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The Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare took up the following Systemwide issues this year:

**Health Insurance Changes**
UCFW Representative Leah Karliner advised that UCOP is developing a self-insurance plan and urges employees to move to a Blue/Gold Health Plan. As UCSF has separated from the California Pacific Medical Group, this shouldn’t pose as many issues for UCSF employees. Nor should UCSF see as many changes as other campuses will.

**Response to the Systemwide Task Force on Senate Membership**
Paul Green, FW Vice Chair and Member, UCSF Academic Senate Membership Task Force on status of the task force. He read part of UCSF Academic Senate Chair Bob Newcomer’s letter on the next step for proceeding at the Systemwide level.

Several rule and policy changes for the SF Division have been proposed for non-Senate faculty (i.e. Health Science Clinical and Adjunct) to provide comparable rights and privileges afforded to Senate faculty. These include having all full-time faculty members reviewed by their peers for academic actions and all faculty being able to fully participate in voting matters pertaining to UCSF campus. In addition:

- Graduate Council is revising Regulation V to allow all faculty to be sole chairs of student committees.
- All faculty will have access to P&T processes for grievances and disciplinary actions.
- VPAA is working towards a more streamlined application process to confer Emeritus status to HS Clinical and Adjunct faculty.
- To allow recognition of those HS Clinical and Adjunct faculty who sit on Systemwide committees.
- Limited-term without-salary Senate series appointments are being discussed within CAP.
- It is being proposed that as of July 1, 2016, UCSF will apply the eight-year rule for Assistant Adjunct and HS Clinical Science faculty appointed at 100% time.

UCSF R&J Committee and Legal Affairs are reviewing these proposed changes to ensure that they conform with all Divisional and Systemwide rules.

**Salary Remuneration Report**
UCFW developed this in response to an internal UCOP Analyst Report stated that UC Faculty were doing “well.” Insufficient funds to have all survey complete this survey; for now just ladder rank faculty at general campuses will be covered. This means that salary scales will be examined.

**“Stopping the Clock” Rules**
UCFW examined other instances when time should be stopped in a faculty member’s Academic Personnel file. For Assistant Professors, you can stop the clock for child-rearing or child-bearing cases. Other such situations—caring for an ill family member (child or adult) or the loss of a spouse—were discussed as equitable reasons to stop the clock. UCSF Faculty Welfare Committee supported expanding the AP Rules to allow these additional situations to “stop the clock” if necessary. UCFW circulated a survey to UC faculty proposing other such situations and requesting feedback.

**Documents Reviewed**
Members of the UCSF Faculty Welfare Committee also reviewed UCFW documents on:
- Understanding Health Care Costs for UC Retirees on Medicare (Appendix 1)
  - UCSF FW discussed the provided materials. Members found the preliminary data confusing. Members hoped the information would be made available to everyone, perhaps posted on a website, with more explanation provided.
• Salary Equity Plans for UC Campuses (Appendix 2)
  o Members reviewed the equity plans submitted by all campuses to UCOP, in response to their call in fall 2012 to analyze gender/ethnicity issues around salary. They appreciated the thoroughness by the campuses and questioned the ability to conduct such an analysis at UCSF based on its structure. This may also be as there are fewer off-scale faculty at UCSF than other campuses. FW members hoped to see more detailed plans in the new academic year. Off-scale salaries are not allowed for compensation plan faculty members, so if there are any, they are left over from the good old days.

**Divisional Business**

This year, the Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

**Changes to 19000 Funding**
Members discussed these changes and requested the Deans respond to the Academic Senate Faculty Councils with information as to how this will impact faculty. In June 2013, Chair Green attended the SOM Faculty Council to hear Eric Vermillion, Vice Chancellor-Finance comments on the topic.

The conclusion, as presented, is that faculty are expected to fill the gap from grants before the department will step in. However nothing is presented on how to handle faculty who are hundred percent teaching and so don’t have a grants pool to pull funds from.

FW members also raised the issue of APM 190, which states “where there is a shortfall, ladder rank faculty will have salary covered.” As benefits are part of an FTE not covering them presents a violation of APM 190. Chair Green will reach out to V-P Marshall, Academic Affairs for clarification. He will also reach out to FW Chair counterparts at UCD, UCLA, and UCSD.

**Diversity Efforts**
Gordon Fung, Chair of the Senate’s EQOP Committee spoke to efforts to improve the status of underrepresented groups at UCSF. It is hoped that EQOP and Faculty Welfare will work together in the future on this topic. LGBT and disability issues aren’t part of the issues discussed by EQOP at this time.

The advancement process should be more supportive of diversity efforts to assist those not regularly exposed to underrepresented populations through their research, i.e. pathology or basic science research labs. EQOP is looking to do an orientation and develop guidelines for faculty who aren’t aware they should be highlighting these things in their CVs.

EQOP also is developing a salary equity survey addressed to all the health sciences campuses, starting with UCSF. It will focus on all the different schools (broken down by series, gender, age, and ethnicity) plus on-campus/off-campus facilities. This will create a template for the other campuses.

**Faculty Endowment Proposal**
Vice Provost Sally Marshall provided an overview of the proposed Faculty Endowment Program. The idea arose out of the 2009 Faculty Climate Survey that spoke to “salary stability” and “salary equity based on gender” as being two major concerns. The latter is largely, at present, a perception and not reality at UCSF. It is still being explored at a Systemwide level. UCSF will examine methodologies for measuring salary equity (one committee per school).

The idea of a Faculty Endowment Program may be morphed into a “Life Cycle of a Faculty Member” endowment program. This Program would result in twenty percent salary support – which could allow faculty to use that protected time in any way they choose and provide some salary stability. An
endowment of this size would need to be around $20M annually. FW members support the proposal starting at the Associate-level and up, with particular focus on promoting protected time.

**Housing Policy Changes**
Gary Forman, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Life Services gave an overview of current housing situations, current limits, and proposed new housing limits. Housing term limits were suspended in FY2009 and are now being re-implemented. Schools are pushing to have a two-year limit for professional students and to have a reserved set of housing units that are constantly rotating—so that they can be offered to incoming students. Moving forward, the following term limits were proposed:

- Five-year limit for post-docs, fellows, and professional students.
- Six-year limits for PhD students.
- Three-year limits for faculty.

After discussion, FW members agreed with the proposed limits except for the three-year limit for faculty. Instead, FW members proposed a two-year limit for faculty. (Appendix 3)

**Lab Safety Protocol and Faculty Indemnity Changes**
FW members heard several presentations on the changes to lab safety protocol as a result of the settlement in the UCLA legal matter. Compliance trainings were rolled out at a Systemwide level and implemented at UCSF by a joint team involving Associate Vice Chancellor Boyd, Compliance & Ethics, and Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost Bluestone.

Chair Green went over the current legal protection for faculty in criminal cases. UC does indemnify and defend UC employees named in civil action as long as the employee is acting in good faith and without malice. There is no such policy in criminal actions. The terms of the Regents’ settlement include three essential requirements for UC laboratories to implement between September 2012 – February 2013:

1. Adequate training
2. Detailed lab-specific Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)
3. Use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)

The settlement has been strictly applied to Departments of Chemistry. Since UCSF does not have such a Department, it has identified two analogous ones -- the Departments of Biochemistry and Biophysics (School of Medicine) and Pharmaceutical Chemistry (School of Pharmacy).

UCSF must develop a formal safety manual and chemical hygiene plan and ensure that they are maintained and that all personnel have reviewed them. UCSF must certify compliance with the state twice a year. If a violation is reported to the Vice Chancellor of Research, it must be addressed within thirty days or the campus will be fined.

FW members advised that the new requirements are labor-intensive for the faculty member requiring extensive sign-offs. They also raised issues of research staff who decline to do trainings even if they’ve been asked, and how it can take upwards of a year to get notification from EH&S that someone has finished trainings. FW members wondered if “lab insurance” or malpractice insurance could be developed. Faculty didn’t want to separately purchase it, but have it included as part of the packet included with being a faculty member.

**Risk Assessment Audit and Compliance Policies**
Associate Vice Chancellor Elizabeth Boyd, Ethics and Compliance, gave an overview on the new process for performing annual campus risk assessment come fiscal year 2014. She also explained how information collected during risk assessment will be used and answered questions about the process.
In the past, each office—ethics and compliance, audit services, clinical compliance, and risk management—did an annual individual personal risk assessment for UCOP. Moving forward, there will be a joint risk assessment which will highlight particular foci across all groups.

Examples of prior issues that surfaced from the individual audits was "effort reporting" (timeliness of reporting, systems used to capture reporting, etc.). This year, potential issues include PHS Regulation and how it fits in with APM670 and the new “Sunshine Act law” coming into effect later in 2013. AVC Boyd also commented that the new Lab Safety Training module was to be tailored for each particular lab. So only those involved with those types of pathogens, etc., would have to take the training course.

