

April 22, 2010

DEANS
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS
DIRECTOR BOLTE

Re: Perspective & Expectations Regarding Retention Cases

Dear Colleagues:

As a follow up to discussions I have had with the deans, I want to convey the following information which guides my decision-making process for retention cases (i.e., those academic personnel reviews for salary increases only, which are triggered by bona fide competing offers). Additionally, I want to confirm my thinking about the impact that retention-based salary increases will have on faculty's next review for advancement subsequent to such an action and dispel some misconceptions about retention cases.

My hope is that actions we have taken over the last couple of years to systematically increase faculty salaries will reduce the temptation of faculty to seek competing offers solely as a means to increase their salary at UCSC. We have recognized the need to raise faculty salaries and have implemented new campus practices during the last two years that are intended to increase faculty salaries through a more generous merit process. Still, the negative impact of the budget crisis on salaries is undeniable, and has likely contributed to a noticeable increase in the quantity of retention cases reviewed this year.

Our goal in response to a bona fide competing offer is to retain high-performing faculty and to compensate them at market rates to the extent possible. At the same time, while each faculty member is valued by the campus, it should be clear that there is no requirement that UCSC match a competing offer or take any retention action at all.

To approach this goal effectively and equitably – and in a manner that is sustainable – we must systematically take into account the different factors that make each competing offer unique and weigh their significance on a case-by-case basis to arrive at a reasonable response that is in the best interests of the campus as a whole.

Among the most relevant factors:

- Reputation/standing of the competing department relative to the faculty member's department at UCSC
- Competing institution's overall comparability to UCSC (if not UC-caliber, salary increase will generally not be approved)
- Salary offered by competing institution relative to faculty member's current salary rate (>20% salary increases are typically not approved)
- Previous retention actions, including frequency, time since last retention action, and percentage of salary increase
- Impact to department, division and campus if faculty member is not retained
- Equity issues within department and divisions

When the campus does increase a faculty member's salary in response to a competing offer, consideration must also be given to the impact on the placement on the salary scale at the time of the next advancement action. The general guideline is that the retention-based salary increase will be taken into consideration in the next personnel review; it is possible that additional compensation may be awarded if merited based on the strength of the file presented at the next review, but it is not guaranteed.

Finally, I expect that faculty who have submitted a bona fide competing offer for retention action by the campus will inform their chair, dean, and me of their decision whether to remain at UCSC at the time they respond to the other institution. This information, in addition to impacting curriculum and resource planning issues, is now being requested by UC Office of the President, which has just recently instituted required reporting on retention action outcomes from all the campuses.

I ask that deans and department chairs discuss all of the information conveyed here – along with the information contained in my memo of March 23, 2010 regarding minimum processing time for retention actions – with their faculty to facilitate their understanding of retention actions and what the campus may do in response to them, including the expectations that result from such actions.

While arguably not ideal, I believe that retention cases handled in alignment with these expectations, and current CAPM policy, provide the best mechanism at this time by which our campus can make reasonable and sustainable efforts to retain our faculty.

Sincerely,



David S. Kliger
Campus Provost and
Executive Vice Chancellor

cc: Chancellor Blumenthal
Faculty Assistant Chung
Chair Kletzer, Academic Senate
AVC Peterson
Committee on Academic Personnel
Department Managers
Divisional Academic Personnel Coordinators