there is a compelling need to correct the "loyalty penalty" for those faculty who never search other jobs (and therefore do not use outside offers to significantly increase their salaries). The FEC is eager to see concrete proposals for changing salary scales along with plans for how these recommendations may be implemented at the University and Campus levels.
February 2, 2021

TO: Susannah Scott
   Divisional Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Pradeep Sen, Chair
       College of Engineering, Faculty Executive Committee

RE: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The College of Engineering FEC met on Tuesday, February 2, 2021 and reviewed and discussed the report.

The committee acknowledges that the report is a good starting point and endorses the first recommendation regarding transparency, but feels the report needs to be significantly expanded to be useful.

The committee commented about the following areas of concern that they feel need additional explanation:

1. The memo addressed many issues at a high level but provides no concrete action items or solutions. The recommendations provided in the report are vague and would be difficult to implement without further justification and more explanation.
2. It is unclear how the eight peer institutions were selected and do not appear to be useful as comparison institutions.
   a. The committee noted that the majority of the peer institutions operate very differently than the current UC model or the recommendations proposed in the report. The committee does not recommend the UC adopt the practices of most of these institutions but wonders if there are better alternatives for comparison.
   b. The committee noted there is no mention of the cost of living differences between the UCs broadly and the comparison institutions. Cost of living should play a large role in the analysis of the proposed model and solutions.
3. The report does not address budget impacts.
4. The report does not address the long-term impacts of not taking action.

The report recommends off-scale adjustments should be a rare exception and that retention cases disrupt the system. The committee understands that off-scale adjustments are the consequence of salary scales not changing over many years. However, the committee also noted that in the College of Engineering, off-scale adjustments are a critical tool for rewarding faculty for notable achievements and to help ward off aggressive overtures from competing institutions. Essentially, they provide the only practical option the College and Departments have to control the salaries without “advancing the clock” like moving up a step would entail, which is especially critical for early-career faculty. They recommend that the university consider this implication and consider other flexible options.

The committee recognizes that, in some departments, the only way for a faculty member to earn a large off-scale adjustment is to apply at other institutions and noted outside offers are the only
mechanism to calibrate the market. They recommend the university find a model that is proactive, incentivizing faculty not to apply for outside positions, instead of only reactive, which is the current model.
February 10, 2021

TO: Susannah Scott, Academic Senate Chair

FR: Mark Buntaine, Bren School Faculty Executive Committee Chair

RE: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The Faculty Executive Committee of the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management would like to express its support of the recommendations listed in the Report of the Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales from October 7, 2020. We look forward to providing our feedback to specific proposals on how to implement the recommendations.
February 9, 2021

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair of the Academic Council

Fr: John Latto, FEC Chair, College of Creative Studies

Re: CCS FEC discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report at its meeting on February 2, 2021

The members of the committee appreciated the work of the task force and the importance of the issues that are raised. However, there was some concern about the optics of discussing ladder faculty salaries at this time when Non-Senate Faculty are still working without a contract; our graduate TAs, system-wide have raised concerns about the need for a Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA); and we are in the midst of a global pandemic that has placed significant stress on many members of society.

There was a general agreement with the criticisms raised of the current system and a broad support for the creation of a more transparent and equitable system.

Particular concern was raised about starting salaries for new faculty—the gap between starting salaries for faculty, particularly in non-STEM disciplines, and the cost of living in Santa Barbara has widened significantly. The student loan debt burden on younger faculty, generationally, is another factor impacting junior faculty. It was felt that with higher starting salaries there would be less need for off scale supplements later.

It was acknowledged that there are many problems that flow from the reliance on off-scale salary. One thing was unclear, however, in terms of the impact this would have on the merit system, in particular, whether full steps alone would provide sufficient granularity to appropriately recognize a range of levels of performance.
February 10, 2021

To: Susannah Scott  
Chair, Divisional Academic Senate

From: Sabine Frühstück  
Chair, L&S Faculty Executive Committee

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

At its meeting on January 28, 2021, the Faculty Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science (FEC) reviewed the report of the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force, a subcommittee of the Senate Academic Planning Council. The task force was charged with examining issues surrounding faculty salary scales, in particular excessive reliance on off-scale pay to achieve competitive compensation.

FEC recognizes the problem the Task Force intends to address: Due to long-term underfunding, off-scale salary components are ubiquitous and have led to an opaque salary system. Thus, the goal of the Task Force to rethink the salary scale system, “move to more transparent and equitable faculty compensation salary scales,” and substantially reduce the need for off-scale compensation in the process is appreciated.

Accordingly, the Task Force Report addressed five recommendations regarding: A. Transparency, equity and objectivity, B. Annual adjustment, C. Disciplinary differences, D. Making off-scale the rare exception, and E. Phasing the system in over time, beginning with new hires.

FEC wishes to raise a number of concerns as follows:

Regarding annual adjustment, the report identifies as a problem, “Off-scale compensation is bad for morale -- it is dispiriting and demoralizing when faculty in the same discipline and department, with similar research responsibilities and teaching loads, receive widely disparate compensation.”

The report appears to suggest a time-based salary-scale system that leaves unclear how the Task Force envisions addressing the significantly different levels of faculty performance, particularly in research and in spite of “similar research responsibilities and teaching loads.”

On that same point, the report fails to address how different levels of achievements would be reflected by the new scale. This may be our committee’s biggest concern. How does the Task Force envision distinguishing between high-performing, normatively performing, and underperforming faculty? The Report only mentions two promotions - to Associate Professor with tenure and to Professor - but does not address subsequent “promotions” that are currently in place, namely to Professor VI and Professor Above Scale.

Regarding disciplinary differences, discussion point VI.B. offers: “If UC wants to expand the number of disciplinary-based scales, the factor-based disciplinary model would allow flexibility for both large and small groupings of disciplines, and would move away from scales with explicit disciplinary names. However, the factor-based mechanism would be less transparent and arguably less market-based, and would be a departure from the current set of scales (and disciplinary groups) to which faculty and administration are accustomed.” The report does not speak to the difference in impact on actual salaries of either model beyond the question of transparency and familiarity.
Regarding implementation, discussion point VI.C. suggests it “to be uniform across the UC system,” leaving unaddressed the issue of vast differences in cost of living across the UC system.

Laudably, the recommendations would improve particularly the salaries of recently-hired Assistant Professors and many Associate Professors. This may bring UC base salaries more into alignment with peer institutions. However, crucially, while the report aims to make off-scale salaries a “rare exception,” it does not offer any clues about how meritorious performance would be acknowledged and therefore how UC would keep attracting, promoting, and retaining the most competitive faculty.

Last but not least, it is unclear how this system would be funded under the current pandemic and what will surely be a lengthy economic aftermath.

For all of these reasons, the FEC cannot support the Report’s recommendations unless the concerns outlined above could be explicitly addressed.

cc: Pierre Wiltzius, Executive Dean of the College and Dean of Science
    Jeffrey Stopple, Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean of Undergraduate Education
    Charlie Hale, Dean of Social Sciences
    Mary Hancock, Acting Dean of Humanities and Fine Arts
February 17, 2021

MARY GUAVAIN, Chair
Academic Council

RE: Systemwide Review of Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Mary,

The Academic Senate has reviewed the campus revised “Systemwide Review of Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report.” The following committees have reviewed and responded: Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Career Advising (CCA), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Planning and Budget (CPB), Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), and Privilege and Tenure (P&T).

Each committee supports the efforts to bring clarity, transparency, and equity to the salary administration process across the entire UC system. However, they each also had some concerns with the current details of the report.

P&T further supports the efforts to realign salaries with rank and step and to eliminate the loyalty penalty. The committee mentions the report does not address how merit increases will be implemented. They question if increases will be performed in full step increments, fractional increments, or increased use of acceleration, or if salary for faculty will be based on similar time in ladder, regardless of performance. They further advise against using a system that accentuates disincentives for certain services, advising and teaching. The committee also recommends consideration and development of processes to address the transient inequities that will arise between existing and new faculty after implementation of the proposal.

CPB provided several points that may improve the proposal. Their suggestions include: further emphasis that a transparent and consistent rank-step scale is important for UC recruitment and retention, more quantitative and qualitative information on off-scale practice differences between campuses, identifying practices that address off-scale inequities quicker, consideration of total compensation as opposed to strictly salary, and inclusion of best practice mechanisms for recognizing different levels of faculty performance in compensation, if off-scale is to be rare or eliminated.
CFW also raised their concerns with the report’s recommendations and lack of details. CFW was not convinced that removing off-scale practices would be beneficial. They note that off-scale is one of UCSC’s only tools for competitiveness in recruitment and retention of faculty. They recommend that off-scale salary should remain available to the Chancellor. Their main concern is with the context of high cost of living in Santa Cruz. CFW also mentions the missing cost of living adjustments. They were pleased to see the report urged UC leadership to develop systemwide resources to assist faculty with housing costs, but they note that cost of living is not limited to housing. They strongly suggest the inclusion of consideration of cost of living in all proposals concerning faculty salary. CFW then goes on to discuss the missing details of the report: how eliminating off-scales would affect UC faculty whose salaries exceed the scales even after adjustment, how the scales would be adjusted, and how market rates would be taken into consideration for different disciplines.

CCA was pleased to see revision to salary compression and inversion issues but expressed concerns regarding constrained use of off-scale increments for faculty recruitment and retention. They acknowledge the difficulty in balancing competitive recruitment and retention offers and avoiding salary compression and loyalty penalty issues, but they state that the current report’s proposals are vague in regard to potential trade-offs. CCA also notes that diversity, equity, and inclusion issues, between current salaries and proposed revisions, should be addressed. CCA continues to detail which issues of the implementation are missing: how disciplinary differences will be factored, how inequity would be assessed and addressed, what is equitable for faculty members with similar rank and step but different performance with regard to research, teaching, service, and DEI contributions, and how the revised salary scale will be implemented.