**Compliance & Risk Assessment Document**

FW members further reviewed the new Discussion of Compliance Risk Assessment and Draft Work Plan submitted by the Ethics & Compliance Office. Members appreciated being asked to review and approved as drafted.

**Space Planning**

The Chancellor’s Space Planning Committee, Chairs Jeff Bluestone, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and Bruce Wintroub, Vice Dean of the School of Medicine, is responsible for assessing the need for and assigning space resources in an effective and efficient manner. The Chancellor’s direct reports are responsible for identifying the needs of the schools and assessing the use of this space in a report to the Space Planning Committee every three years to assure the space is managed and used efficiently.

The principles that the Committee follow are:

- General space accountability and governance would require the same economic performance for the same type of space.
- Fairness, consistency, transparency, economic sustainability and strategic prioritization in the deployment of space
- Non-permanence of space allocation, retention and use. Space may be released by the school when new space is allocated, (Chancellor may retain 10% of the space for future use), or relinquished for non-use, such as program closure.
- Operation cost responsibility for space - Units will be responsible for covering the operation costs of the assigned space, approximately $90.00/sq. ft.

Current data on the use of space has been submitted by the departments/schools. Space analysis and agreement of space use will be finalized by end of year. The policy goes into effect January 1, 2013. The committee requested a tool for individual faculty to request space, noting that this function is not transparent.

**Mission Bay Academic Building**

Chair Green updated the committee members on the Mission Bay Academic Building debate. FW members wanted feedback on the HIPPA issues and just how effective the “white noise” will be in covering up conversations. FW members raised further clinical issues of receiving patient calls throughout the day, and the inability of having to reserve private rooms for such calls. FW final questions pertained to the multiple different responsibilities held by faculty – while HIPAA laws may not be violated, others might be. The Privacy Office has examined and found there is no cause for alarm.

Other issues raised include no space for bench scientists to conduct research at the new Mission Bay Academic Building. Research is to be conducted at pre-existing locations. If those spaces aren’t at the MBC, faculty will have to shuttle back to their other campus location.

**Tobacco Free at Work Policy**
The Committee reviewed the initial policy in Fall 2012 and advised Campus Life Services that as written, it couldn’t be supported. The Communication from Faculty Welfare Committee spoke to concerns about those with medical marijuana prescriptions as well as those UCSF employees who live with a smoker and in particular with how managers and faculty were to be expected to enforce this new policy. Overall, committee members felt the new policy was unnecessary.

A revised policy was circulated to the campus-at-large in July 2013, in preparation for its implementation on September 3, 2013. Faculty Welfare Committee members noted that the medical marijuana mention had been removed from the policy and that in general the policy’s tone was more muted. FW Chair Green still advised CLS that the Academic Senate and the FW Committee within it couldn’t support this policy as it remained.

Communication between the Senate and Campus Life Services continued over the summer. At the time of report drafting, the FW Committee still didn’t support the policy as written. However the new policy was implemented anyway.

**Going Forward**

Ongoing issues under review or actions that the Committee will continue into 2013-2014.

- Senate Membership Task Force
- Health Care Costs
- Space Planning

**Appendices**

- **Appendix 1**: Understanding Health Care Costs for UC Retirees on Medicare
- **Appendix 2**: Salary Equity Plans for UC Campuses
- **Appendix 3**: Communication from the Committee on Faculty Welfare to Campus Life, Facilities, and Administrative Services on the Proposed Changes in Housing Policy

Senate Staff:
Alison Cleaver, Senior Analyst
alison.cleaver@ucsf.edu; 415.476.3808
Understanding medical health care costs for UC retirees in Medicare
(February 21, 2013)

Joel E. Dimsdale, M.D.¹
jdimsdale@ucsd.edu

This document was prepared to help University of California retirees understand health care costs. Retiree health care costs are distributed in three main buckets—costs for Medicare, costs for UC medical coverage, and out-of-pocket costs (co-pays, deductibles, etc). For retirement planning, employees and retirees should consider all sets of costs.

1. Medicare:
If you have Medicare, your Part A (in-patient coverage) comes with no costs to you if you qualify for premium-free Medicare². The standard Part B (out-patient coverage) cost is ~$105/month in 2013 and is payable to Social Security. Generally, UC medical plans coordinate the Part D (drug coverage) portion of the Medicare plan with the medical plan. For Medicare Part D (drug coverage), you normally will not incur charges unless you have MAGI >$85,000, in which case you will pay additional costs.

Many people have their Medicare cost deducted from their Social Security benefit and others are billed directly by Social Security. However, if your Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI) as reported on your IRS tax return from 2 years ago (2011) is >$85,000, you will incur additional costs, referred to by the Social Security Administration and Medicare as an Income-Related Income Adjustment Amount (IRMAA). These extra MAGI-associated costs can be substantial (see next page).

2. UC Medical Plans coordinated with Medicare
UC offers a number of medical plans, including Medicare-coordinated plans. These plans in essence cover the gaps between Medicare parts A and B. The maximum UC contribution, which is calculated separately for Medicare retirees and pre-Medicare retirees, is based on a weighted average of the gross premiums based on enrollments in the previous year, and takes into account the standard Medicare Part B premium. In 2013, the maximum UC contribution covers 83% (on average) of the gross premium (including the standard Part B premium), provided the retiree is not subject to graduated eligibility³. The maximum UC contribution will decrease over the next few years to 70% for both Medicare and pre-Medicare retirees.

If the maximum UC retiree health contribution (after any reduction for graduated eligibility, if applicable) is greater than the rate for the Medicare-coordinated plan you selected, then the difference is used to reimburse you for all or a portion of the standard Medicare Part B premium. The reimbursement is credited to your monthly pension benefit. The University has no control over the premiums that Medicare charges for Part B coverage. Additionally, due to the timing of Medicare premium announcements, the maximum UC Medicare Part B reimbursement is generally based on the preceding year’s Medicare Part B premium. Thus, for 2013, the maximum UC Medicare Part B reimbursement is $99.90, which was the standard Medicare Part B premium for 2012 (as opposed to $104.90 which is the 2013 part B premium).

¹ The author acknowledges the many colleagues who have helped develop this document.
² You may qualify through your own work record; or the work record of a spouse, former spouse or deceased spouse, who has worked full time 40 quarters and paid Medicare taxes during that period.
³ Graduated eligibility is determined by date of hire, years of service, and age at retirement. For details see University of California Retirement Handbook.
The UC retiree health contribution costs are levied to each campus on the basis of projected UC retiree health payments for the year divided by the system-wide UCRP Covered Compensation of all active employees over the same time period. In 2012, the amount charged to each campus was 2.76% of its UCRP Covered Compensation.

The Medicare Part B and Part D rates are greatly influenced by an individual’s MAGI. The following table provides the MAGI additional costs for 2013. It is uncertain how much MAGI will increase in subsequent years. For instance, Professor Smith’s individual tax returns show a MAGI of $150,000. Using the table below, one sees that Smith would have a part B monthly charge of $239.70 ($104.90 + $104.90 + $29.90).

### 2013 Medicare Part B and Part D Costs (IRMAA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income as reported on 2011 IRS Tax Return</th>
<th>Part B monthly premium amount/person</th>
<th>Part D monthly premium amount/person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard premium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Your plan premium</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with a MAGI of $85,000 or less</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples with a MAGI of $170,000 or less</td>
<td>Standard premium = $104.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with a MAGI above $85,000 up to $107,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples with a MAGI above $170,000 up to $214,000</td>
<td>Standard premium + $42.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with a MAGI above $107,000 up to $160,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Your plan premium + $11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples with a MAGI above $214,000 up to $320,000</td>
<td>Standard premium + $104.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with a MAGI above $160,000 up to $214,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Your plan premium + $29.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples with a MAGI above $320,000 up to $428,000</td>
<td>Standard premium + $167.80</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with a MAGI above $214,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Your plan premium + $48.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples with a MAGI above $428,000</td>
<td>Standard premium + $230.80</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The above table presents the additional costs for Medicare Part B and Part D based on the Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI) as reported on the 2011 IRS Tax Return. The costs are calculated according to the Income as reported on 2011 IRS Tax Return table provided.*
Illustrative Five-Year Projected Costs for UC Medical Coverage

It is difficult to summarize all contingencies. The following analyses pertain to Member only insurance rates for an individual retiree who is eligible for the full UC contribution towards health insurance cost. To simplify it further, the table only provides cost information for Kaiser and Anthem Plus. Furthermore, the table forecasts anticipated costs in the next few years, using anticipated health care premium costs, assumptions about retiree choice of insurance plans, etc. The table does not include any MAGI charges.

