

May 31, 2011

DEANS  
UCO/LICK DIRECTOR  
DEPARTMENT and PROGRAM CHAIRS  
LADDER-RANK FACULTY

Re: Ladder-Rank Academic Personnel Actions

Dear Colleagues:

I write to share information involving faculty salaries and advancement and retention actions that was presented to Deans, Department Chairs and Department Managers at the Academic Personnel Process Workshop on May 17, 2011. I have previously conveyed much of this information to you in my [letter dated November 30, 2010](#). Of particular note is the continuation for another three years of the campus' special salary practice related to advancement actions.

### **Advancement Actions**

#### **Special salary practice now available through review year 2013-14**

In consultation with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the divisional deans, I am pleased to announce that the campus will continue with the salary practice that was initially implemented for a three-year period (reviews taking place in 2008-09 through 2010-11), for an additional three years, or through reviews taking place in 2013-14. This results in a total program of six years, which provides most faculty with a minimum of two opportunities for advancement under this special campus salary practice.

This practice allows advancement (including acceleration below Professor, Step 6) to be coupled with a greater range of possible salary increases than in the past. The criteria for merit advancement at all ranks and steps have not changed, and CAP and the deciding authorities have consistently applied the revised salary practice to reviews commencing in 2008-09.

Academic advancement is based on the record of accomplishments in teaching, research, and service as presented in the review file. A faculty member is considered for a normal advancement (advancement of one step) when the review file demonstrates excellence in all three areas. A greater-than-normal advancement (one step plus an additional off-scale salary component) is considered when performance is outstanding in two of the three areas or, on rare occasions, when performance is unusually outstanding in only one of the three areas as long as performance in the remaining areas meets the criteria for normal advancement. An acceleration (advancement of two steps) is considered when the review file demonstrates outstanding performance in all three areas, meaning that performance in each of the areas is significantly beyond expectations.

Prior to the revised campus salary practice, the typical outcome for a greater-than-normal advancement was an increase in off-scale salary equivalent to a half-step, and only on very rare occasions was acceleration accompanied by an additional increase in off-scale salary. To increase faculty salaries in conjunction with recognizing and rewarding academic performance, the following practices remain in place through the 2013-14 review year.

- Greater-than-normal files that are closer to a normal action will be considered for a one-step advancement plus an additional off-scale component equivalent to a half-step.
- Greater-than-normal files that are closer to an acceleration, but which do not quite demonstrate outstanding performance in all three areas, will be considered for a one-step advancement plus an additional off-scale component equivalent to \$100 less than the next step.
- Accelerations to steps *below Professor, Step 6* will be considered for an additional off-scale salary component, typically equivalent to a half-step.
- Based on the recommendation of the task force, salary practices for acceleration to Professor, Steps 6-9 and Above Scale, as well as to further Above Scale, remain unchanged from previous years.

### **Guidelines on external letters for mid-career appraisal**

The mid-career appraisal is a formal assessment of an appointee's achievement and promise for eventual promotion. As you may be aware, there is ongoing discussion on campus regarding the requirement for external letters for mid-career appraisals. This is a complex issue that requires a change in policy preceded by formal campus review. Although letters are required by campus policy, a set number of letters is not mandated; *the quality of the letters is more important than the quantity*. In consultation with the Deans and CAP, the following guidelines on external letters apply for files reviewed in 2011-12:

- Mid-career appraisal only – Three external letters are usually sufficient.
- Mid-career appraisal with possibility of tenure – Five or six external letters are usually sufficient.
- External Reviewers – Choose letter writers who are not closely associated with the candidate. If at all possible, avoid collaborators and graduate advisors.
- Solicitation text – If external reviewers are asked for an assessment of tenure at this time, ask them to comment on whether the candidate presently warrants tenure at their institution.

### **Retention Actions**

As I wrote in November, the retention of ladder-rank faculty continues to be an issue of utmost importance. The numbers of retention actions are yet another indication of the high caliber of faculty that we have at UCSC. Generally, our campus goal in response to bona fide competing offers is to retain faculty with packages that come as close as possible to matching the outside offer, given the specific circumstances and the campus budgetary situation. While each faculty member is valued by the campus, there is no requirement that UCSC fully match a competing offer, and in some situations, the campus might not be in a position to mount any counter-offer.