CAP had similar concerns about the details of how recommendations would be implemented and questioned the efficacy in addressing current salary scale issues. CAP indicated the importance of being able to make competitive recruitment and retention offers due to the high cost of living in Santa Cruz and would appreciate information detailing which cost of living factors will be used in assessment and how. They also questioned the proposal to remove off-scale salaries since it may reduce UCSC’s competitiveness with other campuses and institutions in recruitment and retention. CAP also brings up the point that it is difficult to determine what a discipline looks like due to salary bias if the Factor-Based Disciplinary Model were to be implemented. They believe these models will not motivate faculty to excel in their work.

CAAD’s stance is very similar to those of CAP. They remain concerned about the removal of the off-scale system, mainly with regard to faculty retention. They note UCSC’s previous experience with removing off-scale for equity in 2006. There is not sufficient data for the number of those affected, but one colleague had a significantly lower salary than their counterparts at similar and lower rank and step. They also support off-scale as a means of recognizing significant contributions to equity and diversity.

Sincerely,

David Brundage, Chair
Enc: Senate Committee Responses (Bundled)

cc: Sylvanna Falcón, Chair Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity  
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Adrian Brasoveanu, Chair, Committee on Career Advising  
Junko Ito, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Julie Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
February 9, 2021

David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Re: Systemwide Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear David,

The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) has reviewed the report and recommendations from the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. Overall, we concur with the views of the Committee on Academic Personnel, letter dated 1/13/21, that states this recommendation could introduce more problems, even though the rationale for eliminating “off-scale” is understandable.

Eliminating "off-scale" presupposes the scale is actually transparent and equitable across the board, which it is not. It also presupposes there's a way to respond to outside job offers that are above our published salary scales, which there is not. Even though we share concerns about the inequities in the off-scale system itself referenced in the report, we are also concerned that the proposed solution to those inequities would be elimination of off-scale.

Our own campus has had experience with removing off-scale in the name of equity. In 2006, during an “equity assessment,” the campus removed off-scale for faculty. Though we are not able to gather concrete numbers of how many directly affected, one faculty colleague who had this happen to them has a significantly lower overall salary than their counterparts at the same rank and step today, as well as those who are at a lower rank and step. As this colleague has built their career here, an opportunity to correct this past decision has not occurred. Even moving to another UC institution won't resolve this issue because of non-competitive hiring rules in the UC system.

Lastly, CAAD has discussed ways in which to recognize significant contributions to equity and diversity through compensation. One of the only ways to do so would be through off-scale. Not everyone contributes to the campus in the same way; many go above and beyond. And therefore, eliminating “off-scale” would remove one of the only possible mechanisms to recognize such notable contributions to equity and diversity.

Sincerely,

Sylvanna Falcón, Chair
Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

cc: Junko Ito, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel
    Adrian Brasoveanu, Chair, Committee on Career Advising
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Julie Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Senate Executive Committee
January 13, 2021

David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear David,

During its meeting of December 17, 2020, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) reviewed the Academic Planning Council’s Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales Report and Recommendations¹. Members agreed that systemwide recognition of the inherent problems of the current faculty salary scales is a step in the right direction. However, CAP raised concerns about the report’s failure to include details about how any of the recommendations would be put into practice, and questioned whether the recommendations would be effective in addressing current salary scale issues without creating additional problems. Further, CAP was surprised and disheartened to find that there was no representation from UC Santa Cruz (nor from UCLA) on the Task Force.

As faculty in one of the highest cost of living areas in California, members were pleased to see that the Task Force recognized that campuses vary widely with regard to cost of living, and encouraged UC leadership to develop resources to assist faculty with living and housing costs. Although not recognized by the Office of the President, cost of living does affect the total remuneration of UC faculty salaries, and the level of this effect varies from campus to campus. As such, it is imperative that campuses with high cost of living like UC Santa Cruz are able to make competitive offers, particularly with regard to appointment and retention cases. The document, however, does not detail which measure of cost of living would be utilized in the assessment, and how. CAP noted that one of each Chancellor’s greatest tools to increase salary competitiveness in personnel actions is the ability to utilize off-scale salaries. Members questioned whether removing the ability to use off-scale salaries could further erode UC Santa Cruz’s ability to compete with other campuses and institutions to recruit and retain exceptional faculty.

CAP raised concerns about both disciplinary models explored in the report. Members suggested it would be difficult to determine what a discipline looks like due to biases in salaries if the Factor-Based Disciplinary Model were put in place, and noted that other countries have tried to link salary increases to inflation, as in the proposed Comparison-Based Disciplinary Model, with little to no success. Further, concerns were raised that neither of these models would create a system that motivates faculty to excel and do excellent work.

¹ Academic Planning Council Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales, Report and Recommendations, October 7, 2020
In all, CAP is grateful for the attempt to address UC salary scale issues. However, without clear implementation details, the committee is unable to assess and/or endorse the recommendations presented in the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

Junko Ito, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

cc: Sylvanna Falcón, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
Adrian Brasoveanu, Chair, Committee on Career Advising
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Julie Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Senate Executive Committee
January 27, 2021

DAVID BRUNDAGE
Chair Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Re: Systemwide Senate Review, Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear David,

During its meeting of January 12, 2021, CCA reviewed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations.

Given the main charge of CCA, the discussion revolved primarily around the potential impact of the proposals for new faculty recruitment and retention. The committee was happy to see that the proposed revisions to the salary scales address equity and transparency issues, as well as salary compression and inversion issues. At the same time, the committee expressed concern that, although it is *prima facie* well justified, highly constraining the use of off-scale increments might affect our ability to effectively recruit and retain faculty of the highest caliber.

The committee acknowledged that it is very hard to strike the right balance between making competitive recruitment / retention offers and avoiding egregious salary compression and loyalty-penalty issues. However, the proposals in the current report are vague in regards to the potential trade-offs between these conflicting desiderata, and more explicit recommendations should be made that would guide decision making in specific cases. Furthermore, CCA thought that diversity, equity and inclusion issues connected to both the current salaries and the proposed revisions should be addressed.

Various issues of implementation are also left vague. For example, how exactly will disciplinary differences be factored in? What counts as equity across divisions and/or departments, and how would inequity be assessed and addressed? What counts as equitable for faculty members that are the same rank and step, but might perform differently with regards to research, teaching, service and DEI contributions?

Similarly, how exactly will the revised salary scale be implemented? Is it possible that some faculty will end up being paid less than they currently are? Is the medium term goal to progressively phase out off-scales? If so, will this be accomplished exclusively by raising the salaries of faculty with smaller off-scales at an accelerated pace, or will faculty with large off-scales receive smaller salary increments as they progress through the ladder compared to faculty with smaller off-scales? How reasonable would it be to differentially reward faculty who perform similarly?
In sum, CCA felt that more specificity at the implementation level is needed, but more importantly, a forward-looking discussion of our institution’s recruitment and retention goals and principles is necessary in addition to the current -- thorough, but largely retrospective -- view. That is, articulating a forward-looking compensation philosophy is more important than articulating the full implementation details of the proposed salary scale revisions. This philosophy should be articulated before the rollout of the proposed salary scale revisions. Without it, the actual deployment of the plan may end up varying a great deal from what we intended.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine.

Sincerely,

Iš
Adrian Brasoveanu, Chair
Committee on Career Advising

cc: Junko Ito, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel
Sylvanna Falcón, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Julie Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege & Tenure
Re: Systemwide Review of the Faculty Salary Scale Task Force Report

Dear David,

During its meeting of January 21, 2021, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed the Academic Planning Council Faculty Sales Salary Scale Task Force Report and recommendations. Overall, members agreed that the salary scales should be updated, but raised serious concerns about the recommendation of removing off-scale salaries, and raised questions about the overall lack of details in the report.

The Task Force report recommendations are keen to do away with off-scales, but after reading the report, members were not convinced this would be a good idea. Members noted that off-scale is one of UCSC’s only tools to remain competitive in recruitment and retention actions. CFW members thought that off-scale salary should remain a resource available to the Chancellor. This is a particularly pressing concern in the context of the high cost of living in Santa Cruz.

The report recommendations are missing a cost of living adjustment. CFW was pleased to find that the report urged UC leadership to develop systemwide resources to assist faculty with housing costs, but cost of living includes many variables in addition to housing. As such, and because Santa Cruz is one of the highest cost of living areas in the country, CFW must utilize this opportunity to voice the need to include the consideration of cost of living in any and all proposals that concern faculty salaries.

The report also lacks significant details. For example, it is not clear how eliminating off-scales would affect UC faculty whose salaries exceed the scales even after adjustment. Presumably such salaries will still have a measure of off-scale. The rationale for updating the scales should be detached from the idea of removing off-scales. We can support updating the scales while opposing getting rid of off-scales.

It is not clear from the report how exactly the scales would be adjusted, nor how market rates would be taken into consideration for different disciplines. Like the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), members of CFW feel that the intention to adjust the scales is a good one, but the proposal significantly lacks necessary implementation details, and as such is difficult to endorse.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Nico Orlandi, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: Junko Ito, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel
    Sylvanna Falcón, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
    Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
    Adrian Brasoveanu, Chair, Committee on Career Advising
    Julie Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
    Senate Executive Committee
February 9, 2021

David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear David,

At its meeting of January 14, 2021, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the Academic Planning Council’s Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations. The committee strongly supports the project’s aim to bring consistency, transparency, and equity to compensation practices across the entire UC system. Further, we affirm the foundational nature of faculty peer-review in the compensation process.