The table below provides the projected Medicare retiree contributions under Kaiser and Anthem Plus, based on the expected UC contribution policy (declining 3% per year) and the medical trend rate assumptions from the July 1, 2012 valuation report. These valuation assumptions do not take into consideration the actual 2013 Part B premium rates ($104.90 for the standard premium), nor other plans available now or in the future. Note that as the contribution percentage declines, Medicare members enrolled in Kaiser are expected to eventually have a net Part B contribution.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Max UC Contribution</th>
<th>Kaiser</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Anthem Plus</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max UC Contribution</td>
<td>UC Plan Contribution</td>
<td>UC Part B Contribution (credit back)</td>
<td>Retiree Plan Contribution</td>
<td>Retiree Net Part B Contribution</td>
<td>UC Plan Contribution</td>
<td>UC Part B Contribution (credit back)</td>
<td>Retiree Plan Contribution</td>
<td>Retiree Net Part B Contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>83% Policy</td>
<td>$346.72</td>
<td>$217.93</td>
<td>$99.90</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$340.23</td>
<td>$6.49</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$93.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>80% Policy</td>
<td>$371.65</td>
<td>$256.07</td>
<td>$106.89</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$370.85</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$106.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>77% Policy</td>
<td>$395.25</td>
<td>$295.76</td>
<td>$99.49</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14.67</td>
<td>$395.25</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$7.12</td>
<td>$114.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>74% Policy</td>
<td>$417.38</td>
<td>$337.16</td>
<td>$80.22</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$41.48</td>
<td>$417.38</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$17.18</td>
<td>$121.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 For instance, row 1 illustrates that UC will contribute up $346.72/month for individual coverage in 2013. The university pays Kaiser a premium of $217.93 and adds back into the pension check the monthly part B premium of $99.90. The retiree pays nothing. For Anthem Plus, the university pays that $340.23 premium and credits the pension check $6.49. The retiree does not need to contribute to medical cost. However, the retiree does wind up paying $93.41 ($99.90 - $6.49) for Part B coverage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>71% Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$434.87</td>
<td>$374.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2013 – Retiree Costs for Part B and Part D and UC Medical

Putting it all together, the following tables illustrate the combined costs of Medicare + MAGI as well as UC coverage. The tables indicate the general principles for retirees enrolled in single-party Medicare with different MAGI for two plans: Anthem Plus and Kaiser. For couples where both members are on Medicare, the MAGI thresholds are doubled.

Monthly individual premiums for 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAGI &lt;$85000</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Part B</th>
<th>Part D</th>
<th>UC plan</th>
<th>Total (see page 3 for credit back)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthem Plus</td>
<td>$104.90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104.90 - credit back to retiree of ($6.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>$104.90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$104.90 - credit back to retiree of ($99.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAGI between $85,000 and $107,000</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Part B</th>
<th>Part D</th>
<th>UC plan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthem Plus</td>
<td>$146.90</td>
<td>$11.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$158.50 - credit back to retiree of ($6.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>$146.90</td>
<td>$11.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$158.50 - credit back to retiree of ($99.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAGI between $107,000 and $160,000</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Part B</th>
<th>Part D</th>
<th>UC plan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthem Plus</td>
<td>$209.80</td>
<td>$29.90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$239.70 - credit back to retiree of ($6.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>$209.80</td>
<td>$29.90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$239.70 - credit back to retiree of ($99.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAGI between $160,000 and $214,000</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Part B</th>
<th>Part D</th>
<th>UC plan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthem Plus</td>
<td>$272.70</td>
<td>$48.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$321.00 - credit back to retiree of ($6.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>$272.70</td>
<td>$48.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$321.00 - credit back to retiree of ($99.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAGI &gt;$214,000</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Part B</th>
<th>Part D</th>
<th>UC plan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthem Plus</td>
<td>$335.70</td>
<td>$66.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$402.30 - credit back to retiree of ($6.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>$335.70</td>
<td>$66.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$402.30 - credit back to retiree of ($99.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The tables above illustrate costs for retirees with different MAGI. It is assumed that most faculty members would fall in the first 3 groups, but some longtime highly compensated faculty and/or individuals working after retiring from UC may fall in the final two groups.
MEMORANDUM
ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Date: February 25, 2013

To: Provost and Executive Vice President Aimée Dorr
Academic Council Chair Robert Powell

From: Vice Provost Susan Carlson

Re: Campus Faculty Salary Equity Plans ready for review

As you know, President Yudof requested that each campus develop a plan for conducting regular faculty salary equity reviews and communicated his directions in a letter to the Chancellors dated September 11, 2012 (attached). The letter asked that each Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost submit a campus plan to Provost Dorr by November 15, 2012, a deadline later moved to January 15, 2013 by Provost Dorr. We received the tenth campus plan last week.

The next step is for you, Bob, to work with the appropriate Senate Committees to review the plans and to let Provost Dorr have your feedback as quickly as is possible. I know that UCAAD is planning to assist in the review. The Provost set April 1 as the previous deadline for approving plans or suggesting amendments (based on the January 15 due date), but since some of the plans were late in getting to us, I am suggesting that we make May 1, 2013 the new deadline for a decision about moving ahead with approval or with agreement on needed amendments. I would suggest that means we need input from the committees, via you, by mid-April. That gives you, Aimée, and me a chance to talk before May 1.

President Yudof’s memo requested that each campus plan include the following:

- administrators and faculty committees who will be involved in the faculty salary analysis;
- period of salary equity review (annual, biannual, other);
- units to be studied;
- plans for addressing and reporting any pattern of discriminatory salary differences; and
- methodology employed.

The President also agreed that campuses could continue salary equity studies in place at the time of the request.

Enclosed are the 10 plans as well as a summary chart—prepared by Academic Personnel staff—of the plans and their responses to the President’s request for various components in a plan. Please let me know if you have any questions as you move ahead with this review of the plans.

Enclosures: Faculty Salary Equity Plans Summary
Portfolio of campus plans (including September 11, 2012 memo from President to Chancellors)
## Faculty Salary Equity Plans Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Personnel Involved in Faculty Salary Analysis</th>
<th>Faculty Committees</th>
<th>Period of Review</th>
<th>Units to Be Studied and Methodology</th>
<th>Plan for Addressing and Reporting Discriminatory Salary Differences</th>
<th>Continuing Current Studies Analyzing Salary Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Berkeley | Six member joint Senate-administration steering committee (membership may change over the project's course; additional faculty, staff or administrators may also be consulted) | *Senate Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations*  
*Senate Committee on Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities representative*  
*Additional faculty member with relevant expertise*  
*Dr. Marc Goulden, Director, Data Initiatives, Office for Faculty Equity and Welfare*  
*Vice Chancellor, Equity and Inclusion (ex officio)* | Initial Study/Report to be completed January 2015, then updated every three years | *Steering committee will develop Study methodology, determining what unit-level(s) analysis*  
*Dr. Goulden will conduct preliminary studies, as needed* | *Divisional Senate Chair will broadly disseminate Report and post to the Office for Faculty Equity and Welfare website*  
*Provost responsible for implementation (authority may be delegated to the Vice Provost for Faculty)*  
*Implementation dependent upon faculty, Chairs, staff, Senate committees or various administrators*  
*Per steering committee recommendations, campus policies, practices, guidelines or programs will be revised, accordingly* |

| Davis | UC Davis Salary Equity Task Force (membership TBD) | TBD | TBD | *Initially, decomposition of salary variables into five groups (e.g., summer salary, off-scale salary, grant-funded salary, etc.)*  
*Standardize each faculty member's salary within an appropriate comparison unit*  
*For in-depth analysis of relative salary for sub-disciplines, the Dean (where the primary appointment is held) will identify units of analysis*  
*Demographic factors and market pressures* | *Task Force charges:*  
1. Develop a plan for ensuring that campus policies, procedures and guidelines are as gender and ethnic-neutral as possible re faculty compensation  
2. Recommendations for variables used in models for predicting salaries based on faculty performance; long term goal is the development of practices enhancing faculty diversity and faculty success  
3. Recommendations re methods for comparing faculty performance across academic disciplines  
4. Recommendations for minimizing conflicts of interest  
5. Develop implementation timeline re analyses and recommendations  
6. Delimitate principles re the distribution of the UCD faculty equity salary analyses  
*Provost and Divisional Senate Chair will widely disseminate the committee report; post on the Provost's website* |

