



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)
Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair
anpalazoglu@ucdavis.edu

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

February 16, 2011

DAN SIMMONS, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: RESOLUTION ON FACULTY SALARY INCREASES

Dear Dan,

UCAP discussed, during its meeting on January 11, 2011, your letter to President Yudof dated December 21, 2010, outlining the position of the Academic Council on the implementation of a possible increase in faculty salaries. Although, with the recently announced budget cuts, such a salary increase may be infeasible, UCAP still wishes to be on record in articulating the principles that should guide any future salary increase plans.

It is the position of this committee, in agreement with your first choice, that the salary scales are based on merit and that any funds available for increases in faculty salaries be allocated to grant increases based on the individual's rank and step by raising the salary scales for all faculty. Further, UCAP recommends that the dollar amount of off-scale should be maintained for this round of proposed salary increases.

UCAP cannot endorse the second, deemed undesirable but offered as acquiescence, option of limiting the salary increases to those faculty who had a positive merit review in the last five years. This option has several flaws. First, it would create two parallel salary scales and, as noted in your letter, would violate the spirit if not the substance of APM 620-0(c). Second, it reflects a poor understanding of the salary scales. The faculty earn their rank and step based on a rigorous peer review process and the salary they collect corresponds to their scholarly accomplishments consistent with that step. Some faculty may move faster through the steps if they show extraordinary performance and others may reach higher steps more slowly, paced by their level of progress. In any case, the salary scale is an affirmation of the faculty member's past accomplishments and his/her corresponding stature. By creating a second-tier salary scale now based on how a faculty may have been reviewed in the last five years, destroys the inherent value of the salary scales and adds an unnecessary new criterion for salary increases. Third, such an additional criterion is patently unnecessary as the faculty review process has built-in procedures to monitor faculty progress. Such procedures give credibility to the peer review process (and the associated salary scales) that has been the cornerstone of our excellence for decades. Finally, selective implementation of a market adjustment to scales would set a precedent and open up the possibility of multiple parallel scales existing together which is another way of legitimizing off-scale components at the expense of base salary scales.

Sincerely,



Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair
UCAP