Because the current document is not a specific proposal, CPB did not discuss in great detail the market-rate compensation example provided. We focused instead on broader points that might improve the proposal in its next iteration. Our suggestions include:

- Emphasizing further that a transparent and consistent rank-step scale is in itself important for UC recruitment and retention, and maintains the integrity of the system.
- Providing more specific qualitative and quantitative information on how off-scale practices differ at different campuses (or units), especially those practices which lack faculty oversight.
- Identifying practices that address off-scale inequities in more immediate ways. Given that a wholesale replacement requires significant time, how can improvements be made that will apply to the current professoriate (not merely future hires)? These might include, for example, creation of systemwide guidelines for awarding off-scale compensation.
- Adding some consideration of total compensation as opposed to strictly salary.
- Including best practice mechanisms for recognizing different levels of faculty performance in compensation, if off-scale is to be rare or eliminated. (Members noted that off-scale compensation often rewards achievement).

CPB appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

Dard Neuman, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

cc: CAAD Chair Falcón
CCA Chair Brasoveanu
CFW Chair Orlandi
CAP Chair Ito
P&T Chair Guthman
DAVID BRUNDAGE, Chair  
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division  

Re: Systemwide Review of Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report (Revision)  

Dear David,  

During its meeting of December 9, 2020, and then again on January 13, 2021, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T), reviewed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force report.  

Overall, the committee supports efforts to bring clarity and transparency to the salary administration process, to realign salaries with rank and step, and to eliminate the loyalty penalty. However, the report did not address a fundamental question that requires serious consideration before moving forward: how merit increases will be implemented. The committee could only assume the prospective development and clarification of a system such that relative merits will continue to be evaluated and differentially rewarded, but how will that take place? Will this come through full step increments, fractional increments, or increased use of accelerations, or is the intention to completely flatten salary for faculty with similar time in ladder track, regardless of performance? Not all individuals perform exactly equivalently at step, and the committee advises against a system that would accentuate disincentives for certain kinds of service, advising and teaching. Arguably, the step system broke in the first place owing to inadequate granularity.  

Given that the proposed alignment will apply only to newly hired faculty, the committee also recommends additional consideration and development of processes to address the transient inequities that will arise between existing faculty and new faculty (i.e. salary compression), as the proposal is implemented.  

Sincerely,  
/s/  
Julie Guthman, Chair  
Committee on Privilege and Tenure  

cc:  
Junko Ito, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Sylvanna Falcon, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity  
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare  
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Adrian Brasoveanu, Chair, Committee on Career Advising
February 8, 2021

Professor Mary Gauvain  
Chair, Academic Senate  
University of California  
VIA EMAIL

Re: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

Dear Professor Gauvain,

The Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report was distributed to San Diego Divisional Senate standing committees and discussed at the February 1, 2021 Divisional Senate Council meeting.

Senate Council appreciates the effort to address faculty salaries. Council did not express a preference for either model, the comparison- or factor-based disciplinary model. Council members noted that neither model addressed the high cost of living in California, nor the variance in the cost of living across UC campuses. Members voiced support for retaining the off-scale component as an important recruitment and retention tool. The absence of discussion of above-scale salaries in the report was also noted.

The responses from the Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel, Committee on Diversity and Equity, Committee on Faculty Welfare, Committee on Research, and Committee on Planning and Budget are attached.

Sincerely,

Steven Constable  
Chair  
San Diego Divisional Academic Senate

Attachments
cc: Tara Javidi, Vice Chair, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate
     Ray Rodriguez, Director, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate
     Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, UC Systemwide Academic Senate
January 25, 2021

IN CONFIDENCE

STEVEN CONSTABLE
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: CAP Response to the Faculty Salary Scale Task Force Report

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the system-wide review of the Faculty Salary Scale Task Force Report. The committee reviewed the report at its January 13, 2021 meeting. A CAP majority endorses the spirit of the recommendations and does not pose any objections that would prevent the recommendations from being considered for implementation. CAP offers the following comments on aspects of the report and recommendations:

CAP members agree that faculty salary scales should be based on transparent and objective mechanisms that lead to equitable outcomes. The committee also agrees that there should be built-in mechanisms to accommodate for disciplinary differences in salary rates. In terms of the two proposed models (comparison-based versus factor-based), the committee had no strong feelings that led the committee to favor one model over the other. Of particular concern, however, is that neither proposed salary scale model contains any information on if and how faculty salaries at the Above Scale rank will be impacted by the proposed changes. If Above Scale salaries are not appropriately raised, any scale adjustment would be inequitable to this population and counterproductive to the University’s goals. Above Scale salaries should be adjusted at minimum, by an amount equal to the salary increase proposed to those at Professor IX.

CAP members remarked that the proposed salary scale tables included in the appendix of the report show that the years at step for Professor IX is three-years. APM 220-18 b. 4 states that “Except in rare and compelling cases, advancement will not occur after less than four years at Step IX”. Members contemplated whether this was an error or if there were forthcoming changes to policy that would change the normative time at rank and step.

Several CAP members voiced their opinion that while these recommendations would solve current faculty salary inequities by leveling the playing field so to speak, it does not solve these issues long-term. CAP sees faculty salaries as part of the review process. As such, the committee is aware of the wide disparities in faculty salaries across different academic units and divisions for faculty at the same rank and step through the utilization of the market off-scale salary components. The report does nothing to investigate the factors such as gender and ethnicity that have led to an entrenched and disturbing salary disparity, with several members commenting that these recommendations would only solve one facet of inequality. CAP members would have liked to see a deeper analysis of the current state to better understand how the proposed salary scale models could solve these issues in perpetuity.
Despite best efforts to bring faculty salaries more in line with market conditions, a minority of CAP members feel that a proclivity to seek outside offers to raise one’s salary will still exist. Several CAP members opined that within a few years of any such implementation of modified salary scales, the UC system would be in the same position that we are in now. Those "in the know" will inevitably game the system to increase their salaries while other faculty will pay the “loyalty tax” unless there will be a new policy that will severely limit the ability to award off-scale salary components, combined with a radical transparency and communication effort that would ensure that 100% of faculty are "in the know." On the other hand, some CAP members feel that the proposed salary scale models provide a foundation that may alleviate these issues, and perhaps salary disparities will become less important as a motivating factor in these efforts (as opposed to programmatic or intellectual issues).

CAP members agree that such a bold revision to the current salary scales would require a lengthy implementation period to soften the budgetary impacts and that raising salaries for new hires and junior faculty should be prioritized over more senior faculty members. Some CAP members felt that given the substantial budgetary constraints in implementing increased salaries across the UC system dampens the likelihood of either model being implemented, even if done in an incremental manner.

CAP appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Faculty Salary Scale Task Force Report.

Aleck Karis, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

cc: T. Javidi
    R. Rodriguez
    J. Lucius
January 22, 2021

STEVEN CONSTABLE, CHAIR
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE) discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report at our December 2020 meeting. The committee appreciated the work of the Task Force in summarizing the problematic present state of the UC faculty salary system, and especially appreciated the eye of the Task Force towards equity issues.

While the committee broadly concurred with the characterization of the current state of affairs presented by the Task Force, we interpreted the Task Force’s key recommendations as general (and useful) guiding principles and examples, not concrete recommendations. To understand (for example) the relative merits of the comparison vs. factor-based alternatives presented from an EDI perspective, more details on current salary distributions and proposed implementations of these alternative systems would be needed.

Specifically:

- The committee agrees that the fact that UC salaries lag behind market rates, that scale levels are unpredictable, and that there are no policies for annual adjustments all create baseline conditions that contribute to recruitment and retention problems. A system that eliminates this gap on average (like the factor-based or comparison alternatives presented) would help with overall recruitment and retention goals, and likely help from an EDI perspective. However, verifying the overall EDI impacts and differentiating between the suggested alternatives will require more detailed information on both salaries and the relevance of the proposed comparison groups and/or factor models.

- The committee supports the general ideals espoused in the report, particularly around transparency and a desire to minimize use of off-scale salary. We agree with the Task Force that the lack of transparency around the off-scale component has a high likelihood of contributing to equity problems. But again, it is difficult to assess without more detailed information on salary by gender and race/ethnicity.

- Finally, while the committee understands the ideals behind the “one-UC” recommendation and the desire to minimize off-scale use, we note that more rigid systems could negatively impact EDI efforts related to recruitment and retention at individual campuses. We want the UCs to be able to compete with the best peer institutions for the best faculty, and having the flexibility to do so, particularly when it advances EDI, is valuable.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Burney, Chair
Committee on Diversity & Equity

cc: T. Javidi
January 22, 2021

STEVEN CONSTABLE, CHAIR
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report at our December and January meetings. While we found the spirit of the proposal commendable, we also identified various, important problems. We provide our comments below:

1. The proposal indicates that pay will be adjusted “annually according to a transparent mechanism that uses readily available measures of market levels”. Information about these mechanisms is important but is lacking in the current proposal. We do not know, for example, which “measures of market levels” will be used, how they will be interpreted, or how they will be revised. Since the proposal entails eliminating negotiations in salaries, there is a substantial risk that adopting a single scale will lead to real-term wage stagnation across the system.

2. The Task Force proposes a comparison-based model to account for disciplinary differences. We find this a potentially troubling source of inequities. As per data of the University of California, different disciplines have notably different demographic profiles and are associated with significant pay differentials. For example, women represent 43.2% of faculty in Arts & Humanities with 20% of faculty classified as Under-Represented Minorities, in contrast to Business & Management, where women are only 21.1% of faculty and URM less than 8%. A flexible system of rewards that makes use of off-scale salary would allow for exceptional faculty in lower paid disciplines to make up for some of the salary gap. Eliminating off-scale components would thus have a disproportionate effect on disciplines that, historically, are more demographically representative but are associated with lower salaries. This is exceedingly concerning, not the least because of how it contradicts our institution’s commitment to diversity and equity.

