UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Jim Chalfant
Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: jim.chalfant@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate
Faculty Representative to the Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

May 23, 2017

JANET NAPOLITANO, PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Faculty Salaries

Dear Janet,

I am attaching a letter from the chairs of three Senate committees – UCFW, UCAP, and UCPB – who have long collaborated on efforts to close UC's gap in competitiveness for faculty salaries, and the high priority that should be placed on fixing the published salary scales by bringing them closer to market reality.

The three committees feel very strongly that where individual instances of inequity or compression of salaries exist, the campus should address those with its own resources. They urge that a 3% salary adjustment for 2017-18 apply across the board to all faculty, viewing the distinction between that figure and the 1.5%/1.5% split to be very significant. In contrast, all three committees found the distinction between applying the 3% to total salary (including off-scales) or applying the same amount to the base portion of salaries to be a comparatively minor distinction.

Their recommendation was based on a letter from UCFW, also attached, that was unanimously supported by the Academic Council its April 26 meeting. All involved emphasize that salary adjustments based on the rank and step a faculty member has achieved are inherently merit-based, and that the proposed adjustment, while welcome, would barely keep up with inflation.

As we were preparing to send these recommendations to you at the beginning of May, we received a copy of your May 1 memo to the chancellors informing them of your final decision to implement the 1.5%/1.5% split for 2017-18. We regret that we are too late to have any chance of changing the outcome for the coming year, but hope that these recommendations can influence future salary actions.

The Senate has requested updated data on the pattern of off-scale salaries from Academic Personnel and Programs, and Shane and I would welcome an opportunity to discuss both the 3% vs. (3+X)% distinction and broader questions concerning salary determination.

In addition, many faculty believe that there are differences in the service loads borne by different faculty groups and in the probability that an individual will seek an outside offer as a strategy to increase salary. Specifically, it is becoming more common for faculty to seek and use outside offers as a strategy to obtain a pay raise; however, URM and women faculty may be less likely to do so, and may be burdened by higher service loads. While I am unable to cite exact quantitative data concerning these phenomena, it seems to follow that we need to focus on the competitiveness of base salaries, rather than rely on our implicit system of increasing salaries through outside offers. A faculty member's academic productivity, not their negotiating skills, should determine rank, step, and salary. If we ever attempt to close our competitiveness gap with a substantial investment in faculty salaries, we will need to consider the question of how much to adjust the salary scales and how much to increase off-scale increments. With 3% to spend, the factors I have described add to the case made by the three committees.

Finally, noting that your instructions to the campuses allow for an adjustment of the sort the committees advocate, and since some campuses are dealing with salary inequity relative to other campuses and non-UC institutions for all faculty, we request that you forward a copy to all chancellors.

Thank you for considering the Senate's views on this matter.

Sincerely,

Jim Chalfant

Jim Chalfant, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council
Provost Dorr
Vice Provost Carlson
Senate Director Baxter
Senate Executive Directors

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

May 10, 2017

JIM CHALFANT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: FACULTY SALARIES

Dear Jim,

The University Committees on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), Planning and Budget (UCPB), and Academic Personnel (UCAP) strongly recommend that a percentage salary increase is uniformly applied across the board as early as in the coming year, and that it is not split in order to be targeted. The proposed increase could be applied entirely to total salaries or entirely to base salaries. In the former case, the increase could be 3%, while in the latter case it would be more than 3% applied solely on base salaries in order to close the comparator salary gap and begin to fix the scales.

In addition, all three committees feel strongly that merit increases should be handled through normal shared governance processes via local CAPs. Range adjustments to deal with UC's salary gap, to keep up with inflation, and to bring the salary scales closer to market reality should be across the board and should not involve merit; by applying salary adjustments to each step, these range adjustments are by definition merit-based, since each faculty member achieved their rank and step through the rigorous peer-review process that uniquely characterizes UC's salary determination.

Our committees strongly oppose the complicated, non-transparent approaches to salary adjustments that have been applied in recent years.

Further, justification and discussion of our recommendation is provided in UCFW's memo to the Chair of Academic Council which is attached.

We ask that this letter be forwarded to President Napolitano, Provost Dorr and to the Chancellors and EVCs/Provosts.