| Irvine | *Continue campus programs (annual campus pay equity analysis, UCI ADVANCE Program for Faculty and Senate committee of salary equity)*  
*These continuing campus programs include central administration, campus ADVANCE Program, Deans, Department Chairs, faculty equity advisors and faculty*  
*Senate Council on Academic Personnel ("CAP") conducted 2009/10 and 2010/11 faculty salary assessments but assessment discontinued last year. CAP concluded that campus salary scales reflect UCI market salaries. CAP will continue occasionally commenting on salary issues raised in the review file.* | *Senate CAP*  
*Senate Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom* | Annually (since 1997-98) | *Campus Pay Equity Study*  
1. Ladder rank faculty on active pay status in October of each academic year; excludes fulltime Faculty Administrations; using AAUP methodology  
2. No reporting of aggregate residual by academic unit; presents the number of positive and negative residuals in $5,000 ranges within a unit  
*ADVANCE Program for Faculty Equity and Diversity (no unit information)*  
* Academic Senate Salary Analyses*  
1. CAP assessment of ladder rank salary equity (general campus), jointly with CAP evaluation of faculty productivity with merit and promotion review  
2. In 2009, CFW analyzed faculty salaries from 1998-2008 for campus-wide systemic differences in starting salaries and salary increases (over time), based on gender and ethnicity (no significant disparity found) | *Continuing programs (annual campus pay equity analysis, UCI ADVANCE Program and Faculty and Senate committee of salary equity) address faculty salary equity issues*  
*Committed to addressing potential inequity issues via campus-wide study or individual cases*  
*Campus Pay Equity Study posted on the Academic Personnel website; findings reported since 1997-98; salary residuals for individual faculty members provided to Deans and administrators participating in faculty salary decisions; individual faculty can calculate predicted salaries using the published formula for each academic unit*  
*Senate salary analyses are posted on the campus senate website* |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Personnel Involved in Faculty Salary Analysis</th>
<th>Faculty Committees</th>
<th>Period of Review</th>
<th>Units to Be Studied and Methodology</th>
<th>Plan for Addressing and Reporting Discriminatory Salary Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Los Angeles  | Nine member joint Senate-administration steering committee (membership may change over the project’s course; additional faculty, staff or administrators may also be consulted)     | *Senate Council on Academic Personnel  
*Senate Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity representative  
*Two additional faculty member with relevant expertise (appointed by the Executive Vice Chancellor (“EVC”) in consultation with the Senate)  
*Christine Littleton, Vice Provost, Faculty Diversity and Development  
*Lynn Gordon, Associate Dean, Diversity, SOM  
*Albert Glover, Director, Academic Affairs, SOM  
*Associate Director, Research and Analysis, Office of Diversity and Faculty Development | Initial Study/Report to be completed January 2015, then updated every 3 years | *Steering committee will develop Study methodology, including determining what units will be studied (e.g., school, division)  
*Associate Director will head the Study  
*Associate Director will conduct preliminary studies, as needed | *Broad dissemination of report by Senate Chair and posted to the Office for Faculty Diversity and Development website  
*Report will describe and interpret key findings of the Study and as a result, may recommend changes to campus policies or practices  
*Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel is responsible for addressing patterns of discriminatory salary differences identified in the Report |
| Merced       | Six member joint administrative Senate Faculty Equity Study steering committee                                | *Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare  
*Senate CAP                                                                  | Initial Study and Report to be completed January 2015, then updated every 3 years | *Steering committee will develop methodology  
*Due to small size of campus, at minimum, salary comparison by gender, ethnicity, rank and discipline  
*Steering committee may also head a CAP audit, identifying potential discrepancies in personnel recommendations and decisions re academic compensation, hiring, promotion at each review level (Unit, Dean etc.)  
*All ladder rank faculty, including those holding concurrent administrative appointments, on the payroll as of November 2013, will be included in the analysis | *Finding will be transparent and accessible to the campus  
*Campus will address any patterns of salary differences identified |
| Riverside    | Eight member committee of faculty, administrators and staff, appointed by the EVC and Provost (membership may change over the project’s course; additional faculty, staff or administrators at times may also be consulted)  
*(Co-Chair)Vice Provost, Academic Personnel  
*(Co-Chair)Associate Vice Chancellor (“AVC”), Diversity, Equity and Inclusion  
*Senate representatives (3)  
*Associate Vice Provost, Faculty Success, Equity and Diversity  
*Academic Personnel Office representative  
*Affirmative Action Office representative | TBD which committees will be represented                                  | Initial Study completed January 2015, then every other year | *Steering committee will develop methodology; incorporating compensation analysis by the Affirmative Action Office for OFCCP compliance | *Narrative of key findings of the Report and committee recommendation will be submitted to the EVCP and provided to the campus community |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Personnel Involved</th>
<th>Faculty Committees</th>
<th>Period of Review</th>
<th>Units to Be Studied and Methodology</th>
<th>Plan for Addressing and Reporting Discriminatory Salary Differences</th>
<th>Continuing Current Studies Analyzing Salary Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| San Diego | * Professor MacCubbins (developed methodology for 2006/07 Study and basis for continuing model)  
* Professor Bitmead (former AVC, Academic Personnel) (conducted the 2006/07 and 2011/12 Studies) | *Senate CAP  
*Senate Task Force on Faculty Rewards  
*Gender Equity Task Force | * Initial Study: 2006/07  
* 2011/12 most recent  
* 7/1/13 goal for publishing next Study results  
* At least very five years | *Study methodology  
1. Based on the 2001/02 Senate/Administration Gender Equity Task Force and endorsed by the UCSD Senate  
2. Regression model  
a. Fitted by division and department to salary data for a number of years by nonlinear regression variables (years since highest degree and years at UCSD) used to produce predicted salaries for comparison with actual faculty salaries, determining residual for each faculty member (differences between the actual and predicted salaries)  
b. Faculty members with a negative residual (faculty member's salary is lower than the salary predicted for the average faculty member with the same regression variables) and falling 10% or more below the predicted salary (some exceptions) are "flagged" for further analysis  
* Units studied: general campus and Scripps Institution of Oceanography faculty  
* Campus also addresses faculty salary equity issues through an annual Affirmative Action Program Analysis, based on recruitment, advancements, separations and compensation criteria | * Study purpose:  
1. Regularly monitor faculty salaries and objectively ensuring salaries of a disproportionate number of women or underrepresented minorities are not below the consistently applied model  
2. One screening tool for identifying faculty salaries that may require further analysis, not addressed by using the regression model (i.e., academic reasons)  
* Study results posted on the Academic Personnel website (individual salaries kept confidential)  
1. Process format for publically reporting Study results—in process; likely will follow UCI reporting format  
2. Post by 7/1/13  
* Various levels and methods of review of results are planned, including administrators and CAP. Campus will also continue annual Affirmative Action Program analysis along with attending to career equity reviews. |
| San Francisco | Eleven member joint Senate-administration steering committee (membership may change over the project's course; additional faculty, staff or administrators at times may also be consulted)  
* Vice Provost, Academic Affairs (Project Lead)  
* Senate's EQOP Committee representative  
* Senate's Faculty Welfare Committee representative  
* Senate's CAP representative  
* Assistant Vice Provost, Academic Affairs  
* Vice Chancellor, Diversity and Outreach  
* Vice or Associate Dean for Academic Affairs from each school (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy)  
* Academic Data Coordinator, VPAA Office | * Senate Equal Opportunity Program ("EQOP") Committee  
* Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare  
* Senate CAP | Initial Study to be completed October 2014; first Report by January 2015, then updated every 3 years | * Each of the four professional schools will study by gender and ethnicity, negotiated salaries (X + Y) plus stipends  
* Data provided by the Vice Provost's office as of 7/1/14 and subsequent July 1 every 3 years  
* Methodology for each school's study will be developed by the school  
* Steering committee will approved all methodology | * Report will be posted on Academic Affairs website  
* Report will identify key findings of the studies and recommend changes in campus or school polices or practices |
| Santa Barbara | TBD | * Gender Equity Advisory Group (convened by Senate)  
* Senate Committee on Diversity and Equity (reviewed and feedback is incorporated into subsequent analyses) | [Assume yearly], stated that 2012 was the ninth year of campus analysis | * AAUP methodology used  
2012 Study: Ladder-rank faculty on active pay status (academic year salaries) (based on 10/1/12 payroll and personnel data and Academic Personnel data); data considered as a whole then divided by Colleges or Divisions | Administration will continue to use results of analysis, specifically reasons for large negative residuals, in faculty academic personnel cases |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Personnel Involved in Faculty Salary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Sevent member implementation committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Vice Provost, Academic Affairs (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Senate Committee on Academic Personnel representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Senate Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Director, Academic Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Director, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Analyst, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Committees</th>
<th>Period of Review</th>
<th>Units to Be Studied and Methodology</th>
<th>Plan for Addressing and Reporting Discriminatory Salary Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Complete analysis by the end of fall 2013, for discussion winter 2014; develop and implement plans addressing study finding issues by end of 2014</td>
<td>*No period of review defined</td>
<td>*CFW recently completed a study of faculty salaries and ladder rank advancement; comparing advancement and salary growth with service years and time since degree (individually and by department)</td>
<td>By the end of 2014, develop and implement plans address study findings issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by Academic Personnel, February 2013
CHANCELLORS

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing to ask you to implement a series of actions on your campus to address issues of faculty salary equity. This is the culmination of a review process that began with a report on faculty salary equity issued by the Senate in July 2011.