3. The adoption of a single salary-scale with minimal use of off-scale pay fails to take into consideration differences in the costs of living across the nine campuses of the University of California. As an example, whereas the median house price in San Diego is $719,000 (or 7.6 times the proposed salary for an Assistant Professor III), the cost for a comparable property in Merced is $305,000 (or 3.2 times the proposed starting salary for an Assistant Professor III). This creates a profound form of inequity across faculty in the UC system and risks creating a loss of talented and competitive faculty in campuses with higher costs of living.

4. We are disappointed to read that the proposal for a single salary scale is not associated with more flexible review and promotion policies. Current retention practices reward substantial contributions to research in a way that is not accounted for in the Task Force’s proposal. Without substantive modifications to review and promotion policies, as well as a profound modification to the culture of evaluation of academic files, a single salary scale will fail to reward exceptional contributions by our faculty. The fact that the Committee on Academic Personnel has explicitly expressed concerns about the use of accelerations and off-cycle reviews makes us concerned that the Task Force’s proposal will lead to less incentives for exceptional contributions and a loss of faculty to competitors.
5. We are unclear about the skew in the increases across ranks with respect to current UC average salaries. The proposal indicates modest increases in salaries (<10%) for faculty at or below Associate Professor III but provides more generous salary increases for faculty above this level (>10%). This requires further explanation, in particular given the intergenerational inequities that it may introduce as well as the impacts it might have when recruiting early career faculty who might find a rigid salary structure unattractive.

Sincerely,

Shantanu Sinha, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: T. Javidi
January 19, 2021

STEVEN CONSTABLE, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The Committee on Research (COR) discussed the Faculty Scales Task Force Report and are in general support of adjusting faculty salary scales and including annual adjustments. It is unclear, however, whether the report fully engages with the challenge of retaining top-performing faculty, and how practical the recommendations are in light of the political and budgetary climate since the 1980s. COR offers the following comments about the Task Force’s recommendations for consideration:

1. In agreement with the report, COR finds it troubling that every faculty member is currently hired with an off-scale salary component. The use of the off-scale salary component to make up for salary scale deficits is not the best way to address the fact that our salary scales lag far behind the market.

2. The proposal omits consideration of compensation for Above Scale faculty. The proposed scale on page 12 of the report shows faculty at Professor IX step moving up (possibly over a multi-year transition period) by $43,600, which is the difference between the proposed level of Step IX ($210,800) and the current level of Step IX ($167,200). Those in lower steps move up by smaller amounts (Professors I would move up by $40,600). If Above Scale professors are not appropriately shifted up, this scale adjustment would be unfair, disregard the differences in merit reflected in current salaries, and counterproductive to the University’s retention goals. Above Scale professors should be shifted by an amount equal to the scale shift for Professors IX, namely, by $43,600.

3. The proposal requires all ten campuses to have the same scale, which does not seem to be realistic or advisable. Cost-of-living should be taken into account to reflect the large differences in costs in different regions that house UC campuses. The Task Force Report acknowledges that the recommendations do not address housing costs, but it is the Committee’s belief that even if UC leadership developed augmentation methods to assist with living and housing costs as the Task Force recommends, it would still create and perpetuate disparity in overall compensation.

4. The report recommends that off-scale components should be the rare exception, and alludes to the idea that retentions are problematic because they promote inequity and create a loyalty penalty. It is COR’s understanding that a big reason for off-scale salary components is because of retention issues, and it is our highest performing faculty who are at risk of being recruited away. If the Task Force views retention as a problem and wants off-scale salary
components to be rare, it may be very difficult to retain our highest-performing faculty.

5. The report did not address the very obvious practical problem that any attempt to move everyone’s off-scale salary component into the scales is going to be very politically difficult (and even more so now during the seeming budget crisis).

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Faculty Scales Task Force Report.

Sincerely yours,

Victor Ferreira, Chair
Committee on Research

cc: G. Cauwenberghs
    T. Javidi
    R. Rodriguez
January 22, 2021

STEVEN CONSTABLE, CHAIR
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report at its meeting on January 19, 2021. Here are the key points that came out in the discussion:

1) Priority should be placed to close the existing 7.5% gap between UC general campus faculty salaries (on-scale and off-scale) and comparable salaries at the eight institutions that UC salaries are compared to.

2) The 7.5% gap does not address the high cost of living in California compared to other institutions located in other parts of the country. The actual gap is likely to be much higher if housing and other costs of living are taken into account.

3) While CPB supports the development of a pay scale that is transparent and equitable, CPB believes that off-scale salary remains a necessary tool for retention. Efforts to make the pay scale more competitive in the past almost without exception fell short, as a salary freeze would be imposed in previous financial downturns that the state of California faced. The vulnerability of the pay scale, coupled with the elimination of off-scale, would make retention even more difficult.

4) It is also not clear, under the proposed new policy, when off-scale salary can justifiably be allowed. The report suggests that off-scale salary should be the rare exception. But it does not discuss under what circumstances the rare exception can be allowed.

5) Among the two mechanisms suggested by the report, CPB prefers the use of the comparison-based disciplinary model. The factor-based disciplinary model seems arbitrary and may lead to many unnecessary disputes about which multiplier should apply to a certain discipline.

Sincerely,

Kwai Ng, Chair
Committee on Planning & Budget

cc: T. Javidi
February 17, 2021

Mary Gauvain, PhD
Chair, Academic Council
Systemwide Academic Senate
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Re: APC Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Mary:

The San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate recently reviewed the task force report and recommendations from the APC Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. As we understand it, the Task Force’s report found that off-scale compensation is pernicious; retention actions break the system; and multi-year salary plan modifications are difficult to maintain. Its recommendations include transparency, regular annual adjustments, appropriate disciplinary differences, and making off-scale compensation the rare exception, rather than the rule.

Both UCSF’s Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) generally support increases to the faculty salary scales, along with more transparency, but note that such increases would have a limited impact on HSCP faculty, given that they are only part of our compensation. While increases to the scales will positively impact faculty UCRP income, such increases do not usually affect current take-home pay.

That said, and with respect to the regular use of off-scale compensation offers for the purposes of recruitment and retention, our CAP notes that UCSF is located in a highly competitive clinical environment both with academic and private sector medical institutions, and adequate incentives are often necessary to hold onto faculty in that regard. There are certainly analogous market conditions for many academic disciplines on the general UC campuses. With that in mind, and without significant increases to the salary scales, it is hard to conceive of a world where off-scale compensation packages are relegated to an exception.

Finally, our Division would like to make two small comments, both provided by CAP:

1. **Membership:** The task force did not include any faculty members from UCSF or UCLA. That said, it is fairly clear that this task force is focused on the general salary scales, not the HSCP, which deserves its own task force.

2. **Salary Freeze:** It goes without saying that external economic conditions deleteriously impact UC’s efforts to consistently maintain the scales and/or make increases to them, with the salary freeze being only the most recent example.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important Task Force report. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sharmila Majumdar, PhD, 2019-21 Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Enclosures (2)

Cc: Sandy Feng, MD, Chair, UCSF Committee on Academic Personnel
    Jill Hollenbach, PhD, Chair, UCSF Committee on Faculty Welfare
Communication from the Committee on Academic Personnel
Sandy Feng, MD, Chair

February 16, 2021

TO: Sharmila Majumdar, Chair of the UCSF Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: Sandy Feng, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

CC: Todd Giedt, Executive Director of the UCSF Academic Senate Office; Kenneth Laslavic, Senior Analyst of the UCSF Academic Senate Office

RE: Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations Review

Dear Chair Majumdar:

At the February 10, 2021 meeting, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) reviewed the task force report and recommendations from the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force. In brief, the task force was convened to address a long-standing gap of the faculty salary scales behind the market, and in particular, excessive reliance on off-scale pay to achieve competitive compensation. The subsequent report found that off-scale compensation is pernicious; retention actions break the system; and multi-year salary plan modifications are difficult to maintain. Its recommendations include transparency, regular annual adjustments, appropriate disciplinary differences, and making off-scale compensation the rare exception, rather than the rule.

On the whole, UCSF’s CAP is supportive of regular annual adjustments to the faculty salary scales, as well as transparency, with the caveat that the scales (X) are only part of the compensation for most faculty on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), which include X, X’, Y and Z. Specifically, only X+ X’ base components of pay, plus some forms of administrative stipends, are considered “eligible pay” when determining retirement. Generally, when there are increases to the scales, a UCSF faculty member’s Y payment is decreased by an equivalent amount. Therefore, increases to the scales will positively impact UCRP, but will not usually affect current take-home pay.

With respect to the regular use of off-scale compensation offers for the purposes of recruitment and retention, CAP notes that UCSF is located in a highly competitive clinical environment both with academic and private sector medical institutions, and adequate incentives are often necessary to hold onto faculty in that regard. There are certainly analogous market conditions for many academic disciplines on the general UC campuses. With that in mind, and without significant increases to the salary scales, it is hard to conceive of a world where off-scale compensation packages are relegated to an exception.

While we are supportive of generally increasing the scales, the UCSF CAP would like to make the following comments:

1. Task Force Membership: The task force did not include any faculty members from UCSF or UCLA. That said, it is fairly clear that this task force is focused on the general salary scales, not the HSCP, which deserves its own task force.

2. Salary Freeze: It goes without saying that external economic conditions deleteriously impact UC’s efforts to consistently maintain the scales and/or make increases to them, with the salary freeze being only the most recent example.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important report. If you have any questions about CAP’s comments, please contact myself, or Academic Senate Associate Director Alison Cleaver (alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu).
Re: Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales Report – Systemwide Review

Dear Chair Majumdar:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) writes to offer its general support for the recommendations of Academic Planning Council’s Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales. The Task Force recommends that “UC move to more transparent and equitable faculty compensation salary scales that reflect market rates, that are adjusted annually, and that eventually eliminate or substantially reduce the need for off-scale compensation.”