As the campus gains more experience with these competing offers, we continue to refine our practices involving such actions. In addition to reminding you of the many factors that are taken into consideration in developing a retention offer and of the conditions that faculty must now agree to before a retention-based salary increase becomes effective, I want to clarify what an outside offer of employment must contain to justify a retention action.

### **What constitutes an outside offer of employment?**

In order for UCSC to initiate a retention action, an outside offer must come from an individual authorized to make the offer on behalf of the institution. Typically, this will be a formal offer letter on the institution's letterhead, signed by the person with authority to make the offer.

However, the practice at some institutions is to have a dean or department head make a preliminary written offer (including email), which states that once the candidate accepts, the formal offer from the President/Chancellor will follow. In either case, the written offer must contain the following information:

- A response deadline set by the other institution;
- Tenure or tenure-track status of the appointment (rank, if used by the institution; rank and step required for UC intercampus recruitments);
- Annual Salary, including basis (i.e., 9-month, 11-month, or 12-month); and
- Effective date.

What is not acceptable is correspondence that states that the candidate will be recommended for consideration for an offer, or an email exchange between the search committee and the candidate.

### **Timing reminder**

All retention actions require review by CAP with final authority lying with the CP/EVC or Chancellor. To allow for this review, retention cases must be submitted by the dean to the Academic Personnel Office before the CAP deadline and allow at least two weeks, *following review by CAP*, for a final decision. In some cases, this will make it necessary for faculty to obtain deadline extensions from the competing institutions.

### **Factors considered when making counter-offers**

Each competing offer is unique. The different factors that make up an offer are considered and their significance weighed on a case-by-case basis to arrive at a reasonable response that is in the best interest of the campus as a whole. Among the factors taken into account in formulating a counter-offer are the following:

- Impact on the department, division, and campus if the faculty member is not retained;
- Reputation/standing of the competing department and institution relative to UCSC;
- Salary offered by the competing institution relative to a faculty member's current salary rate (salaries are compared on a 9-month basis and increases of greater than 20 percent are uncommon and require substantial justification);
- The faculty member's previous history of competing offers; and
- Equity issues within departments and divisions.

### **Two conditions for retention-based salary increases**

A salary increase for retention purposes is now contingent upon the faculty member agreeing to two conditions: 1) Decline the offer from the competing institution; and 2) Maintain active service status at UCSC during the entire upcoming academic year. This contingency language is included in all positive retention decision letters along with a firm deadline by which faculty must affirmatively respond to these two conditions or the campus's retention offer expires.

### **Off-Scale Limits**

As conveyed in November, when approving salaries for advancement and retention actions, off-scale salary limits for each rank and step will be taken into consideration. Exceptions to the campus off-scale limits may be granted when justified.

### **Limit increase for Professor, Step 9 and other eligible titles as this level**

Beginning with academic advancement reviews effective July 1, 2012, the campus off-scale salary limit for Professor, Step 9 will be \$157,500 on the academic year ladder-rank salary scale and \$172,600 on the corresponding Business/Economics/Engineering (B/E/E) scale. For fiscal year professors, the Step 9 off-scale limit will be \$182,700, and \$200,200 on the B/E/E scale.

In closing, I encourage Department Chairs and Deans to review [CAP's Top Ten List of Tips for Personnel Files](#) that CAP Chair Takagi shared at the recent Academic Personnel Process Workshop and all faculty to look for an upcoming communication directed at faculty that contains "CAP's Top Ten List of Tips for Faculty Preparing Personnel Files."

Sincerely,



Alison Galloway  
Campus Provost and  
Executive Vice Chancellor

cc: Chancellor Blumenthal  
Faculty Assistant Chung  
Assistant Vice Chancellor Peterson, Academic Personnel  
Chair Takagi, Committee on Academic Personnel  
Academic Personnel Analysts  
Assistant to UCO/Lick Director  
Department and Program Managers  
Divisional Academic Personnel Coordinators