Sincerely,

Lori Lubin, Chair
UCFW

Bernard Sadoulet, Chair
UCPB

Fanis Tsoulouhas, Chair
UCAP

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
Lori Lubin, Chair
lmlubin@ucdavis.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

April 20, 2017

JIM CHALFANT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Salary Administration

Dear Jim,

As the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) considers the administration plan to again allocate this year's faculty salary scale base adjustment by requiring campuses to split the 3% funding pool into 1.5% across-the-board and 1.5% to targeted redress of equity, inversion, and compression (among other things), we urge you to make the case for a comprehensive salary plan, and in lieu of that, for consistency across campuses in administration of the present plan. Both of these plans have in common the belief that UC is one university, with one standard scale for faculty salaries that is competitive with the market.

Let us first address internal consistency. The easiest way to be consistent is to simplify the allocation to one where the 3% is applied fully across the board. This approach is the easiest to administer and would do the most to ensure faculty do not further lag comparators. This approach was supported unanimously by UCFW at our meeting of April 14, 2017. Further, a consistent approach is needed to avoid unintended consequences of confusing and overly complicated schemes that vary even between units on a single campus. Non-uniformity among campuses on how the targeted 1.5% is allocated may cause unexpected disparities and further discrepancies between average salaries from campus to campus. Additionally, non-uniform decision-making processes on campuses can result in a lack of control by faculty groups and lead to a lack of transparency.

Philosophically, we echo last year's UCFW letter[1] and note that the use of 1.5% for merit-based actions further removes the merit/promotion process from faculty control and serves to undermine the scales. Year-to-year scale adjustments – the 3% pool in question – are designed to ensure that base pay is competitive in the market and keeps pace with inflation. The faculty merit cycle is multi-year, and so are the associated increases. Conflating the two makes it more difficult to lobby for a comprehensive, competitive salary program by masking the fact that issues of inequity, inversion, and compression are large and need to be addressed by a program separate from the nominal 3% pool in order to close the comparator salary gap and revitalize the scales[2].

[1] See UCFW2AC RE: Salary Actions for Faculty, March 29, 2016 (enclosed)
[2] See Academic Senate Chair Chalfant and Vice-Chair White's document "The Salary Scales are Broken and We need to Fix them" (enclosed)

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Lori Lubin, UCFW Chair

Encls.

Copy: UCFW
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
Calvin Moore, Chair
ccmoore@math.berkeley.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

March 29, 2016

DAN HARE, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Salary Actions for Faculty

Dear Dan,

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare continues to consider the issue of salary administration for faculty. The 3% 2015-16 salary increases for faculty were allocated along two axes: 1.5% "across the board" and 1.5% for selected areas of redress, such as equity, inversion, compression, and exceptional merit. The reporting on the latter 1.5% shows wide variation in administration among the campuses, and neglects to illustrate how much of the identified gaps were closed by those actions. Nonetheless, UCFW has been led to believe that subsequent faculty salary actions will follow this same model (with even less reporting), or perhaps a model based solely on local discretionary actions, omitting any "across the board" actions. Indeed, UCFW has inferred that future faculty salary actions could be exclusively "merit-based".[1]

Accordingly, we urge the Council to remind University leaders of the thoroughness, thoughtfulness, and transparency of the current faculty merit review system.[2] Further, because faculty merit reviews occur only every three years, we assert that salary actions for faculty not undergoing a merit review that year be based on their most recent merit review. A faculty person on sabbatical researching a book or developing creative work may not be able to demonstrate on a calendar-year basis the value of that work, but that faculty member should not be penalized for advancing research or scholarship in a methodical manner. The inaptness of annual reviews for faculty is exacerbated when disciplinary differences are considered. While it may no longer be persuasive to some to observe, the fact is that this model of merit review for faculty has built the University to its present level of excellence.

The argument that faculty who are not reviewed annually should receive no increase that year relies upon assumptions that COLAs are politically unpopular and that faculty should not automatically receive inflationary adjustments between merit reviews. This point of view distorts the nature of faculty work and ignores the validity of the University's rank, step, and scale system – a point which

[1] Note President Napolitano's remarks to the Regents on March 23, 2016, in which she promised to return to the Board with a merit-based salary plan for faculty and staff. See also her letter of Feb 29, 2016 to the chancellors outlining her merit-based pay philosophy for non-represented staff (enclosed).