CFW believes that it is critical that UC faculty salaries be competitive, and CFW supports raising salary scales to better reflect market rates. CFW also supports regular reviews and adjustments of the salary scales.

The issue of “off-scale compensation” described by the Task Force does not affect faculty on the Health Science Compensation Plan in the same way it affects other faculty. As almost all faculty at UCSF are on the Health Science Compensation Plan, CFW defers to colleagues who are more directly impacted by off-scale compensation to comment on this portion of the Report.

Sincerely,

Jill Hollenbach, PhD, MPH
Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair
January 15, 2021

MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL FACULTY SALARY SCALES TASK FORCE REPORT

Dear Mary,

UCAP discussed the Report from the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force, a subcommittee of the Academic Planning Council during our meeting on January 13th. The committee appreciates the goal of adjusting the salary scales to reflect market value, address inequities and reduce the need for off-scale compensation.

However, we believe the strategies proposed by the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force will not produce the desired outcomes, and, indeed, the goal is unobtainable. Any efforts to recalibrate the scales to increase the baseline are laudable and warranted because UC salary scales lag below other institutions. However, the current proposal addresses what UCAP is viewed as an unattainable goal because it will be undermined by the ongoing need to offer salary increases to attract and retain faculty who have secured outside offers. UCAP disagrees with the characterization that off-scale compensation is “pernicious,” because there are differences between disciplines that make a one-size-fits-all salary scale unviable. We also recognize that highly distinguished faculty members deserve to be rewarded with off-scale salaries. The UC salary scales appear to lag below other institutions and warrant revamping. We appreciate and support higher scales at each step, but are opposed to making off-scale adjustments only applicable in rare circumstances.

The committee supports the Task Force’s aspirations for transparency, equity and objectivity but we assert that the report does not adequately delineate how “transparency” and “objectivity” are defined and will be ensured on a consistent basis.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Susan Tapert, Chair
UCAP
MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Mary,

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) has discussed in detail the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations, and we have several comments. UCFW assessed the report and recommendations from the perspective of equitable recruitment and retention. We assert that a significant obstacle to equitable recruitment and retention is that the scales are not market competitive, of which over-reliance on off-scales is a symptom. Similarly, salary inversion and compression are also symptoms of the underlying lack of market competitiveness of the scales. The solution to these problems is not to eliminate the use of off-scales, but to eliminate the conditions that lead to their use on such a broad basis. The scales must be brought to market and regularly updated.

UCFW finds the use of off-scales should remain available, as originally intended, as a reward for exceptional research, teaching, or service. Used properly, off-scales are an essential tool in equitable recruitment and retention.

UCFW recognizes the challenges involved in ensuring that salary scales are market-based for different disciplines. Between the two proposed models we found that the comparison-based model appeared to be more transparent and understandable relative to the factor-based model, which has the potential to enhance rather than reduce equity, due to its complexity and relative opacity.

UCFW also highlights the need for additional process changes to bolster market competitive scales. The Berkeley division has a faculty committee that oversees faculty compensation, lending transparency to and thus trust in the process. We suggest the unequitable process and impacts of securing outside offers as a negotiation tool, and the “loyalty penalty”, could be diminished with greater transparency and regular equity reviews. This type of faculty oversight should be considered a “best practice” and adopted by all locations. Some find the “Irvine model” has been successful in limiting gaps in ranges and is worthy of more widespread consideration.

To further ensure transparency and equity, we recommend that system-wide Academic Personnel collect and maintain anonymized demographic data (including gender, race, ethnicity), segregated by campus and Division, on both successful and unsuccessful retentions regarding salary and benefit offers, so that such data can be periodically reviewed by UCFW and other stakeholders.
Of course, communications regarding salary processes and policies must be clear and accessible to all, especially those regarding negotiations and grievance.

Lastly, UCFW reiterates our position that it is essential that mechanisms be developed to address the serious issue of housing affordability, which differs across campuses, as well as loan accessibility, which suffers from systemic inequities across gender, race, and ethnicity. Increasing access to affordable housing should be viewed as a complement to salary improvements.

Thank you for helping to advance our shared goals.

Sincerely,

Shelley Halpain, UCFW Chair

Copy: UCFW
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Robert Horwitz, Academic Council Vice Chair
February 17, 2021

MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: FACULTY SALARIES SCALES TASK FORCE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Dear Mary,

UCPB appreciates the opportunity to opine on the Faculty Salaries Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations. We also appreciate the thoughtful work done by this group to explore ways to ensure UC faculty salaries can be made competitive while preserving the importance of peer review enshrined in the rank and step system as well as the transparency of our compensation decisions. We understand that practices around the awarding of off-scale salary vary by campus, but we agree with the task force that in cases where such decisions are solely made at the discretion of administrators it undermines the peer review system that is at the heart of UC’s faculty excellence and renders such decisions opaque in ways that may allow inequity to fester.

While UCPB strongly endorses the overall goal of achieving competitive salaries in a transparent and equitable fashion, the committee did have some comments and concerns about the more specific recommendations of the report. Several members expressed the view that discipline specific scales would not be sufficiently fine-grained as compensation can still vary widely by field and sub-discipline. There was also significant concern about the role that housing costs play in terms of the overall competitiveness of faculty salaries, though there was no consensus on whether this was best addressed by creating campus specific scales or through other measures (such as a housing allowance or supplement). There was also concern that should implementation of this plan begin with new hires as a way of phasing in the costs over time, it could greatly exacerbate the existing “loyalty penalty” and harm faculty morale, particularly for mid-career faculty.

In light of the complexities of fixing the scales and the fact that the current budgetary environment is unlikely to produce the funds necessary for a dramatic increase to the scales, UCPB suggests that one immediate and no-cost solution would be to ensure that every campus integrate faculty in a formal role in all off scale decisions via local CAPs or some other Senate body. While this would
not solve all of the problems identified in this report, faculty from campuses where faculty do play such a formal role were notably less troubled by off scales than were faculty from campuses where such decisions reside entirely with administrators.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sean Malloy, Chair
UCPB

cc: UCPB
MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: UCACC Comments on the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

At its meeting on February 11, 2021, the University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) reviewed and discussed the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations and offer the following thoughts for your consideration. Although the comments are not oriented to academic computing, there was enough unity of thought that Committee members agreed to submit the comments.

Committee members are greatly appreciative of the APC Task Force’s efforts to improve faculty compensation structures UC-wide as well as the emphasis on bringing greater transparency, equity, and objectivity to the setting of faculty salaries.

At the same time, some members opined that factors in addition to disciplinary differences require consideration in setting faculty salaries systemwide. Specifically, UC campuses are located throughout the State with some being located in areas with much higher cost of living than others. Both recruitment and retention efforts are negatively impacted when campuses with higher costs of living are overly constrained in their ability to compensate faculty adequately. Should the recommendations of the task force be adopted, members of UCACC strongly recommend a location-based adjustment to faculty salaries similar to adjustments made for disciplinary differences.

Committee members were also concerned that a university policy of not responding with counter offers to retain outstanding faculty will result in the loss of those faculty. An outside offer is the clearest recognition of the actual market value of a professor. A record of outside offers should be used by the system as input to future calculations of how the salary scales should be calibrated over time. The outside offer is tangible evidence of the value of the faculty member in the
academic world. Further, there is little evidence that faculty are choosing not to pursue employment outside of the UC system because of loyalty. Those who don’t are happy with their jobs, departments, campuses, and communities, and are willing to remain employed at the salary they are receiving. It would be grave loss of outstanding faculty over time to give up those who receive outside offers because of the equity impacts of a purported loyalty penalty.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Report.

Sincerely,
/s/
David Robinowitz, Chair
University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications
MARY GAUVAIN  
CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Mary,

UCORP discussed the Academic Planning Council Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations at its meeting on February 8th.

UCORP members feel that off-scale salaries are a useful tool for recruitment and retention, and that important retention efforts would be adversely affected if there is no way for the university to compete in terms of salary. Members also expressed concern about taking power away from faculty committees (CAPs), which on some campuses are very involved in off-scale salary decisions.

UCORP acknowledges the thoughtful work of the task force in drafting the report, and appreciates the opportunity to review the report and comment on the recommendations.

Sincerely,

Richard Desjardins  
Chair, University Committee on Research Policy
February 18, 2021

Mary Gauvain
Chair, UC Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Chair Gauvain,

The Divisional Executive Board, councils, and committees appreciate the opportunity to review the proposed revision to (Systemwide Senate Review) Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations.

Executive Board members support the general and equitable improvement of faculty salaries across the UC system. However, committees felt there are too many unaddressed variables to respond in a definitive manner. The complexities resulting from differing circumstances within and among campuses and schools are not addressed within the recommendations.

Per the attached responses from committees and councils, many members expressed concern about an implicit discontinuation or reduction of off-scale salaries, which they argue is an effective and important tool for recruitment and retention, particularly for underrepresented minority faculty members and in furthering gender equity. It was felt that reductions in off-scale salary components, currently an active proposal at UCLA, should not occur until the scales were to be concomitantly revised.

Sincerely,

Shane White
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc:  Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
     Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
     April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
     Todd Greenspan, UCOP Director of Academic Planning
January 26, 2021

Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Review: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on December 15, 2020, the Faculty Welfare Committee discussed the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations. Committee members offered the following comments.

The committee agrees with the recommendation that the salary scale should be updated to be comparable to other comparator universities analyzed in the report.

