The Joint Senate/Administration Faculty Salaries Task Force report is distributed for feedback. The report makes three recommendations to address faculty salary competitiveness over the next several years. (1) Maintain funding for merit actions based on existing merit and CAP review processes, such that faculty who advance to a new rank and/or step receive a new salary at least equal to the average of campus colleagues at the same rank and step. (2) Appoint a follow-on task force to assess particular issues facing UC professional schools. (3) Contingent on funding, resume regular scale adjustments such that individual faculty salaries reach at least the median of University faculty at the same rank and step.
RFC Response: UC Wide Review: Faculty Salaries Task Force Report

The Affirmative Action and Diversity committee was largely in favor of the proposal drafted by the joint Senate-Administration Faculty Salaries Task Force. The disparities in faculty salary at UC, and our campus (UC Davis) in particular, are a significant source of concern and must be addressed as expeditiously as possible. The committee recommends that the data contained in the report be made available to Senate faculty and that they be made aware of efforts (planned or ongoing) to address the problem. The committee would also like to call attention to the fact that the "loyalty penalty" discussed in the report (i.e., that paid by faculty who remain at UC for their careers) may be an especially salient problem for women and minorities. Members of the committee who are representatives of the Academic Federation also asked if, in addition to the follow-up task force planned for addressing issues in the UC professional schools, there would be a follow-up task force to address AF, or lecturer, salary scales. The question also arose of how the costs associated with these increases in pay for ladder faculty might affect the pay scales of other faculty at the university and it was suggested that this possibility be considered when making these recommendations. Lastly, it was noted that the task force should investigate if salary is the main component responsible for faculty retention problems at UC, or whether climate or other factors also play a role.
Response continued on next page.
The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) has reviewed the Faculty Salaries Task Force Report and supports the report’s findings and recommendations. CAP believes the recommendations, if implemented, would increase equity in faculty salaries, and in doing so, at least slightly decrease the case-load of accelerations and equity reviews.
Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

March 23, 2012 11:12 AM

No response at this time.
Faculty Welfare

April 11, 2012 3:45 PM

The Faculty Welfare Committee strongly supports the goals of the Faculty Salaries Task Force Report to strengthen UC’s system of faculty remuneration to hire and retain the highest quality faculty. We disagree, however, with some of the recommendations the Task Force proposes to fulfill those laudable ends.

The report documents that the published salary schedule for UC faculty lags far behind the marketplace for faculty salaries at the best research institutions. The vast majority of new hires at all ranks must be offered off-scale salaries. The Task Force proposes that when funds become available for scale adjustments across the UC system, individual faculty should have their salaries raised to at least the median salary of the nine General Campuses for faculty at the same rank and step. A second recommendation proposes that when faculty members advance to a new rank and/or step they should receive at a minimum the average salary of their colleagues on their campus at the same rank and step.

Because these proposals set salary targets by identifying either the salary median or mean of colleagues at the same rank and step, the Committee would like greater clarity in revealing how these cohorts would be determined. What exactly do they share? Do they have to be in the same college, department, or discipline? The answers to these questions are not self-evident. Small changes in definition could have large outcomes when one proposal throws a wide net to include colleagues across the entire UC system and the other proposal narrows the target cohort to the mean salary for faculty in similar positions on one’s own campus.

A significant portion of the Committee was also concerned about the prospect that salaries at different campuses would be allowed to diverge over time. Davis would suffer because this campus currently offers the lowest proportion of off-scale salaries in the UC system. The adoption of a single UC wide salary target for faculty at a comparable rank and step would resolve this inequity. Some Committee members pointed out that the Committee on Academic Personnel at Davis played a large role in restricting the number of off-scale salaries. There are reforms currently under consideration that could significantly change Davis’ track record of low salaries.
Graduate Council

April 10, 2012 2:21 PM

Graduate Council is in general supportive of competitive UCD faculty salaries for maintaining and further developing research and teaching excellence. In comparison to peer institutions, specifically to other UC campuses, there must be some level of equity in salary scale across faculty ranks at UCD that is strongly correlated to dedication to graduate training in and outside the classroom.
CPB has reviewed the Joint Senate/Administration Faculty Salaries Task Force report. CPB feels that the report ignores the real problem, that is, that the current salary scale is broken. As documented in the report, at all campuses, at all ranks, in all disciplines, the majority of faculty receive off-scale salaries. There are wide variations between departments, between campuses and between ranks as to the magnitude of these off-scales. The proposed ‘fix’ in the task force report makes no attempt to address the issue of the salary scale. In addition, the system-wide recommendations ignore differences between campuses and disciplines.
Research

March 23, 2012 11:13 AM

No response at this time.