[2] See Council Chair Gilly's remarks to the Regents in July 2015: http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2015/cw7.22.pdf (pp. 7-8). (Note also Council Chair Hare's remarks to the Regents in September 2015 regarding the rigors imposed on associate professors before tenure is granted: http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2015/cw9.16.pdf (pp. 4-5).)

UCFW has repeatedly made in the past when considering other proposed salary plans.[3] This point of view also wrongly conflates off-year merits with COLAs: Off-year merits are based on previous performance, not an external measure of prices or expenses. Off-year merits are a reflection of the academic excellence attained previously and the reality that faculty work does not progress on an easily annualized basis. Off-year merits demonstrate the loyalty of the institution to the faculty and its faith in them, and vice versa. Market range adjustments are intended to prevent inversion and compression; they should not be confused with merit awards for excellence and should apply to all on an equal basis.

There is not unanimity on UCFW regarding the value of splitting the faculty merit pay into pools as was done last year, but we acknowledge that equity, inversion, and compression are issues that require attention. Indeed, successfully addressing these issues may require a separate or stand-alone salary plan, not a carve-out from the merit pool.

UC's faculty merit system is philosophically sound and, when adequately funded, it is operationally sound, as well.

We look forward to working with you on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Calvin Moore, UCFW Chair

Encls.

Copy: UCFW
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate

[3] See, *inter alia*: http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/RMA_SCarlsonreFacultySalariesTFRpt_051312FINAL.pdf (pp. 64-65), http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucfw/faculty_salary_gap.pdf, and UCFW2DS re Faculty Salary Scales and Increases, Dec 13, 2010 (enclosed).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO | SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9074
Fax:(510) 987-9086
http://www.ucop.edu

February 29, 2016

CHANCELLORS

Dear Colleagues:

Based on the UC Budget as approved by The Regents and recommendations and analysis from Systemwide Human Resources and Compensation, I am asking you to move forward with plans to administer a 3 percent budget for the merit program for non-represented staff for fiscal year 2016-17.

The funding framework reached between the University and the Governor helps us budget for annual pay increases for policy covered (non-represented) staff with more certainty. Predictability in UC's salary program for policy covered staff is a welcome development for our employees and the University. This program targets all policy covered staff in career or partial year career appointments; it excludes student employees and anyone already covered by Academic Personnel Policies or a union contract.

As announced by my office last year, this program will be merit-based, with any salary increases based on the individual's performance and contribution. Recognizing and rewarding outstanding performance and differentiated pay practices based on employees' accomplishments will help motivate people to achieve superior results. Superior performance is difficult to achieve when everyone receives the same increase in compensation regardless of their contribution. The merit-based approach is also consistent with feedback we received from staff in the most recent Engagement Survey. Employee feedback urged us to make pay for performance a more prominent feature in our salary programs. With proper distribution of performance ratings, managers can differentiate merit awards and appropriately recognize the strongest contributors. A grid that provides differentiation guidance is attached. It also outlines areas of flexibility for your organization and offers advice on other best practices related to linking pay to performance.

The implementation of this salary program for policy covered staff is another step toward consistent delivery of our pay programs that reward individuals for their performance and contribution. Ultimately, predictable pay practices that are based on performance engage employees, maintain the University's competitive position for talent and help build an even higher performing organization where staff feel they can excel. Good compensation practices motivate to achieve at the highest levels. Clarity in performance communications is of the utmost importance along with simplicity.

Let me know how we can support you and your locations as you move forward with this important program.

Yours very truly,

Janet Napolitano
President

Attachment

cc: Executive Nava
Vice President Duckett

Areas of Flexibility, Merit Program Guidance and Best Practices

You have flexibility in the timing and administration of the budget along with establishing any additional program parameters or criteria that best suit your campus/local needs.

You may determine eligibility for employees who hold limited or floater appointments and for employees in contract appointments locally, based on the provisions of the person's contract.

If implemented at the beginning of the fiscal year, increases should be effective July 1, 2016 for monthly paid employees, and June 19, 2016 (or July 3, 2016 is the other option, but not recommended) for bi-weekly paid employees.