The committee strongly disagrees with the recommendation to eliminate the use of off-scale salary based on the following considerations:

1) Cost of living:
The committee notices that there were no representatives on the Faculty Salary Scale Task Force from UCLA and UCSF, both of which are located in areas with higher cost of living compared to some other campuses. Differences in cost of living among campuses are briefly mentioned but are said not part of the report of the task force. However, it is important to note that salaries and cost of living adjustment are not separate; they are intertwined. It is a significant issue for campuses at high cost of living areas, such as LA and Bay Area. The faculty needs to be able to afford to living in the vicinity area of the campus. The report reflects a rejection of this consideration and an underlying desire of equalizing campuses.

The committee believes that cost of living, including housing cost and childcare cost, is an important factor affecting the salaries. There is disparity on living and housing cost among the campuses. Off-scale salaries have been used to equalize cost of living. A transition to a system that tries to minimize the off-scales has to find a way to accommodate the cost of living. If it is considered separately from salary, as the report reflects, additional housing support for the faculty is needed, especially for areas with high cost of housing, such as LA and Bay Area, in order to maintain standards of quality in our faculty.

2) Differences among UC campuses:
The members note that not all UC campuses are in the same situation. Market values are not the same for campuses. The report talks about market values of academics, but under-appreciates the heterogeneity of the faculty across the UC campuses. It is not realistic to think that the salary scales can capture all the differences. Since there is heterogeneity, the campuses will need flexibility of the off-scale system. The current recommendation would reduce the ability of each campus to offer off-scale salaries. The committee members think that the recommendation needs to acknowledge differences among campuses and include considerations for all ten campuses.

3) Faculty recruitment and retention:
The committee notes that UCLA faculty salaries are among the highest across the 10 UC campuses. This creates contention with some other campuses. On the other hand, cost of living in LA is among the highest across the nation, which makes faculty recruitment and retention challenging to UCLA.

The majority of the UCLA faculty is on off-scale salaries. In many cases, off-scale salaries are used to recruit and retain faculty that other institutes try to recruit away or get offers elsewhere. The committee is concerned that the implementation of the recommended salary scales could negatively affect the ability of UCLA to recruit and retain faculty, which is essential to maintain the high-quality teaching and research statue of the campus. Off-scale allows more flexibility with recruiting packages. If off-scales are eliminated, what other approach can be used to recruit and retain faculty? Accelerated promotions, hiring at higher steps, etc. may have to be used, which could create new sets of issues related to equity and fairness.

On the other hand, the members recognize that eliminating off-scales could promote transparency and equity and eliminate loyalty penalty. People who like to stay at UCLA and don't seek other offers usually don't get extra off-scale salaries. The committee recommends establishing a career equity review mechanism at each campus to ensure equity and transparency in compensation.

4) Funding resource:
Members raised several questions. 1) Would the new salary scale be campus-wide adjustment? 2) Where does the fund come from to adjust campus and discipline differences? 3) Is this self-funded or from 19900 funds? Adjusted scales are linked to the retirement system, which is not addressed in this report. Current off-scales are generally from 19900 funds. If these will be built into scales, then it could be neutral in terms of contributions to retirement system.

If you have any questions, please contact us via the Faculty Welfare Committee’s interim analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Huiying Li, Chair
Faculty Welfare Committee

cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Academic Senate
Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Elizabeth Feller, Interim Analyst, Faculty Welfare Committee
Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee
February 8, 2021

Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Item for Review: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on January 25, 2021, the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) had an opportunity to review and discuss the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations.

Members offered the following comments:

The report implies that UC is a homogenous institution, when in reality it is composed of very different campuses, located in distinct areas, populated by very different faculties facing dramatically different living costs. This is a cause of inevitable tension. Members appreciated that the report acknowledged the variance in housing costs across campuses, but worried that the limited solutions proposed were vague and likely impractical.

Members stated that our campus is lagging behind compared to our counterparts outside the UC system. Changing the scale would not fix that problem. Several faculty criticized what they considered to be an under-appreciation of the variation in salaries across fields. The scales system recognizes those differences to a degree by establishing several scales, but a those several scales are clearly not sufficient to accommodate the contemporary variation in market competitiveness across the many fields. Members specifically questioned how professional schools such as Medicine and Law are expected to remain competitive without competitive salaries. Members stressed that disciplines are unique and not easily comparable in terms of salaries.

Changing the off-scale compensation does not eliminate concerns about bias. Administrators would still make decisions—which could be seen as arbitrary and biased—whether conscious or unconscious. The single largest benefit of having scales is having predictability. This proposal would only work if the points in section III (“Findings”) are addressed. As a campus, we would need to see detailed data and not only averages. How this will play out at UCLA? What would this mean at a campus and at a systemwide level? Would it have an effect on recruitment and retention? This is ultimately hard to interpret and assess without UCLA-specific data.
Members noted that the task force did not include UCLA representatives. There may also be equity differences that may be difficult to explore and could be masking a challenge that we are facing as an organization and university. Members suggested simulating for diverse populations.

Because the report indicated than nearly all faculty salaries in the UC system are already off-scale, the main benefit of the scale is no longer to set salaries, but rather to offer a predictable sense of the rate at which salaries will increase if faculty perform well. The proposal to revise these scales (along with a proposal by UCLA Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel to systematically reduce off-scale salary percentages) threaten to undermine this predictability to the detriment of faculty welfare.

If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at groeling@comm.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Tim Groeling, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Principal Policy Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
February 2, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Andrea Kasko, Chair
       Graduate Council

Re: Systemwide Senate Review: Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations

At the Graduate Council meeting on January 15, 2021, the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations was presented as an information item. Although the Graduate Council was not required to opine on this issue, members offered the following observations for your consideration:

Members agreed that while faculty salary scales should be based on transparent mechanisms that lead to equitable outcomes, members noted that salary disparities and lack of competitive salaries will negatively impact the UC's ability to recruit the best faculty, especially at a time when the UC is committed to increasing faculty of color (Latino/a, African American, Asian/Pacific Islanders); diverse faculty certain to be sought after by top private and public research universities. As well, this will impact graduate education and the research enterprise.

Although the recommendations in the report do not directly address cost of living and housing costs, members agreed that housing remains a critical issue that needs to be addressed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the Graduate Council analyst, Estrella Arciba, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu.
I. Introduction

The Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales is a subcommittee of the University of California Academic Planning Council. The Task Force recommends that UC move to more transparent and equitable faculty compensation salary scales that reflect market rates, that are adjusted annually, and that eventually eliminate or substantially reduce the need for off-scale compensation.

UC faculty salaries significantly lag those of its comparator institutions. In October 2018, the last date for which data are available, general campus faculty salaries (on-scale and off-scale) lagged comparable salaries at the Comparison-8 institutions\(^1\) by 7.5%. The last time UC salaries were on par with Comparison-8 institutions was in 2000; the largest gap between UC and Comparison-8 institutions was in 2010-11, at 12.8%. This disparity must be addressed if UC is to maintain its quality and stature.

---

\(^1\) Harvard University; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Stanford University; Yale University; State University of New York at Buffalo; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; University of Michigan; University of Virginia.
The COVID-19 pandemic and its consequences have thrown the University of California into crisis, along with higher education systems across the country and around the world. Current circumstances make it more important than ever to examine the principles and operation of the UC faculty salary system. Despite unknown future impacts on funding for faculty salaries, the Task Force strongly recommends that UC take the long view of stabilizing the salary scales system. This will be crucial to UC’s competitive position among its academic peers during and after recovery from the current crisis. This is not the first, and will not be the last, period of financial crisis that the University of California has lived through. We urge UC leadership to seize the opportunity this crisis presents to establish a long-term plan that will progressively implement salary scales that are transparent, competitive, and equitable at all levels, that are adjusted annually, and that progressively decrease off-scale increments. When this crisis recedes and state budgets recover, it will be essential to have a plan in place that will prevent UC from losing its preeminent position among academic research institutions.

II. Background and issues

The University of California is the world’s premier public research university due to the excellence of its faculty, the research they conduct, the caliber of graduate students they attract, and the quality of instruction they offer. In order to attract and hire first-class faculty, UC must offer compensation at a level calibrated to a highly competitive market. This was noted in a 1997 white paper prepared by UC for the California Citizens' Commission on Higher Education, and still holds true today:

“A key priority for the University is maintaining faculty salaries that are competitive with comparable institutions. In addition, salary levels must be sufficient to provide flexibility to attract and retain the most gifted scholars and teachers. Resources dedicated to faculty support must be adequate to provide a productive working environment for faculty and students who are pursuing both research goals and excellence in teaching. Provision of adequate support includes the need for capital investment in laboratories and classrooms to support teaching and research. To the extent that programmatic resources are inadequate to meet all of the University's funding needs, maintenance of faculty salaries and support has to be a paramount concern. Other functions and programs can be restored when resources rebound. However, if the faculty base on which the University is built declines, it may never be rebuilt.”


The current peer-review process and attendant salary scales are a cornerstone of UC’s excellence: they bring uniform and transparent standards to faculty advancement and compensation. Salary increases are based on both systemwide adjustment to the applicable scale, and on individual factors such as merit, promotion, and off-scale compensation. “The knowledge that all faculty in the UC system are evaluated by their peers under a single equitable set of criteria has functioned as a cultural contract for faculty who have served long careers in the University.” Dan Simmons, The Death of UC Faculty Salary Scales, April 2006.
Nevertheless, and despite uniform standards and processes, the salary scales system is suffering:

- While the review process is clear, salary scale levels have not been predictable in many years. Rather, every year the Academic Senate has to consult with UCOP Administration on salary levels, which must then compete with other University funding needs.
- The current model is not transparent. There is no clear policy for annual adjustments to the salary scales that reflect market rates and that can be relied on when discussing faculty compensation with the Regents and the State.
- The current model relies heavily on off-scale compensation to cover the gap between on-scale salary and market rates. Such additional compensation likewise lacks transparency because it the off-scale amount is discretionary and typically determined by an administrator, such as a dean. In 1999, 50% of General Campus ladder-rank and equivalent (LRE) faculty were paid off-scale, and 6% of total faculty pay was off-scale. In 2019, 99% of General Campus LRE faculty were paid off-scale, and 24% of total faculty pay was off-scale. (Appendix A.)

