



*James Steintrager*  
*Telephone: (510) 987-9983*  
*Email: james.steintrager@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*

April 2, 2024

**CHERYL LLOYD, VICE PRESIDENT  
SYSTEMWIDE HUMAN RESOURCES**

**Re: Total Remuneration Study**

Dear Vice President Lloyd:

Now that the bids for the 2024 Total Remuneration Study have been received and are under review, I want to emphasize that the Academic Senate position is that the methods and comparators for faculty in this complex analysis should be the same as the 2014 Total Remuneration Study to enable comparative analyses. The methods in the 2014 study were developed jointly by UCOP Human Resources and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and its task forces to correct some errors in the first UC total remuneration study conducted in 2005. These methods were first used for the 2009 study and used again without change for the 2014 study. Detailed descriptions of the methods and comparators used in 2014 appear in Appendices A – D of the 2014 total remuneration report<sup>1</sup>. Here are the main concerns of the Academic Senate:

First, the Senate believes that it is critical for the 2024 results for faculty be compared directly with the 2014 results to determine precisely how UC's total remuneration competitiveness was affected by adopting the 2016 Retirement Tier and its PEPRA cap. The only way that a valid comparison can be made is to replicate the methodology used in the 2014 study. To fail to do so would confound the effects of retirement plan changes with changes in study methods, likely yielding erroneous estimates of the effect of retirement plan changes on UC's competitiveness. The Senate will not accept the results of a confounded study.

Second, because the recruitment of outstanding faculty is more of a campus-based process than a systemwide process, the Senate has asked for a breakdown of total remuneration by campus. Divisional Senates want to know how their total remuneration has changed over the past ten years, not only relative to external peers, but also to other UC campuses. Again, no such valid comparisons can be made unless the methodology for the 2024 study mirrors the 2014 study, where data for each UC employee occupies a row of a spreadsheet. A breakdown of the 2014 results by campus is attached as a model.

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/\\_files/2014\\_total\\_remuneration\\_study.pdf](https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/2014_total_remuneration_study.pdf)

In closing, the Senate requests that the upcoming total remuneration study be at least as comprehensive and illuminating as the 2009 and 2014 studies. Awarding the contract to a vendor that plans to use a different methodology would undermine the goal of making accurate comparisons over time and render the study ineffective in shaping future benefit designs. Please also note that Academic Council has reviewed the points made in this letter and unanimously endorsed them at our last meeting.

Sincerely,



James Steintrager, Chair  
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council  
President Drake  
Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom  
Chief Operating Officer Nava  
Vice Provost Haynes  
Associate Vice President & Chief Procurement Officer Williams  
Associate Vice President of Total Rewards Henderson  
Senior Director of Health & Welfare Benefits Programs and Strategy Pon-Gee  
Director of Compensation Projects Wong  
Actuarial Services Manager Monroe  
Senate Division Executive Directors  
Senate Executive Director Lin