

December 9, 2014

Janhavi Bonville, MPP
Assistant EVCP
Executive Vice Chancellor's & Provost Office
513 Parnassus Avenue, S-115
San Francisco, CA 94143

Re: Faculty Salaries 2015-2016 & the *Total Remuneration Study*

Dear Asst EVCP Bonville:

The San Francisco Division of the University of California Academic Senate along with the Associate and Vice Deans of Academic Affairs in the four respective Schools (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy) have reviewed and discussed issues, ideas, and concerns regarding the UCOP proposal (1) to increase faculty salaries in 2015-2016 three percent, for three consecutive years, and (2) how this increase, or other measures, could lessen the salary compensation gap highlighted by the *Total Remuneration Study* (TRS), compiled by Mercer Consultants.

UCSF has around fifteen percent FTE faculty and zero faculty with off-scale salaries. The TRS focused exclusively on FTE/ladder rank faculty, and as such, didn't adequately reflect the broader situation at UC San Francisco. This campus has a large percentage of faculty in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, who were not included TRS report.

Overall, we have assessed the following concerns with the UCOP proposal:

1. Funded Mandate. While we appreciate this effort, this will only work if it is an ongoing funded mandate with funds coming from UCOP to the campuses. If the campuses are asked to match funds, this could be cost-prohibitive.
2. Faculty to Receive Increase. Any faculty salary increase should be reflected in a monthly paycheck to benefit all faculty, all series, all percent time, Senate and non-Senate, including those on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan
 - a. While we have heard repeated mention of this faculty salary increase being for all faculty, provided salary cost figures were just for FTE faculty.
 - i. We have assumed this is because information on other series wasn't available
 - ii. If UCOP is interested in generating a similar TRS report for Health Sciences Compensation Plan faculty, UCSF is happy to provide data.
3. NIH Salary Cap. UCSF has numerous faculty impacted by the NIH salary cap. Implementing an across-the-board salary raise might result in these faculty being excluded.
 - a. This presents a very specific campus issue that we would need time to explore solutions for, or create waivers around.

- b. In these particular situations, funds could go to a department—to the Y salary component—allowing faculty to use the monies for research.
4. Salary Equity. In light of the salary equity plans each campus has developed, UCSF would hope implementation of a faculty salary raises wouldn't increase pre-existing disparity or gaps but would aim to lessen them.
5. Salary Components. Any faculty salary increase should go to either the X or X' component. Further an increase in X or X' shouldn't be offset by a decrease in Y.
6. Method/Pathway for Delivery. It is unclear from information provided if these funds would be delivered through 19900 state funds, or through a blanket increase in the salary scales. Schools, divisions, and departments might have difficulty implementing if they come through state funds.
 - a. Each campus should have flexibility to implement faculty salary raises as pertains to their particular market -- however that method should be consistent across schools, departments, and divisions

The San Francisco Division of the University of California Academic Senate looks forward to developing broader recommendations regarding the creation and implementation of a three-year three percent faculty raise. We anticipate those to be completed in January 2015 after further discussion with necessary parties.

Sincerely,

Farid Chehab, PhD, 2013-15 Chair
UCSF Academic Senate