Clearly the current compensation model is not working. This is an untenable situation for a public institution committed to transparency and fairness, and is in contravention of APM-620 which requires salaries to be “on-scale to the greatest extent feasible.” The subjective and discretionary nature of off-scale salary opens the door to biased allocation of state resources to faculty, and is inimical to a key precept of shared governance: that the best evaluation of faculty merit leading to overall salaries stems from peer review.

III. Findings

The Task Force reviewed numerous past workgroup and task force reports on the UC faculty salary scale system. Among the principal take-aways:

A. Off-scale compensation is pernicious. Off-scale compensation creates multiple problems, including:
   i. UC is not revealing the actual cost of faculty salaries and is therefore inadequately conveying its fiscal needs to the State;
   ii. Off-scale compensation decisions are not subject to faculty review on some campuses and can be swayed by unconscious biases of the administrator making the decision, such as ageism, sexism, or racism; and
   iii. Off-scale compensation is bad for morale -- it is dispiriting and demoralizing when faculty in the same discipline and department, with similar research responsibilities and teaching loads, receive widely disparate compensation.

B. Retention actions break the system. When faculty threaten to leave, they are wooed with off-scale offers that undermine the entire system and embed even greater salary inequity. This results in a “loyalty penalty” for faculty who do not seek outside employment and therefore do not receive retention remuneration.

C. Multi-year salary plan modifications are difficult to maintain. Repairing the faculty salary system requires a multi-year commitment. Past multi-year efforts were sustained for a couple of years at the most and then abandoned, usually due to external economic
forces. The Task Force urges that if a new faculty compensation plan is adopted, it include a planned mechanism to respond to unforeseen external pressures, and be subject to a systemwide commitment to its prioritization in the face of external pressures over the several years it will take to implement.

IV. Principles

The Task Force bases its recommendations on the following principles, which it takes to be fundamental to UC’s mission, stature, and excellence:

A. The University of California’s rank and step system with peer review for advancement is foundational to the excellence of the University.

B. The adherence of all ten UC campuses to a single set of salary scales is a cornerstone of UC quality.

C. The University of California is committed to achieving equity in faculty hiring, advancement, and compensation.

V. Recommendations

A. Transparency, equity, and objectivity – Faculty salary scales should be based on transparent and objective mechanisms that lead to equitable outcomes. An example of such a mechanism is attached in Appendix B, Experimental Models of Market-Based Professorial Salary Scales; background on the model is in Appendix C. The model was designed by UCOP Academic Personnel and Programs (APP) in December 2019, and offers a rational and transparent methodology for calculating market-based salary scales.

B. Annual adjustment - Faculty salary scales should be adjusted annually according to a transparent mechanism that uses readily available measures of market levels.

C. Disciplinary differences – Salary scales should be sensitive to disciplinary differences. The Task Force offers two possible mechanisms for addressing disciplinary differences; it does not recommend one over the other. The models are further discussed below.

   1. Comparison-based disciplinary model – Scales are based on compensation rates in similar disciplinary groupings at Comparison-8 institutions.

   2. Factor-based disciplinary model – Similar to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), scales have a base minimum (Scale 0) and factor-based scales determined by a multiplier (Scale 1 at 1.10 of Scale 0; Scale 2 at 1.20 of Scale 0 and so on up to 2.25 of Scale 0) (see HSCP scales on Table 5 of current academic salary scales). Disciplinary groupings would be placed on the scale closest to their market-based comparators; annual adjustments would be made to track salaries at the Comparison-8 institutions.

D. Off-scale compensation should be the rare exception – A new salary scale system should be structured so as to substantially reduce the need for off-scale compensation. Phase in over time – The new compensation system should be phased in over time (probably beginning with new hires) to soften its budgetary impacts and insure its equitable application.
VI. Discussion

A. Comparison-based disciplinary model
Appendix B, a comparison-based compensation model, applies to new hires, and includes a percentage increase at each step advancement (which factors in years at step) and a salary bump for promotions. The percentage increases make salaries at the middle step of each rank comparable to peer institutions; the scales are adjusted annually based on accepted consumer indices. The advantages of this approach are scales that reflect actual faculty salaries and that restore the importance of peer-review as the primary determination of faculty salary. It also reduces the “loyalty penalty” for long-serving UC faculty, and transfers a significant share of faculty salaries from off-scale to on-scale. It prioritizes equity and transparency, and reduces the need for major retention actions. Although this approach would be costly, off-scale pay for current faculty would be subsumed into on-scale compensation, thereby lowering costs.

B. Factor-based disciplinary model
If UC wants to expand the number of disciplinary-based scales, the factor-based disciplinary model would allow flexibility for both large and small groupings of disciplines, and would move away from scales with explicit disciplinary names. However, the factor-based mechanism would be less transparent and arguably less market-based, and would be a departure from the current set of scales (and disciplinary groups) to which faculty and administration are accustomed.

C. Housing costs
The Task Force’s recommendations should be implemented uniformly across all UC campuses. The campuses vary widely however on issues of cost of living, particularly housing. Campuses are straining to address housing costs through various loan and support programs, and levels of housing support are based on numerous factors. The recommendations in this report do not directly address these issues; however, the Task Force urges UC leadership to develop and augment systemwide resources to assist faculty with living and housing costs, and to ensure equity in the design and application of housing support programs.

VII. Conclusion

The Faculty Salary Scales Task Force offers the above recommendations to Provost Brown and the Academic Planning Council for their consideration. The Task Force urges UCOP and Academic Senate leadership to take the necessary steps to make the faculty salary scales system more transparent and equitable, to institute annual adjustments, and to move faculty compensation away from off-scale pay as much as possible.
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General Campus Faculty
% of Earnings that are offscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>OffScale</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Faculty Offscale</th>
<th>Offscale</th>
<th>All Base Earnings</th>
<th>% of Base Earnings Offscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>6,391</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>$33,433,346</td>
<td>$575,125,267</td>
<td>5.8% *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6,041</td>
<td>7,431</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>$95,460,944</td>
<td>$795,890,498</td>
<td>12.0% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>7,586</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>$80,949,083</td>
<td>$855,471,958</td>
<td>9.5% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6,288</td>
<td>7,568</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>$149,161,620</td>
<td>$969,406,940</td>
<td>15.4% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6,531</td>
<td>7,626</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>$168,114,293</td>
<td>$1,011,746,913</td>
<td>16.6% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>7,743</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>$195,207,119</td>
<td>$1,071,974,201</td>
<td>18.2% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>7,591</td>
<td>7,889</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>$229,648,451</td>
<td>$1,135,030,522</td>
<td>20.2% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7,963</td>
<td>8,160</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>$266,470,820</td>
<td>$1,210,821,959</td>
<td>22.0% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8,132</td>
<td>8,271</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>$298,436,032</td>
<td>$1,268,607,906</td>
<td>23.5% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>8,252</td>
<td>8,376</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>$322,232,618</td>
<td>$1,338,179,617</td>
<td>24.1% **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>8,329</td>
<td>8,441</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>$339,647,853</td>
<td>$1,413,566,853</td>
<td>24.0% **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For 1999, the future Step 9 was used as the "Above Scale Onscale Rate"
** For all other years, the "Above Scale Onscale Rate" was calculated as Professor Step 9+11.3%

The 11.3% factor is based on the average percentage increase per year at step x 4 years


### APPENDIX B

**Experimental Models of Market-Based Professorial Salary Scales**  
**Based on Average New Hire Salaries and Comp 8 Averages**  
CONFIDENTIAL - FOR INTERNAL UC DISCUSSION ONLY

**Professorial Series Academic Year Salary Scale (Table 1)**  
as of July 2018

**Concept:**  
1. Develop a market-based scale for new faculty hires, to be adjusted annually (e.g., by California CPI-U or other appropriate factor)  
2. The intent of a market-based scale would be to lessen or eliminate the need for off-scales

**Process:**  
1. Proposed starting point for calculations: the average salary of a newly-hired Asst. Prof. Step III  
2. 3% increment per year at step; alternate percentages are also presented  
3. Alternate Scenario: 2.5% increment per year at step for 2-year steps; 2% per year at step for 3-year steps  
4. 10% bump at promotion (Asst 4 to Assoc 1; Assoc 3 to Prof 1)  
5. Comp 8 averages by rank (adjusted to compensate for Business, Econ. and Engineering salaries) shown for comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Years at Step</th>
<th>UC Scale, Effective 7/1/2018</th>
<th>Proposed Market Scale</th>
<th>UC avg salary Oct 2018</th>
<th>proposal % diff. from 2018 scale</th>
<th>proposal % diff. from avg</th>
<th>point of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62,700</td>
<td>84,200</td>
<td>106,500</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>-20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66,600</td>
<td>89,200</td>
<td>88,400</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70,200</td>
<td><strong>94,500</strong></td>
<td>93,500</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>100,200</td>
<td>96,900</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>106,200</td>
<td>100,700</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82,100</td>
<td>112,600</td>
<td>105,100</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78,100</td>
<td>110,200</td>
<td>112,100</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>116,800</td>
<td>109,100</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86,400</td>
<td>123,800</td>
<td>114,500</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91,600</td>
<td>131,200</td>
<td>115,700</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98,700</td>
<td>143,000</td>
<td>122,700</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91,700</td>
<td>136,200</td>
<td>135,200</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98,800</td>
<td>148,500</td>
<td>135,500</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106,300</td>
<td>161,900</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114,100</td>
<td>176,500</td>
<td>147,000</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122,500</td>
<td>192,400</td>
<td>159,200</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>132,100</td>
<td>209,700</td>
<td>172,600</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>142,500</td>
<td>228,600</td>
<td>185,700</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>154,100</td>
<td>249,200</td>
<td>193,300</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>167,200</td>
<td>271,600</td>
<td>203,400</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Comp 8 averages have been adjusted downward by 8.5% to compensate for the inclusion of Business, Economics and Engineering disciplines in the original Comp 8 data.
Effect of 10% bump at promotion
Assistant IV to Associate I and Associate III to Professor I
Compared to: Assistant IV to Associate III and Associate V to Professor III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years at Steps</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$20,000</th>
<th>$40,000</th>
<th>$60,000</th>
<th>$80,000</th>
<th>$100,000</th>
<th>$120,000</th>
<th>$140,000</th>
<th>$160,000</th>
<th>$180,000</th>
<th>$200,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Advance from Asst 4 / Assoc 3
- Advance from Asst 6/ Assoc 5