Provost Dorr discussed the recommendations with the Council of Vice Chancellors on July 26 and their input was an important factor in finalizing the actions. I am asking you to take the following actions on your campus:

- Each campus will determine the administrators and faculty committees who will be involved in the faculty salary analysis; the period of salary equity reviews (annual, biannual, other); the units to be studied; plans for addressing and reporting any pattern of discriminatory salary differences; and the methodology to be employed. Campuses may elect to continue current studies that are already analyzing salary equity and they may choose to make this analysis a part of standard reports, like the academic Affirmative Action report, as appropriate. Findings should be transparent and accessible to the campus.

- The campus Executive Vice Chancellor/Provosts will share these campus plans with Provost Dorr and Chair Powell by November 15, 2012. Provost Dorr will suggest any amendments to campus plans by February 15, 2013, with input from Chair Powell.

- As a part of this effort, some campuses will be continuing current salary equity studies. All campuses should have produced at least one salary equity study by January 2015. Studies will be available to the Divisional Senate and the UC Provost.

- I expect campuses to address any pattern of discriminatory salary differences that are uncovered through such studies and to examine individual outlier cases in their full context.
There will be a review of the salary equity study analyses to take place in 2018, five years after the reports begin, coordinated by the UC Provost and the Academic Council Chair. A decision should be made at that time about the usefulness of continuing the studies.

I enclose several background documents for your information, including:


- My letter of January 23, 2012 to Chair Anderson, containing my response to the report, along with a summary of your campus responses and two independent studies of the Senate report commissioned by the Office of the President (UCOP).

- Chair Anderson’s summary of Academic Council recommendations and his transmittal of the final, full recommendations from University Committee on Academic Affairs and Diversity (UCAAD).

- My letter of September 11 to Chair Powell, with my outline of the steps the University will take to provide review of faculty salary equity.

- If you would like to receive a copy of specific responses from each campus submitted earlier in the process, Vice Provost Carlson will be happy to provide you with them. Provost Dorr will be responsible for administering the Office of the President’s role in these actions. You may direct questions to her or to Vice Provost Carlson.

I appreciate your attention to this important issue.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mark G. Yudof
President

Enclosures

cc: Academic Council Chair Powell
    Academic Council Vice Chair Jacob
    Provost Dorr
    Vice Provost Carlson
CHANCELLORS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR POWELL

Dear Colleagues:

Several campuses have requested an extension on the November 15, 2012 deadline for submitting campus plans on conducting faculty salary equity studies (see initial request, attached). To meet these needs, I am extending the deadline for submitting plans to January 15, 2013. Senate Chair Powell and I will then review these plans by April 1, 2013. We still expect campuses to have completed a first study by January 2015.

Cordially,

Aimée Dorr
Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs

Attachment

cc: Executive Vice Chancellors
    Academic Council Vice Chair Jacob
    Vice Provosts, Academic Personnel
    Vice Provost Carlson
UC Berkeley
January 10, 2013

Aimee Dorr
Provost & Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs Department
University of California, Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Provost Dorr:

On behalf of EVCP Breslauer, I am pleased to submit UC Berkeley’s plan for a study of faculty salaries by gender and ethnicity. We look forward to learning the results of your review of our plan.

Thank you for your work on behalf of identifying questions in this important realm.

Regards,

[Signature]

Janet Broughton
Vice Provost for the Faculty

cc: EVCP George Breslauer, UC Berkeley
    Vice Provost Susan Carlson, UC Office of the President
Study of Salaries by Gender and Ethnicity
UC Berkeley Plan
January 2013

Berkeley’s Senate Division and Administration will collaborate in producing (1) a Study and (2) a Report based upon the Study. At the request of the Provost, the Vice Provost for the Faculty will have the lead responsibility for this project.

**Personnel.** The project will be carried out by a joint Senate-Administration steering committee with the following composition:

- A representative from the Senate’s Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations.
- A representative from the Senate’s Committee on the Status of Women & Ethnic Minorities.
- An additional faculty member with relevant expertise.
- The Vice Provost for the Faculty (committee chair).
- Dr. Marc Goulden, director of data initiatives in the Office for Faculty Equity and Welfare.
- The Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion *(ex officio).*

The membership of the steering committee may turn over during the multi-year period of its work. The committee may wish to consult additional faculty, staff, or administrators at various stages.

**Study.** The steering committee will develop the methodology for the Study. Among the methodological questions that the committee will answer is the question at what unit-level (or unit-levels) analyses should be developed. The Study will be executed by Dr. Goulden in accordance with the methodology developed by the steering committee. He will also conduct any preliminary studies that may be needed.

**Report.** The steering committee will also be responsible for producing a Report based upon the findings of the Study. The Vice Provost for the Faculty will have primary responsibility for drafting the Report. The Report will describe and interpret the key findings of the Study and recommend any changes in campus policies, practices, guidelines, or programs that it deems advisable. In addition, it may draw upon other pertinent studies of faculty salary and advancement, and it may conduct individual interviews with faculty in order to illuminate key findings. The Report will be broadly disseminated by the Divisional Chair of the Senate and made available on the website of the Office for Faculty Equity and Welfare.

**Outcomes.** Depending upon what the steering committee recommends, the outcome of the Study and the Report may entail changes in specific campus policies, practices, guidelines, or programs. While implementation may depend upon actions taken by faculty, chairs, staff, Senate committees, or various administrators, responsibility for implementation will rest with the Provost, who may delegate that responsibility to the Vice Provost for the Faculty.

**Timelines.** The first Study will be completed by January 2015, along with the attendant Report. Completion will occur close to that deadline to ensure that the Study incorporates all the results of Berkeley's current Targeted Decoupling Initiative (TDI), which adds off-scale increments to the salaries of high-performing faculty members who are undercompensated relative to the “market.” The effective dates of TDI awards in this three-year program are 7/1/12, 7/1/13, and
7/1/14. Late cases may mean that final decisions about some awards will spill into the start of the fall semester of 2014.

The effects of any changes to policy or practice may be hard to detect after just one or two years, given the timing of academic personnel reviews. Thus Berkeley would plan to prepare new studies every three years in order to have a solid basis for evaluating the effectiveness of any changes to policy, practice, guidelines, or programs.
UC Davis
Charge
The Provost and the Chair of the Davis Division of the Faculty Senate have charged the UC Davis Salary Equity Task Force to develop a plan that: (1) describes patterns of salary disparity between genders and among ethnicities, (2) for equity and retention, identifies high-performing faculty members who are receiving less off-scale than their colleagues, (3) makes the findings from future salary equity studies available to the public and to the university community, (4) proposes campus policies, procedures, and practices for ensuring that gender and ethnicity are playing as little role as possible in determining compensation for our faculty, and (5) establishes timelines for implementation of the analyses and recommendations.

The charge to the Task Force is not to conduct the salary equity analyses but, rather to develop a blueprint for analyzing and addressing salary disparities between genders and among ethnicities if analyses of salaries find that such disparities are a function of non-performance factors.

Structure of the Plan
The plan document will begin with an affirmation of UC Davis' values regarding salary equity and minimization of salary disparities due to gender and race. Next, the document will briefly summarize the historical context for the work of the Task Force (e.g., directions from the UC Office of the President and UC Academic Council), followed by legal definitions and considerations regarding salary disparities due to gender or race.

Remaining sections of the report are as follows:

Conceptual definitions of salary variables to be studied: To understand the conceptual underpinnings of salary, we will propose a decomposition of total salary into: (1) academic year and/or per month salary, (2) off-scale salary, (3) summer salary, (4) grant-funded salary, and (5) additional salary components included in the UC Davis Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP). These HSCP salary components include a market-based multiplier of the salary base (determined by the faculty member's "Academic Programmatic Unit" [APU]) and incentive salary components based on clinical activity and extramural funding.

