

 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UC RIVERSIDE | **Academic Senate**
Committee on Faculty Welfare

November 8, 2012

To: Jose Wudka
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Irving G. Hendrick
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Report from Taskforce on a negotiated salary plan for the general campus

As the file will show, last year our Divisional Committee on Faculty Welfare opposed the Negotiated Salary Plan for general campuses, believing that further deviations from the University's already highly differentiated salary policy was not in the best interest of faculty generally.

Notwithstanding our previous comments from 2011-12, we understand that the matter before us now involves the efficacy of the new policy as it moves into a four year pilot period of implementation on three campuses, not including Riverside. Much of the Pilot Project document focuses on program administration. By its very nature there are numerous opportunities for the policy to be implemented in diverse ways, not only between the three campuses, but from department to department and college to college (or school/division) on the same campus.

Success of the program is to be evaluated as described under **Section B** of the report. Almost certainly some administrative forms of implementation will be better than others. Program success needs to be determined by how well the program serves participants, as measured by such things as success in faculty recruitment and retention, faculty satisfaction, and scholarly productivity. Equally important will be the credible measurement of the program's impact on the morale of colleagues who are not able to participate, not because they are less meritorious, but because they do not have access to external funding sources which sanction expenditures on salary in this form. Additionally, we urge that careful attention be given to the potential for creating or exaggerating gender, racial and ethnic inequities among faculty. Because so much is at stake for the University and its faculty, we urge as well that great care be given to the selection of the most well qualified program evaluators, who in turn will undertake their work by producing a highly credible evaluation design.