UCOP Academic Personnel and Programs
## Experimental Models of Market-Based Professorial Salary Scales

Based on Average New Hire Salaries and Comp 8 Averages

**CONFIDENTIAL - FOR INTERNAL UC DISCUSSION ONLY**

### Professorial Series Academic Year Salary Scale (Table 1)

**as of July 2018**

2.50% Increment per year at step - 2 year steps  
2.00% Increment per year at step - 3 year steps  
10.00% 10% bump at promotion (Asst 4 to Assoc 1; Assoc 3 to Prof 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Years at Step</th>
<th>UC Scale, Effective 7/1/2018</th>
<th>Proposed Market Scale</th>
<th>UC avg salary Oct 2018</th>
<th>proposal % diff. from 2018 scale</th>
<th>proposal % diff. from avg point of reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62,700</td>
<td>85,700</td>
<td>$106,500</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66,600</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>$88,400</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70,200</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td>$93,500</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>99,200</td>
<td>$96,900</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>104,200</td>
<td>$100,700</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82,100</td>
<td>109,400</td>
<td>$105,100</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78,100</td>
<td>109,100</td>
<td>$112,100</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>114,600</td>
<td>$109,100</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86,400</td>
<td>120,300</td>
<td>$114,500</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91,600</td>
<td>126,300</td>
<td>$115,700</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98,700</td>
<td>133,900</td>
<td>$122,700</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91,700</td>
<td>132,300</td>
<td>$135,200</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98,800</td>
<td>140,200</td>
<td>$135,500</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106,300</td>
<td>148,600</td>
<td>$141,000</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114,100</td>
<td>157,500</td>
<td>$147,000</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>122,500</td>
<td>167,000</td>
<td>$159,200</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>132,100</td>
<td>177,000</td>
<td>$172,600</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>142,500</td>
<td>187,600</td>
<td>$185,700</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>154,100</td>
<td>198,900</td>
<td>$193,300</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>167,200</td>
<td>210,800</td>
<td>$203,400</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Note: Comp 8 average has been adjusted downward by 8.5% to compensate for the inclusion of Business, Economics and Engineering disciplines in the original Comp 8 data.
University of California
Proposal to Develop Market-Based Faculty Salary Scales

Background

This document provides background on recent efforts to reconsider the UC faculty salary scales using a market-based approach. The impetus for this project came from discussions in 2018 between Susan Carlson, Vice Provost of Academic Personnel and Programs (APP) and Professor Dan Hare in his role as Faculty Advisor to the President, with Gregory Sykes, Director of Academic Data and Compensation, providing analytical support and developing the model scales.

The discussions in 2018 emphasized preservation of UC’s rank and step-based scale system, which is rooted in the practice of regular peer review for assessing faculty merit and rewarding faculty productivity. However, they also acknowledged that the faculty salary scales in their current form do not reflect market realities due to many years of underfunding of the scales, which has led to the extensive use of off-scales to recruit and retain faculty. This in turn has created a lack of transparency about how faculty salaries are set. Publishing salary scales that do not reflect real compensation conditions can also affect public perception of the University: for example, legislators taking the scales at face value might misunderstand what it costs to recruit and retain UC-quality faculty, potentially contributing to State underfunding. The current effort attempts to re-envision the faculty salary scales in a way that preserves and strengthens peer review and reflects market conditions, resulting in a set of scales that accurately demonstrates the value of UC faculty.

Previous efforts at market-based scales – and some campus-based local faculty salary scales – have tended to start from a premise of basing faculty salary scale rates on the current average or median faculty salary rates per rank and step, either across the UC system or at an individual campus. While this method of assessing market costs for recruiting and retaining faculty makes a certain intuitive sense, the extensive use of off-scale salaries has meant that in some cases the average salary rate for a specific salary step approaches or exceeds the average salary rates of faculty at higher steps (compression). There may also be great variation in the dollar increment between the average salary rates at adjoining steps on the scale.

A too strict adherence to basing a scale on the average salary rates of current incumbents can codify existing inequities like salary compression and the “loyalty penalty” suffered by long-term faculty who have not obtained retention off-scales as a result of seeking outside offers. In addition, faculty are not evenly distributed among the steps of the scale; averaging the salaries at steps with very few incumbents can skew results considerably.

To preserve the core concepts of the UC ladder system and bring the scales into line with market realities, Professor Hare proposed a set of principles based on a combination of a single measure of market tendency and regular incremental progression up the scale. APP developed a model for the Professorial series Academic Year salary scale. Models were also developed for Fiscal Year, Business/Economics/Engineering and Law School titles. As a secondary market comparison, the average salary rates of the Comparison 8 institutions were compared to the resulting scales, and modifications were made to the model accordingly.
The University Committee on Faculty Welfare has consulted with APP staff on sequential draft versions of the market-based scales proposal on several occasions from October 2019 through June 2020. The materials have also been reviewed by the Academic Planning Council.

Basic Principles

1. A market-based scale should eliminate, or at least significantly lessen, the need for off-scales to bring salaries in line with market rates.
2. To function properly as a career ladder, a scale should grant clear and standardized merit increases as a faculty member progresses up the steps, and should appropriately mark the significant milestones of promotion in rank.
3. Once established, a market-based scale should be adjusted annually by an appropriate factor (for example by the California CPI-U as calculated by the US Department of Labor) and compared periodically against external market benchmarks (for example, the Comp 8 average) to allow for appropriate adjustments to maintain its market value.
4. To support equity and maintain the purpose of the peer-review system, if a market-based model is adopted it should be coupled with a plan to absorb faculty off-scale components (i.e., to reduce/eliminate the off-scale component once the scale rate for the faculty member’s rank and step matches or exceeds their previous on-scale + off-scale rate).

Average Salary of a New Hire as a Market Measure

The salary that campuses have to pay to recruit new junior faculty was deemed a clear and defensible starting point to measure the current market. As an added benefit, newly hired faculty are a sizeable population, which tends to smooth out variations when calculating an average salary rate.

Process for Developing the Model Scales

- The starting point for the model (the first salary rate included in the scale) was the average salary of a newly-hired Asst. Prof. Step 3 on the Academic Year Professorial scale.
- Initially, a 3% increment was applied per year at step.
- However, the resulting salary rates at higher steps of the Professor Series were so much higher than current averages that an alternate scenario was modeled:
  - 2.5% increment per year at step for 2-year steps (5% increment between steps for normative time at step).
  - 2% per year at step for 3-year steps (6% increment between steps for normative time at step).
- The scales reflect a 10% bump at promotion (advancement from Assistant 4 to Associate 1 and Associate 3 to Professor 1).
- Comp 8 averages by rank (adjusted to compensate for Business, Economics and Engineering faculty being on a separate UC scale) were compared to the midpoint of each rank and were found to be close enough to the model scales for the scales to meet a “market-based” criterion.
- The Academic Year Business/Econ/Engineering scale was modeled using the average rate for a new faculty member hired on that scale.
- Fiscal Year scales were modeled by adding 16% to the Academic Year scale models.
- A Professor-Law School series scale was modeled on the basis of the average rate of a newly hired Acting Professor in the Law Schools. There was no external comparator for Law School salaries, which are not included in the Comp 8 data collection.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLORS/PROVOSTS

Dear Colleagues:

UC’s peer review, rank-and-step system is not only part of what ensures the academic quality of UC but also what has helped maintain and advance that quality throughout the UC system. However, an important instrument of that system – the faculty salary scales – have fallen under disrepair; What is the future of the faculty salary scales and what should be done about their state? We are pleased to send you a report drafted by the Faculty Salary Scales Task Force, a subcommittee of the Academic Planning Council. We are seeking broad input on the Task Force’s recommendations so we ask that you circulate this letter and the report to relevant leadership at your campus.

The Faculty Salary Scales Task Force was charged with examining the issues surrounding the salary scales, in particular excessive reliance on off-scale pay to achieve competitive compensation. The enclosed report offers recommendations to address the issues, including annual scale adjustments and transparency in compensation decisions. Your assessment of these recommendations would be very helpful in charting next steps regarding the faculty salary scales as a tool to advance the goals and utility of UC’s rank-and-step system.

The recommendations are broad, and any discussion of their utility is necessarily in early stages. Please send us your thoughts on whether and how the recommendations should be further considered.

Input and comments should be sent to Todd Greenspan, UCOP Director of Academic Planning, by March 1, 2021, he can be reached by email at todd.greenspan@ucop.edu. Thank you for spending the time reviewing and commenting on the enclosed report. The University cannot offer the quality education of which it is so rightly proud without addressing these issues.

Sincerely,

Mary Gauvain, Ph.D.
Chair of the Academic Council

Michael T. Brown, Ph.D.
Provost and
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Enclosure