You may prioritize your funding including allocating more or less funding to address market, equity, or operational pressures unique to your campus/location. You should also recognize your actual compensation spend and budget for other types of increases that typically come in the form of promotions, equity adjustments, and/or market adjustments as allowed by UC policy. Other large employers regularly budget for and track their spending related to these types of increases, since the combined total can amount to an additional 1 to 1.5 percent of total salaries.

Most people, regardless of the words or range of numbers used, tend to rate things at the most basic level on a three point scale. We have found that UC organizations struggle somewhat with performance ratings, inflating the ratings and actually only using three points on a four or five point scale. The scale tends to start at good and tops out at great. As many of your organizations are using a four or five point scale, below are some techniques to consider using to provide clarity in performance communications along with corresponding monetary rewards by broadly categorizing performance ratings using a three point scale, and emphasizing relative performance using monetary rewards:

- **Poor** - No increase/requiring corrective action and immediate performance improvement or minimal increase for those whose performance and contributions need improvement (bottom 10% of the current year's performances)

- **Good** - An increase rewarding contribution and accomplishments relative to others who have performed well (approximately 75% of the current year's performances)

- **Great** - An increase rewarding contribution and accomplishments that are demonstrably /significantly beyond those of others who have performed well (the top 15% of the current year's performances)

This is a tool to help leaders better manage performance. It should not be used mechanically or to "force" any individual employees into preset performance ratings or increase amounts. It borrows from best practices and principles from organizations who have a reputation of out performing their competitors, employing the best people and managing performance well. The chart below provides an example of how differentiation in merit awards could be attained with a 3 percent budget. It also introduces a more simplified way of messaging while taking into account UC's commonly used 5 point scale.

	Poor		**Good**	**Great**	
Performance Rating	**Does Not Meet**	**Partially Meets**	**Fully Meets**	**Consistently Exceeds**	**Out-standing**
Increase %	0%	0.0 – 1.0%	2.0 to 3.0%	3.0 to 4.5%	4.5 to 6.0%
% of Population Receiving	5%	5%	75%	10%	5%
	Poor		**Good**	**Great**	

Using the scale, above, the proposed distribution results in an overall spend of 3.0%.

To avoid unnecessary compounding (freeing up more budget) and also to avoid dampening the effect of market increases or promotions (as hard cut offs could cause people to lose ground), we advise that you adopt a 12 month proration methodology based on when individuals received their last increase. For example, if someone received a market increase 6 months before the effective date of your merit program they would get 6/12ths of your recommended merit/budget amount for the 6 month performance period.

Apply performance ratings based on the specific fiscal year and/or performance period. This will help avoid labeling ("I'm always a 4" vs "I am being rated a 4 this year") it will also facilitate more productive calibration of ratings taking into account *relative performance and contribution* within your organizations.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
Joel Dimsdale, Chair
jdimsdale@ucsd.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

December 13, 2010

DANIEL SIMMONS, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Faculty Salary Scales and Increases

Dear Dan,

The Academic Assembly committed back to Academic Council the question of how to address the pressing need for increasing UC faculty salaries. UCFW revisited this topic at its meeting of December 10, where we had an extensive discussion with Provost Pitts.

Provost Pitts suggested that a small amount of funds might be made available to increase faculty salaries over a three-year period. He asked UCFW for advice regarding how to apportion this small increase, indicating that the Regents were not likely to support an across-the-board increase in salaries but might be more supportive of increasing salaries based on merit. He suggested that salary increases could be awarded to faculty at the time of their next merit review.

The Committee was unanimous in its opposition to awarding salary at the time of the next merit review. Such a mechanism would spread salary increases over an approximately three-year cycle. The Committee remembered how the latest four-year salary plan was abandoned after only one year and had no confidence that the University would be able to adhere to promised increases spread over three years. In addition, there would be equity issues. For instance, a faculty member who was just reviewed would not be entitled to a salary increase; whereas his or her peer who was reviewed for the same step months later would presumably be given the salary increase. Such inequities would disadvantage certain faculty for an entire merit cycle. This program of delayed awarding of salary increases would lead to considerable acrimony and turmoil. No member of UCFW felt that this was a wise way of operationalizing the salary increase.

