

November 30, 2010

LADDER-RANK FACULTY

Dear Colleagues:

Re: Ladder-Rank Faculty Salaries – Advancement and Retention Actions

It has recently come to my attention that some ladder-rank faculty are not aware of the efforts that the campus is making to increase faculty salaries at UCSC through a more generous implementation of the academic personnel review process. In addition, there has been some misunderstanding by faculty of the factors that may be taken into consideration when deciding on salaries in retention actions. While such information is usually transmitted through your dean and department chair, I feel it is important to communicate directly with you to assure consistent understanding regarding these important topics.

**Advancement Actions**

As many of you are aware, in June 2008, a joint Senate-Administrative Task Force was convened to study faculty salaries at UCSC. The task force made several recommendations, including a recommendation to examine how salaries are adjusted through the personnel review process. After consultation with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) and the divisional deans, a revised campus salary practice was implemented for reviews taking place in 2008-09 through 2010-11. 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 were put into place for the 2008-09 through 2010-11 review years.

- 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.

### **Retention Actions**

The retention of ladder-rank faculty continues to be an issue of utmost importance. 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 a counter-offer.

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 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.

### **Off-Scale Limits**

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.

I hope that the information provided here will help you better understand the efforts underway to compensate and retain our ladder-rank faculty, including astronomers. CAP and the deciding authorities have been following this more generous off-scale salary practice since 2008-09 and will continue to do so during the 2010-11 review year. I am happy to report that early assessments show that the revised salary practices from 2008-2010 have brought UCSC salaries more in line with other UC campuses. At the end of this academic year, in consultation with the Academic Senate, I will further evaluate our efforts to increase salaries and retain faculty. We will determine if the current revised salary practice should remain in place or what other efforts should be taken to maintain and support the valuable resource that is our faculty.

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  
Deans and Director  
Department Managers  
Divisional Academic Personnel Coordinators