Demographic factors impacting faculty salary: Salary scales and the use of off-scale salary have changed markedly over time. Moreover, salary increases with a faculty member's seniority. To factor out the effects of such variables, and to enhance our ability to detect disparities within similar faculty cohorts, we propose using a "baseline" model for predicting faculty salaries that, in addition to gender and ethnicity, will include demographic factors unrelated to faculty performance such as years since appointment and years between terminal degree and appointment. One aim will be to test for potential interactions between gender and ethnicity in influencing faculty salary, although formal analyses of such interactions will be limited by small sample sizes, especially when using many categories of ethnicity.

Units of analysis for salary comparisons: Salaries and salary scales vary substantially among disciplines and sub-disciplines. To facilitate analyses across such disparate scales, we therefore propose that each faculty member's salary (or salary-determining component; see below) be "standardized" within an
appropriate “comparison unit.” Importantly, using different comparison units allows tests of various hypotheses about factors contributing to variance in faculty salary. Any analysis of faculty salary disparities must therefore include a justification of the appropriate comparison unit. For whole-campus analyses, schools, colleges, or divisions may be the most appropriate units for salary comparisons. Salary disparities detected in such coarse-grained analyses may in part reflect the effects of variation in the choice of sub-disciplines between genders and among ethnicities. For finer-grained analyses of relative salary within sub-disciplines, we believe that the units of analysis will be best identified by the dean of the college/school/division where the faculty member holds his/her primary academic appointment. Examples of such comparison units are the academic department or the APU (in the case of the UC Davis Health System).

Standardization of salaries and predictor variables: Disciplines and academic units may vary in the seniority of their new hires, in their use of off-scale salary to meet market forces, and in the rate at which they advocate merit advancement for their faculty members (and the rate at which their faculty seek merit advancement). The Task Force therefore believes it will be useful to devise methods to permit comparison of relative salaries (including their decomposed elements referred to above), as well as factors that predict salaries (e.g., rate of progression through the academic personnel system), across faculty members within various academic units. This requires standardization of variables such as transforming data into percentile figures, simple deviations from comparison unit means, and/or standardized (i.e., z) deviation scores.

Faculty performance-related factors impacting salary: In its purest form, compensation theory leads to the prediction that a faculty member’s salary will be determined by market pressure, which in turn should be dictated largely by performance. There is potentially much to be learned by developing data collection systems and analyses that explore the impact of various “performance” variables on faculty salaries. In this context, the Task Force distinguishes between “aspirational” versus “feasible” models for predicting salary based on faculty performance. An aspirational model would include any performance-related predictors that could conceivably impact salaries without respect to availability of data, limitations of computational resources, or constraints on staff resources. Feasible models, on the other hand, would use existing data sources and would aim to carry out analyses within existing data and within computational and staff constraints. For future consideration, and for the longer-term development of practices that will enhance the diversity and success of our faculty, the Task Force will provide recommendations for variables to be included in both aspirational and feasible models.

Policy and practice recommendations: We will provide recommendations about possible methods that allow comparisons of faculty performance across academic fields. Although we are mindful of faculty performance metrics used in the existing academic personnel process, we believe that academic units should be urged to develop their own methods and metrics for assessing faculty performance that minimize the impacts of unconscious bias in salary decisions. For example, academic units may wish to develop academic discipline-calibrated measures regarding faculty research impact (e.g., units may differ regarding the extent they rely on citation analyses, etc.). Furthermore, regarding the University’s analysis of faculty salary disparities, we will provide recommendations that minimize possible conflicts of interest. For example, we believe that it may be advantageous for the actual salary analyses to be carried out by persons who are not members of the faculty or the administration (e.g., carried out by a post-doc in statistics).

The committee’s report will be broadly disseminated by the Provost and Divisional Chair of the Senate and made available on the website of the Office of the Provost. The Task Force will also outline the basic principles to be followed for regular dissemination of results of faculty salary equity analyses conducted at UC Davis.
Future standing committee and timelines: Further recommendations will include the composition of a future standing administration-faculty senate committee on salary equity. The committee may draw upon other pertinent studies of faculty salary and it may conduct interviews with faculty and/or outside experts to sharpen the analytical plan. The first findings will be completed by January 2015.
UC Irvine
Aimée Dorr  
Provost and Executive Vice President  
Academic Affairs  
Office of the President  
1111 Franklin Street, 11th Floor  
Oakland, CA  94607-5200

Re: Campus Faculty Salary Equity Studies  

Dear Provost Dorr:

Faculty salary equity remains a priority at UC Irvine. We are committed to ensuring equity by addressing potential inequities that are raised either by results of a campus-wide study or by individual cases. We continue to address faculty salary equity issues with the following campus programs:  
   - Annual campus pay equity analysis  
   - UCI ADVANCE Program for Faculty Equity & Diversity  
   - Senate committee assessment of salary equity  
These programs include participation by central administration, the Academic Senate Council on Academic Personnel, the campus ADVANCE Program, Deans, Department Chairs, faculty equity advisors and the faculty themselves.

**Campus Pay Equity Study**  
UC Irvine (UCI) conducts an annual campus pay equity study, reporting its findings since 1997-98 on the Academic Personnel website at: [http://www.ap.uci.edu/Equity/studies/index.html](http://www.ap.uci.edu/Equity/studies/index.html). The methodology used in the UCI study applies the same model recommended by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP)—a linear regression which relies on quantifiable objective measures such as highest level of degree, year of degree, and UCI regular rank hire date. The source of data analyzed in the UCI study includes only ladder rank faculty members who were on active pay status in October of each academic year and excludes full-time faculty administrators.

Since this model relies solely on quantifiable objective measures and does not take into account any subjective measures of quality, such as merit or market variability in specific academic disciplines, conclusions regarding differential treatment by gender or by ethnicity should not be
based strictly on the salaries predicted by these equations. For this reason, UC Irvine presents the results of its study as follows.

Rather than reporting an aggregate residual\(^1\) by academic unit, the UC Irvine study presents the number of positive and negative residuals in $5,000 ranges within a unit. This presentation provides an overall picture of how the salaries of women and minority faculty compare to those of white male faculty members with similar attributes. Displaying the residuals in this manner does not mislead one to a conclusion that faculty salaries differ dependent upon gender or ethnicity, without delving further into why the salary is different. For instance, in some schools there are a large number of senior level (above-scale) male faculty with less than the normal forty years of UCI service equivalent to their rank/step, which may skew the results. Additionally, presenting aggregate school differentials may lead one to overlook a single individual with a large negative residual.

At UC Irvine, the results of the campus annual pay equity study are posted on the Academic Personnel office website, so that faculty may see the graphs of salary residuals by academic unit. Salary residuals for individual faculty are provided annually to deans, equity advisors, and other senior administrators who participate in faculty salary decisions, so they can use the results as one measure of identifying potential areas of inequity, providing an opportunity for adjustment, if warranted. Individual faculty may calculate their own predicted salaries using the formula published below the graph for each academic unit.

**ADVANCE Program for Faculty Equity & Diversity (http://advance.uci.edu/)**

The UCI ADVANCE Program carries out the campus commitment to gender equity and diversity in the professoriate. Originally funded by a NSF institutional Transformation award in 2001, UCI has seen dramatic gains in the presence of women in STEM fields.

As part of the UCI ADVANCE Program, faculty equity advisors are appointed in every school as Faculty Assistant to the Dean, to ensure equity in faculty recruitment and academic policy implementation. Equity advisors provide guidance to faculty members to proactively address potential inequities. Other UC campuses have adopted the UCI ADVANCE model of designating faculty leaders in equity and diversity.

Based on the success of the Equity Advisor model, former Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Michael R. Gottfredson institutionalized UCI ADVANCE and extended its mission to include diversity in July 2006. This commitment ensures that equity and diversity will remain essential priorities in advancing excellence in the multiple missions of UC Irvine.

\(^1\) As defined by the UCI Pay Equity Study, the "residual" is the difference between actual salary and salary predicted by the regression equation. A negative residual indicates that the salary is lower than the amount predicted for white men in the same academic unit who have the same attributes. A positive residual indicates that the salary is higher than the predicted value. It should be noted that one must consider the standard error when reviewing these residuals.
**Academic Senate Salary Analyses**
For the past three years, the Academic Senate Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) has conducted an assessment of ladder rank salary equity, on the general campus, in concert with their evaluation of faculty productivity within the merit and promotion review process. CAP evaluates the file’s strength in relationship to salary when the committee reviews the faculty’s record for merit and promotion advancement. CAP compares the faculty member’s salary against the average salary of faculty at the same rank and step, within the same school. CAP raises any potential issues on specific cases with the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel so that salary adjustments can be made, as warranted. Furthermore, the council prepares a year-end analysis of their findings.