While the simplest way of introducing a small increase is an across-the-board increase to both the scale salary and market off-scale salary, the Committee was informed that the Regents may be uncomfortable in pursuing this approach. Fortunately, there is an alternative: The University has a rank and step merit review system that is ideally suited to the Regents' wish to award salary increases based on merit. If the University is able to grant a salary increase, we suggest that the increase be tied to the rank and step that faculty members have already earned through the merit and promotion system and that the absolute value of any existing off-scale not be changed. In other words, the Regents' wish to award salary increases based on merit can be easily achieved by using the available money for faculty salary increases to increase solely the portion of salaries which is on-scale. For example, a professor making $100,000 plus $10,000 off-scale, would receive a 3% increase on the

$100,000 component alone, for a new total salary of $113,000. Such a plan has a number of advantages: 1) It increases salaries in a way that is transparently tied to merit; 2) The salary increase does not change the dollar amount of the off-scale portion of the salary; and 3) Most importantly, the limited funds available are used to begin to repair the salary scales, an effort that was begun with the four-year salary plan, and sadly abandoned after a single year, despite its importance.

The committee voted unanimously in favor of this recommendation. We look forward to discussing this at Academic Council this week. UCFW feels that the total compensation of faculty is dangerously uncompetitive and welcomes efforts to ameliorate this salary lag. Applying the increase in salary to merit scales has the added benefit of moving (slowly) towards reinforcing the scale system as the vehicle for rewarding faculty merit based on careful peer review. We continue to note that this great University risks an exodus of outstanding faculty unless the total compensation of faculty is in fact competitive. Indeed, the proposed 3% increase, while a step in the right direction, still leaves the University with an enormous gap in faculty compensation.

Sincerely,

Joel E Dimsdale

Joel E. Dimsdale, UCFW Chair

Copy: UCFW
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate

The Salary Scales are Broken and We Need to Fix Them

Jim Chalfant
Professor, Agricultural and Resource Economics
University of California, Davis
2016-17 Chair, Academic Senate

Shane White
Professor, Section of Endodontics
School of Dentistry
University of California, Los Angeles
2016-17 Vice Chair, Academic Senate

Most general campus UC faculty members have a total salary consisting of base salary (the "on-scale" portion) plus off-scale salary. On every campus and in nearly every discipline it is difficult to hire and retain faculty without off-scale salary, but the preservation of the off-scale component of salary is not guaranteed, and the campuses have various policies concerning the permanence of off-scale and whether or not range adjustments (including those based on keeping up with inflation, i.e., COLAs) should be paid. Faculty generally understand, therefore, that to obtain a competitive salary, it is often necessary to obtain outside offers, a time-consuming and wasteful practice that also leads to inequity and morale problems.

In this document, we consider the role of the academic salary scales for general-campus faculty and in the Health Sciences.

General Campus Perspective

What can a new faculty member count on, in considering whether to come to UC? Let's take a new PhD who begins his or her career as an Assistant Professor, Step III. The 7/1/2016 base salary is $66,400. Needless to say, this is not a salary that sustains much of a family lifestyle in California, but it is the minimum salary guaranteed to a Step III Assistant Professor. (Some assistant professors are appointed at higher at lower or higher steps; however, the distinction between steps within the rank of Assistant Professor changes little in the following analysis.)

Suppose that faculty member is successful and productive and proceeds up the ladder, receiving all normal merits. In six years, this person can expect to be promoted with tenure to Associate Professor, Step II, with a minimum salary of $77,300, an increase of less than 3% per year.

After another five years, if continuously successful and productive, this person can advance to Professor Step II, with a minimum salary of $93,400. A total increment of $30,000 in 11 years is slightly above 3% per year. Even after 11 years, this is a base salary that is not at all in line with California's cost of living.

Note: these percentage merit increases are not comparable to range adjustments applied periodically to keep up with inflation or to maintain some degree of competitiveness for UC faculty salaries overall. The "ladder" should mimic salary growth at comparable institutions; indeed, if UC were competitive and there were no inflation, there would be no need for range adjustments, but merit increases would still be needed.

Twelve more years, proceeding at three-year intervals, this faculty member could advance to Step VI, and receive a salary of $124,700. Although there is no normative time at subsequent steps, suppose 3 more steps are achieved at three-year intervals; this faculty member advances to Step IX and a salary of $158,000 after 32 years of employment.

