



Susan Cochran
Telephone: (510) 987-0887
Email: susan.cochran@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*

October 5, 2022

**MICHAEL DRAKE, PRESIDENT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Re: Faculty Salary Competitiveness

Dear President Drake:

At its September 2022 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed the attached letter from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). The letter emphasizes the need to include a competitive faculty salary program in the University's 2023-24 budget plan and request to the State Legislature.

Council very much appreciates your commitment to a faculty salary program focused on rebuilding competitive and equitable salaries. Such a program ideally will be one that aims to eliminate the salary gap for ladder-rank faculty relative to UC's Comparison 8 group of institutions and that reinforces the University's merit-based review system. The Council remains steadfast in referring to the UC salary scales as the backbone of our compensation system. The 2023-24 salary plan should strengthen salary equity and transparency, support the integrity of UC's merit-based peer review system, and continue to focus on improving the market relevance of the published salary scales to help reduce the University's reliance on off-scale supplements for competitive compensation.

One significant point of concern relates to the timing of faculty salary increases recently and going forward. The 2022-23 plan provides a 4% increase to faculty salaries beginning October 1, 2022, while other policy-covered UC employee groups received salary increases beginning July 1. The three-month delay for faculty effectively provides those on 9-month appointments with a 3% raise. It also penalizes faculty on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) and those who receive summer salary via grant funding or administrative stipends. For those using grant funding where the awards include indirect costs, it also serves to penalize the institution. We understand this practice of distinguishing implementation dates for employee groups began only a few years ago, yet a continuing pattern of shortchanging faculty is something we should avoid. The Council would like to hear more about why the timing of increases for faculty and staff employee groups cannot be aligned. If the University is unable to implement a salary plan for faculty and staff simultaneously beginning July 1, 2023, it should provide an offsetting higher increase to faculty with 9-month appointments.

We look forward to working with you on this and other budget priorities that are critical to maintaining UC's excellence. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Susan Cochran". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Susan Cochran, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council
Vice Chair Steintrager
Provost Brown
Chief of Staff Kao
Chief Policy Advisor McAuliffe
Executive Director Lin



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)

Jill Hollenbach, Outgoing Chair

Jill.Hollenbach@ucsf.edu

Terry Dalton, Incoming Chair

tdalton@uci.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)

Kathleen McGarry, Outgoing Chair

mcgarry@econ.ucla.edu

Donald Senear, Incoming Chair

Donald.Senear@uci.edu

September 16, 2022

**SUSAN COCHRAN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

RE: Faculty Salary Competitiveness

Dear Susan,

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), together with the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), renews its plea for competitive faculty salaries at the University of California. We will be pleased to receive the 4% increase to the scales on October 1 (with an additional 1.5% authorized for equity adjustments if needed). But we note that faculty scales continue to lag the market as they have for the past two decades. In 2014, then President Napolitano instituted a policy of annual scale increases to address this shortfall. Regular, albeit relatively modest, 3% increases over several years did make progress in addressing the gap. The larger 5.4% increase effective Oct 1, 2019 had a significant impact. However, the effect of subsequent, somewhat smaller, increases and that have been muted by the delay of the effective date to October 1, is that progress towards closing the remaining gap has stalled.

Additionally, throughout COVID, faculty have performed double teaching duties with little increase in compensation. Compounding factors over this period such as decreasing staff support, the attendant increasing administrative burdens, and perennially rising costs like child-care and housing clearly illustrate the need for rapid increase to faculty compensation. With increasing difficulty to recruit promising junior faculty, especially those from underrepresented backgrounds, and poaching of senior faculty increasingly common, the need for competitive faculty salaries becomes even clearer. Since the turn of the century, the burden to address these concerns has fallen largely to the application of off-scale salary components. As recognized by the October 7, 2020 report of the Academic Planning Council Task Force on Faculty Salary Scales, the use of off-scale compensation, whose decisions are not subject to academic review by the faculty, has led to additional problems, such as a loyalty penalty, compression and even inversion of compensation at different ranks, uneven and inequitable application, and increasing need to offer retention packages. The recommendation of the task force was to mitigate these problems by applying annual scale adjustments to reduce the need for off-scale compensation.

Given the substantial enrollment growth over the next decade that UC leaders have promised, maintaining the quality of a UC education will require substantial growth of the faculty ranks, a problem that is exacerbated by the failure of the UC to grow the ranks of tenured and tenure track faculty commensurate with the enrollment increase over the past decade. It is clear that this will not be possible if faculty are not competitively compensated. Further, to maintain the institutional academic strength of the University, senior faculty who are off- or above-scale must still be fairly compensated.

Finally, we wish to highlight that while most other UC employees received a salary increase July 1, the net effect of an October 1 implementation for faculty means effectively only a 3% increase for the current fiscal year. This has a significant effect on compensation for faculty who use research funds to pay summer salary or who participate in the Negotiated Salary Plan. For these faculty, the delay from July to October 1 results in a delay of a full year for the increase to be applied to these additional salary components. In addition, and while the size of the affected group is smaller, the delay until October 1 also decreases the HAPC for faculty retiring either during or at the end of the current fiscal year. Singling faculty out among the university's several employee groups for this treatment is an unwise policy that has an unnecessary effect on faculty morale and goodwill.

In sum, receiving this year's promised scale increases is necessary but not sufficient. Further increases to the faculty scales, rapidly and of import, are required to maintain the integrity of the institution and to maintain UC's status as the pre-eminent public university in the world. This critical issue cannot be ignored or deferred any longer.

Sincerely,

Jill Hollenbach, outgoing UCFW Chair
Terry Dalton, incoming UCFW Chair
Kathleen McGarry, outgoing UCPB Chair
Donald Senear, incoming UCPB Chair

Copy: UCFW
Monica Lin, Executive Director, Academic Senate
James Steintrager, Academic Council Vice Chair