In 2009 UCI’s Academic Senate Council on Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom (CFW) conducted a separate analysis of faculty salaries by gender and ethnicity in 2009. The Council reviewed faculty salaries from 1998 through 2008 to determine if there were campus-wide systematic differences in cross-sectional salaries for each year, in starting salary, and in salary increases over time, based on gender and ethnicity. This study compared aggregate summary measures of salary (median salary) by gender and ethnicity and did not find significant disparity based upon these attributes. This study and its findings are available on UCI’s Council on Faculty Welfare’s website:

*Faculty Welfare Study:* [http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CFW/salaryResults13may2009FINAL.pdf](http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CFW/salaryResults13may2009FINAL.pdf)

*Executive Summary:* [http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CFW/2SenChr%20ReFacSalDataFINAL.pdf](http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CFW/2SenChr%20ReFacSalDataFINAL.pdf)

Sincerely,

Susan V. Bryant, Ph.D.
Interim Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

cc: Chancellor Drake
    Vice Provost Killackey
    Academic Senate Divisional Chair Gilly
    Vice Provost Carlson
    Executive Director Tanaka
Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost
509 Aldrich Hall
Irvine, CA 92697-1000
(949) 824-6296
(949) 824-2438 Fax

February 20, 2013

Aimée Dorr
Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs
Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 11th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Dear Provost Dorr:

On January 15, 2013 I reported on the faculty salary equity studies conducted on the UC Irvine campus. I wanted to provide an update to my response with regard to the Academic Senate Council on Academic Personnel’s (CAP) assessment of faculty salaries.

After conducting assessments for the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 academic years, CAP voted to discontinue their assessment this past year. CAP’s decision was based largely on the fact that the UC Irvine scales, which are awarded at merit or promotion, represent average faculty salaries by rank and step, and thus reflect market salaries at UCI. While CAP no longer conducts a formal salary assessment, CAP continues to comment occasionally on salary issues raised in the review file.

Sincerely,

Susan V. Bryant, Ph.D.
Interim Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

C: Chancellor Drake
   Vice Provost Killackey
   Academic Senate Divisional Chair Gilly
   Vice Provost Carlson
   Executive Director Tanaka
UC Los Angeles
UCLA Study of Salaries by Gender and Ethnicity
Proposed Campus Plan
January 23, 2013

UCLA is committed to ensuring that academic compensation is provided on a nondiscriminatory basis, without regard to race, color, national origin, or gender, among other legally protected categories. Currently the campus maintains procedures for conducting Merit Equity Reviews (see Appendix 35 of the UCLA CALL) and carries out annual compensation analyses through the Office of Faculty Diversity and Development. As a new initiative, the Academic Senate and the Administration will collaborate in producing (1) a Study of Salaries by Gender and Ethnicity and (2) a Report based on the Study, including a plan forremedying any discriminatory practices that are identified. At the request of the Executive Vice Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel will have the lead responsibility for the project.

**Personnel.** The project will be carried out by a joint Senate-Administration steering committee with the following composition:

- A representative from the Senate’s Council on Academic Personnel
- A representative from the Senate’s Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity
- Two additional faculty members with relevant expertise (appointed by the EVC in consultation with the Academic Senate)
- Carole Goldberg, Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel (committee chair)
- Associate Director, Research and Analysis, Office of Diversity and Faculty Development
- Christine Littleton, Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development
- Lynn Gordon, Associate Dean for Diversity, David Geffen School of Medicine
- Albert Glover, Director of Academic Affairs, David Geffen School of Medicine

The membership of the steering committee may turn over during the multi-year period of its work. The committee may wish to consult additional faculty, staff, or administrators at various stages.

**Study.** The steering committee will develop the methodology for the Study, including a determination of the units to be studied (e.g., school, division, department) and the variables to be emphasized, such as timeliness of promotions. The Study will be executed by the Associate Director, Research and Analysis, in the Office of Diversity and Faculty Development, in accordance with the methodology developed by the steering committee. The Associate Director will also conduct any preliminary studies that may be needed.

**Report.** The steering committee will also be responsible for producing a Report based upon the findings of the Study. The Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel will have primary responsibility for drafting the Report. The Report will describe and interpret the key findings of the Study and recommend any changes in campus policies or practices that it deems advisable. In addition, it may draw upon other pertinent studies of faculty salary and advancement, and it may conduct individual interviews with faculty in order to illuminate key findings. The Report will be broadly disseminated by the Chair of the Senate and made available on the website of the Office of Faculty Diversity and Development. Responsibility for addressing any patterns of discriminatory salary differences identified in the report will lie with the Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel.
Timelines. The first Study will be completed by January 2015, along with the attendant Report. Because of adjustments that may be made over time as a result of Merit Equity Reviews and ongoing salary equity analyses, UCLA would plan to prepare new studies every three years in order to have a solid basis for evaluating the effectiveness of any changes to policy or practice.
UC Merced
January 15, 2013

PROVOST AIMEE DORR

RE: Faculty Salary Equity Plan

Dear Provost Dorr,

Attached please find UC Merced’s plan to conduct an ongoing faculty salary equity study. The committee that has been chosen to lead this effort is a partnership between our office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA), the Academic Senate and Academic Personnel.

Please let me know if you need any additional information or clarification about our process for this project. I look forward to your feedback.

Sincerely,

Thomas W. Peterson
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
UC Merced Faculty Salary Equity Study
Joint Academic Senate and Administration Plan
December 2012

Following the directive from UC President Mark G. Yudof (September 11, 2012 letter to the Chancellors), UC Merced has established a joint Administrative-Academic Senate Faculty Salary Equity Study Steering Committee. Director of Institutional Planning & Analysis (IPA) Nancy Ochsner and Principal Analyst Michael Roona (IPA) were appointed by Interim EVC/Provost Samuel Traina. The Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare selected faculty members Anna Song (Assistant Professor in Health Psychology in the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts), Rudy Ortiz (Associate Professor in Molecular Cell Biology, School of Natural Sciences), and Shawn Newsam (Associate Professor in Computer Science and Engineering, School of Engineering) to serve on the Steering Committee. Becky Gubser, Associate Director of Academic Personnel will represent the Academic Personnel Office. The Committee will consult with additional faculty, staff, and/or administrators at various stages of the study.

Study:

The Steering Committee will develop the methodology for analyzing faculty salary equity by gender and ethnicity. The approach will include, at minimum, simple salary comparisons (averages, ranges, etc.) by gender, ethnicity, rank, and discipline, as well as higher-order analyses (e.g., multiple regression) as appropriate to the size of the faculty population at the youngest and smallest UC campus. If warranted, for example, the Steering Committee will also conduct, with the help of the Academic Personnel Office (APO), a CAP-audit (Committee on Academic Personnel audit). This audit would identify potential differences in personnel recommendations and decisions regarding hiring, promotion/tenure, and salary/step at each level of review (Unit, Dean, CAP, EVC).

Guidelines:

The findings will be transparent and accessible to the campus. The campus will address any pattern of salary differences that are uncovered to determine whether they might be discriminatory. All ladder rank faculty (LRF), including those with concurrent administrative appointments, who are on the payroll as of November 2013 will be included as subjects of these analyses.¹ Salary will be reported in various parts: 9-month base salary, off-scale salary, summer salary, and stipends.

Data Sources:

Potential data sources for the dependent and independent (control) variables include:

1. PPS (UC Path in the future)
2. Sponsored Research
3. Digital Measures

¹ UC Merced also will include the salaries of Adjunct faculty and Lecturers in at least one review of the data.
4. APO/CAP review documents
5. Teaching load reports
6. Market data by discipline (CUPA, Oklahoma State University Faculty Salary Survey)

Report:
The Steering Committee will conduct the analyses and draft the report. The report will describe the analyses and processes, interpret key findings, and suggest recommendations. The report will be broadly disseminated for review by the Academic Senate as determined by the Divisional Chair. It also will be submitted for review to the Deans, Vice Provost for Faculty, Provost/EVC, and Chancellor.

Timeline:
The first study and report will be completed by January 2015. Thereafter, updates will be provided every three years.
UC Riverside
Campus Plan: UC Riverside Study of Salaries by Gender and Ethnicity

The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost will appoint a committee of Faculty, Administrators, and Staff. The Committee will be Co-Chaired by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion at the request of the EVCP. The committee will be responsible for the project, and for providing the study to the EVCP for final review and submission.

Committee Composition

- A request will be sent to the UCR Academic Senate for 3 faculty representatives
- A representative from the Academic Personnel Office
- The Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Success, Equity, and Diversity
- The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (committee co-chair).
- A representative from the Affirmative Action Office
- The Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (committee co-chair).

The membership of the committee may turn over during the multi-year period of its work. The committee will consult additional faculty, staff, or administrators at various stages.