Keeping in mind that the average age at hire for a new faculty member is 36, this is not encouraging. A more appropriate figure for the average age would be the average age at hire of assistant professors, perhaps closer to the early 30s, but still not encouraging. A thirty-year old following this trajectory can expect a salary of $158,000 in 2016 dollars only after reaching the targeted retirement age; even someone hired as young as 26---which is very unusual---would be 62 at this point.

Since CPEC was disbanded, we can no longer draw on annual salary comparisons using readily available Comp 8 data. The 2007-08 report projected a salary, in unadjusted dollars, of $146,030 for Full Professors at the Comp 8. Even growth of 1% per year since that time---well less than inflation---would have put that figure over $160,000 by 2017.

Here is the inescapable conclusion: a potential faculty member who uses the published UC salary scales as a forecast of earnings potential would know that in over 30 years of service, even if successful at every merit review, he or she would not achieve the ***average*** *salary at comparison institutions, let alone anything remotely close to their academic peers in professional accomplishment.*

Any department chair attempting to hire such a person would point out that range adjustments do occur, but would have to acknowledge that they have not kept up with inflation. This potential recruit would have to conclude that expecting the real value of base salaries to be maintained over time, with continued inflation, is overly optimistic. The chair could counter that off-scale salaries are used, but these are not guaranteed. And while merit increases can exceed the normal progress described here, there is again no guarantee; if anything, the post-Step V trajectory described here is an optimistic one.

There is plenty of room for debating how much of an annual range adjustment should be applied to the steps and how much should be applied to other priorities. But there is simply no possibility of defending UC's academic salary scales as being remotely competitive. Yet, these scales are published and readily available to any potential recruit. Within UC, it is well understood that there are various ways to increase salary, but again, these are not guaranteed. They typically require negotiations based on an outside offer. It is debatable but also conventional wisdom that at least some differences exist between groups concerning their willingness to engage in such practices; indeed, some in academic personnel---people closest to the situation---seem to hold the belief that women and under-represented faculty are less likely to negotiate. And, it must be remembered that any negotiation is just between two parties, and unlike the merit review process, is not subject to broad and critical assessment.

This is a problem for the trust all faculty have in the outcomes from individually negotiated salaries, but the important point here is that the absence of broad faculty consultation concerning the setting of a negotiated retention offer or salary increment---in direct contrast to how base salaries are established---puts even more responsibility on the individual faculty member to be willing to negotiate, perhaps having to threaten to leave to receive a competitive salary.

If indeed groups of faculty differ in their ability or willingness to negotiate, our pattern of uncompetitive base salaries simply amplifies inequity with each outside offer received by a member of the faculty.

A potential faculty member considering UC would have to assign considerable value to nonpecuniary characteristics in order to find our published salary scales to be encouraging about the prospects for a career at UC. That faculty member would also have to be willing to present UC with outside offers, and be prepared to either negotiate or move, to approach a competitive salary. None of this serves us well.

The Role of the Salary Scales in Compensation for Health Sciences Faculty

All the principles discussed above apply to HSCP as to general campus faculty members. As for general campus faculty members, the salary scales provide a base that the negotiated components of HSCP salary are layered upon (where X is the base salary from the scale; X-prime is the differential between the scale and the assigned HSCP scale; Y is additional negotiated income; and Z is an incentive based upon performance beyond Y). As for general campus faculty, one's position on the scale is dependent upon merit-reviewed rank and step (independent of HSCP professorial series). However, a key difference is that the HSCP faculty member's UCRP covered compensation is limited to their X and X-prime, not their total pay. Furthermore, Y is negotiated year by year and Z can change at any time, giving even lesser expectation of stability to HSCP faculty.

Conclusions

UC's merit review driven salary scale system is recognized to be the best; its rigor and career-long continuity are without par. But at this time scales are no longer linked directly to salary;

the underfunded scales provide a career trajectory that barely keeps up with cost of living, let alone professional advancement. They provide an expectation of career salary trajectory that is grossly uncompetitive. Recruitment and retention are harmed. Personal relationships between faculty member and chair have become more important than objective independent review of accomplishment and productivity. In the current process, equity and transparency are harmed, but no net savings are realized. So that there can be no misunderstanding, we conclude with this emphasis: our problem is not a reliance on salary scales; it is that the scales are so far below market. The salary scales are broken, and we need to fix them.