



CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
RIVERSIDE DIVISION
UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING, RM 225

MARY GAUVAIN
PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0217
TEL: (951) 827-5538
E-MAIL: MARY.GAUVAIN@UCR.EDU
SENATE@UCR.EDU

November 17, 2011

Robert Anderson
Professor of Economics and Mathematics
UC Systemwide Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Bob:

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF PROPOSED NEW POLICY – APM 668 – NEGOTIATED SALARY PROGRAM

In response to your request, the UCR Senate Committees on Academic Personnel, Diversity and Equal Opportunity, Faculty Welfare, and Planning and Budget, and the Executive Committees of the Colleges reviewed and commented on the proposed policy, APM-668, the Negotiated Salary Program. The Executive Council also discussed the proposal. The individual responses from the committees are attached and a summary of these comments and the Executive Council discussion appear below.

UCR Review Summary:

We see merit in initiatives from the Office of the President to devise ways to increase faculty salaries to competitive levels that may aid in faculty recruitment and retention as well as provide an incentive for faculty in obtaining extramural funds. However, we have several serious concerns about this proposed program that need to be addressed before it would meet our approval.

1. **Public impression:** If the faculty at large is seen by the state as willing and able to fund part of their own academic year salaries, this action may have the negative, unintended consequence of lowering state support for the UC because less state money will be deemed necessary to support ladder-rank faculty.
2. **Conflicting areas of support:** There is substantial concern that the funds used to increase salaries will be taken from areas that are vital to the research mission, e.g. if the funds are diverted from support for graduate students and postdoctoral researchers the process will negatively impact research productivity along with the integration of teaching and research that is critical to the UC. On this point, the proposed program may create a conflict of interest for faculty in terms of increasing their own salary versus supporting the student researchers with whom they work. To some extent this conflict of interest may be self-correcting (or self-

defeating) in that with less support for graduate students, research productivity will decline, which, in turn, will decrease the likelihood of subsequent extramural awards.

3. **Negotiation process in the department:** It is unclear how the negotiation process at the departmental level will occur and whether there will be consequences for departmental functioning and morale. The proposed plan will change the faculty-department chair relationship by putting direct control over some portion of faculty salary in the hands of the chair. A faculty advisory committee in the department that oversees the process, as is the case with the HSCP, should be written into the proposed policy. Also, the need for an annual review of the negotiation puts additional burden on the department personnel process.
4. **Campus disparities:** Access to eligible funds would make the program open to some faculty and not to others in a way that does not reflect the merit of the scholarship. As a result, disparities in salary will increasingly reflect the regulations and practices of governmental agencies rather than academic quality, which is the linchpin of the UC merit and promotion process. This issue is especially problematic given current disparities in salary among UC faculty, disparities that reflect status characteristics (as documented in the recent UC Pay Equity Report), market differences across the disciplines, and the availability of extramural support. The proposed plan would more than likely exacerbate these disparities, resulting in a less equitable and stable workplace and lower campus morale.
5. **Role of the Senate:** There is nothing in the proposed policy that discusses the role of the Academic Senate. How will the Senate participate in the implementation of this plan on a campus?
6. **Use of contingency funds:** There are no guiding principles regarding the use of the contingency funds. In addition, there is concern that these funds will be used by either the department chairs or the deans in ways that do not advance the academic research mission of the units from which the funds emerge.
7. **Long-range consequences.** The proposed program is an offspring of the HSCP; therefore, it is important to examine how the HSCP has been implemented. It is especially important to recognize that the HSCP, which was originally intended to increase faculty salary for competitive purposes, has resulted in the expectation that health sciences faculty will, on a regular basis, pay a portion of their academic year salary. It is also not clear if the plan will be used to create split FTE appointments, a practice that occurs in the health sciences schools and that challenges issues of tenure and security of employment.

Sincerely yours,

Mary Gauvain
Professor of Psychology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Sellyna Ehlers, Director of UCR Academic Senate office