Communication from the Committee on Academic Planning & Budget, Mary Gray, MD, Chair, and the Committee on Faculty Welfare, Grayson Marshall, DDS, PhD, MPH, Chair

March 30, 2012

Robert Newcomer, PhD, Chair
Office of the Academic Senate
500 Parnassus Avenue, MUE 230
San Francisco, CA 94143-0764

Re: Committee Response to the UC Joint Taskforce on Faculty Salaries Memorandum

Dear Chair Newcomer,

As requested, the UCSF Academic Senate Committees on Academic Planning and Budget (APB) and Faculty Welfare (FW) reviewed the University of California Senate-Administration Taskforce on Faculty Salaries memorandum dated February 3, 2012. APB discussed the UC Taskforce recommendations at our regular campus meeting on March 8, 2012. APB and FW faculty members received the UC Taskforce memorandum electronically and were invited to submit their written comments and suggestions for inclusion in this response to you.

Overall Evaluation

APB and FW strongly endorse UC Taskforce recommendations (see Executive Summary). UCSF faculty members share the fundamental values and goals affirmed by the UC working group. It is essential that faculty at our Health Sciences campus maintain parity with faculty at General Campuses with respect to covered compensation under the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP). Recalculation of the Systemwide salary scales based on median campus average at each rank and step directly addresses this important goal. APB and FW understand that future availability of state funds is a crucial determinant of long-term salary policy planning. However, the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) provides ample flexibility to campus administration through its range of Academic Programmatic Unit (APU) scales and compensation components (X, X', Y, and Z) that constitute overall faculty salary. We urge UCSF administration to estimate the cost of HSCP scale adjustment immediately.

Critique of Recommendation 1

“The Taskforce is committed to the value of regular merit and CAP reviews and recommends that when faculty advance to a new rank and/or step, they move, at a minimum, to the average salary of their campus colleagues at the new rank and step. The Taskforce agrees that funding for merit actions should continue in all budget scenarios.”

UCSF faculty members are committed to regular merit and CAP reviews. APB and FW endorse the Taskforce recommendation that funding for merit actions should continue in all budget scenarios. We concur that the new HSCP scale 0 be set at the new University scale. Scale reformulation correlated to
campus averages for each rank and step at the time of merit advancement (UC Irvine Mechanism) is not required for HSCP faculty salary calculations.

Critique of Recommendation 2

“The Taskforce recommends that the Provost appoint a subsequent Taskforce to assess the particular salary issues facing UC professional schools (Law, Business, and Management in particular) where special salary scales are not meeting current needs, and recommends that he task that group with assessing the most effective salary practices for those faculty.”

APB and FW endorse the recommendation on non-Health Sciences professional salaries.

Critique of Recommendation 3

“The Taskforce proposes a return to regular scale adjustments and recommends that individual faculty salaries should be, at a minimum, at the median of University faculty at the same given rank and step. Our hallmark salary scale process presumes annual adjustments to salary, but the lack of state funds has suspended adjustments for several years. Such adjustments would allow the University to reduce the percentage of salaries that are off-scale. Taskforce consensus about this recommendation is contingent on availability of state funds.”

In all budget scenarios, faculty at our Health Sciences campus must maintain parity with faculty at General Campuses with respect to covered compensation under the University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP). According to the UC Taskforce, a new University scale (new HSCP scale 0) set at the median campus average takes into account hiring and retention actions across the system and more accurately represents competitive salaries. Appendices contain detailed information on the General Campus costs for scale adjustment. APB and FW request urgent estimation of UCSF costs for HSCP scale adjustment. Figures are needed for Senate-administration negotiations that must occur whether or not new state funds dedicated to faculty salary are available. APB and FW recognize that scale increases raise the amount of covered compensation for HSCP faculty and that such increases may lead to compensatory adjustments in future Y and Z components. Conversely, department or APU implementation strategies that reduce UCRP covered compensation for HSCP faculty must be prohibited.

Sincerely,

Subcommittee of the UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning & Budget (APB) Examining the UC Senate-Administration Taskforce on Faculty Salaries Memorandum

Mary Gray, MD, Chair
David Teitel, MD, Vice Chair
Ellen Weber, MD, Member

Subcommittee of the UCSF Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (FW) Examining the UC Senate-Administration Taskforce on Faculty Salaries Memorandum

Grayson W. (Bill) Marshall, DDS, MPH, PhD, Chair
Paul Green, PhD, Vice Chair