Study. The steering committee will develop the methodology for the Study, incorporating the compensation analysis that is done by the Affirmative Action Office in conjunction with OFCCP compliance. It is important that the campus leverages this data toward accomplishing its mission and goals in this area. The Study will be executed by The Affirmative Action and Academic Personnel offices in accordance with the methodology developed by the committee. A narrative outlining the key findings of the report and committee recommendations will also be submitted to the EVCP and provided to the campus.

The first study will be completed in January of 2015, and the study will be done every other year.
UC San Diego
February 19, 2013

Provost and Executive Vice President Aimee Dorr
Office of the President
University of California
1111 Franklin St.
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Provost Dorr,

Per President Yudof’s request dated September 11, 2012 I am pleased to share with you UC San Diego’s actions for addressing issues of faculty salary equity.

Like all UC campuses, UC San Diego takes a multi-faceted approach to addressing faculty compensation. We are continuously working to address market competitiveness while also monitoring differences in salary and taking measures when necessary to address salary inequity.

Monitoring Differences in Salary

In an academic institution like the University of California, with a wide array of disciplines and the necessity to respond in individual cases to outside offers or market hiring salaries, it is inevitable there will be differences in faculty compensation. We are committed, however to proactively monitoring differences in salary to assure there are no patterns of intentional or unintentional inequities embedded in these differences. To this end we have, and will continue to conduct pay equity salary studies at least once every five years.

The methodology for UC San Diego’s pay equity study was developed in 2006 for our first pay equity study. The 2006/07 study methodology had itself been based on a model developed by Professor Mat McCubbins for the 2001/02 Senate/Administration Gender Equity Task Force and had been endorsed by the UC San Diego Academic Senate.

The UC San Diego pay equity study uses a regression model that is fitted by division and department to the salary data for a period of years by nonlinearly regressing salaries against the years since highest degree and years at UC San Diego. The regression is then used to produce predicted salaries to compare against actual salaries.

After determining a predicted salary for each faculty member, the study determines the residual for each individual. The residual is the difference between actual salary and salary
predicted by the regression equation. A negative residual indicates that the salary is lower than the amount predicted for the average faculty member with the same regression variables – years since highest degree and years at UC.

There are two purposes for conducting this pay equity study. First, we want to regularly monitor faculty salaries in an objective manner to be sure there are no developing trends which might indicate that the salaries of a disproportionate number of women or underrepresented minorities fall below what is predicted by a consistently applied model.

Study results will be published (in a manner that does not identify individual faculty) on the Academic Personnel Services website. We are still in the process of developing the format for the public reporting of these study results, however we will likely follow a reporting format similar to the one used at UC Irvine. Our goal is to publish the results no later than 7/1/13.

The second purpose of the study is to serve as a screening tool (though certainly not our only screening tool) to identify individual faculty members with salaries which may require further scrutiny. The regression model intentionally relies exclusively on quantitative measures and therefore does not address the potential legitimate academic reasons why an individual’s residual might be negative or positive. Factors that might affect the salary of any individual faculty member include, but are not limited to, the rank, step, and salary at initial hire, non-standard rates of academic advancement such as accelerations or no changes, off-scale salaries due to retention offers, and above-scale salaries.

Therefore, a more qualitative analysis will be conducted for those faculty with a negative residual that falls 10% or more below the predicted salary. Faculty will be excluded for further study if they (1) are at the Assistant professor level; (2) hold a full-time administrative appointment; (3) had a “no-change” in one or more of last 3 reviews; (4) had a salary change during the most recent review cycle (e.g. 7/1/12 for the current study) that brought the individual to within 90% of predicted salary; or (5) participate in the HSCP.

The divisional deans1 will be provided a list of the “flagged” faculty and asked to conduct a qualitative analysis to determine whether they believed the faculty member’s salary can or cannot be explained by legitimate academic factors. The deans are asked to consult with the department chairs and with any other individuals they feel is necessary to conduct this analysis.

Once completed, the deans will communicate the results of their analysis of each case to the EVC. For faculty whom the deans do not feel the academic record justifies the salary level, the EVC and dean will jointly determine an appropriate off-scale adjustment to raise the salary to a more equitable level.

After the EVC has engaged in this process with all divisions, the salary proposals will be vetted as a group by the Committee on Academic Personnel. CAP will be provided both the

---

1 Note: We include SIO faculty in our pay equity study, but due to the transitioning leadership at SIO, they have not yet determined how they would like to conduct the analysis of their faculty. We can report on their plans before July 1, 2013 when any remaining salary adjustments will be implemented.
list of faculty who are proposed for salary increases (along with the dean's justification) as well the list of faculty whose salary will remain unchanged following the dean's analysis. CAP will be asked to provide a recommendation on all cases, including those where no salary increase is proposed as a result of the study. Any proposed salary adjustments will be effective on 7/1 after CAP review and final EVC approval.

We initiated our second General Campus and SIO faculty pay equity study in August 2012; the regression model was fitted by division and department to the salary data from July 2007, July 2008, July 2009, July 2010, and October 2011. The 2011/12 pay equity study was conducted by Professor Bob Bitmead, the former Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel who also conducted the 2006/07 study.

I am happy to report that the 2011/12 study did not identify any statistically significant trends with regards to salary distribution by gender or ethnicity. We are still in the process of analyzing those faculty flagged for further study. We expect CAP review to occur in March or April and any resulting salary increases to take place on 7/1/13.

Annual Affirmative Action Program Analysis

In addition to regular pay equity studies (and related salary adjustments when necessary), we also conduct an annual analysis of (1) recruitments, (2) advancements, (3) separations, and (4) compensation. The outcomes are reported annually in the Academic Personnel Affirmative Action Program.

In this analysis we look for the following:

Recruitment: We analyze applicant pools by job group to see if the pools meet availability benchmarks.

Advancements: Compare the gender/ethnic percentages of those eligible for merit advancement or promotion to those granted advancements.

Separations: We look at the percentages of gender/ethnic representation in the previous year's workforce were compared to the gender/ethnic percentages for separations to determine whether the latter were greater than the former.

Compensation: We look at a complete list of the academic workforce as of 10/31 for each year. This list is reviewed to identify where women and minorities and their respective salaries appear in relation to similarly situated men and non-minorities in the same job group.

When areas of concern are noted, action steps are identified to address them.

Career Equity Reviews

At UC San Diego we also have a process called the Career Equity Review (CER). In 2002 the Gender Equity Task force recommended implementing a career equity review process
in order to allow faculty who felt they were misplaced in terms of rank or step to be recalibrated to the appropriate step. Career Equity Reviews were formally introduced at UC San Diego in 2005.

Currently, only the appropriateness of an individual’s rank and step are considered during the CER process. Recently, however, a Senate Task Force on Faculty Rewards recommended allowing an adjustment of salary for successful CERs. I support this recommendation.

Addressing Salary Compression

We are also studying a number of different ways to address salary compression. At UC San Diego the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) reviews salary proposals. Recently CAP and I agreed on the need and a process for allowing divisions to propose three types of off-scale salary increases: 1) when necessary to respond to an outside offer, 2) to preempt an offer in progress, and 3) in cases when a spot compression increase is recommended by the dean. It is important to note that a compression adjustment would not be provided based solely on a market analysis of the field or other institutions, but rather the Deans will need to show an internal inequity or salary compression issue that needs addressing.

We are also studying more systematic approaches to addressing salary compression. However many more conversations are needed with the deans, department chairs, faculty and the Academic Senate before determining whether one or several solutions will benefit this campus and what we can afford given budget constraints. Please let me know if you would like additional information on our ongoing efforts and ideas for addressing salary compression.

Thank you for your interest and I look forward to future discussions with you and with the Academic Senate on this very important topic.

With best regards,

Suresh Subramani
Executive Vice Chancellor

c: Associate Vice Chancellor Hodgkiss
Assistant Vice Chancellor Larsen
UC San Francisco
Dear Provost Dorr,

I am sending you the UCSF plan for the study of faculty salaries by gender and ethnicity. The analysis of data likely will continue as in prior years, with each school using its own methodology, based on its unique population of faculty. The data to be analyzed will be generated by my office on a set date for all 4 schools, initially July 1, 2014. The major differences are that the Steering Committee will include significant Academic Senate representation and a formal report will be written and will reside on our website. Our plan has been vetted with Senate leadership as well as appropriate vice/associate deans in the schools and the Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach. If you have questions please contact me.

Thank you.

Sally Marshall

Sally J Marshall, PhD
Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
UCSF, 513 Parnassus Ave, S-101
San Francisco, CA 94143-0401
phone 415 514 0421  fax 415 514 0200
email sally.marshall@ucsf.edu

Distinguished Professor, Div of Biomaterials and Bioengineering
Dept of Preventive and Restorative Dental Sciences
Box 0758, 707 Parnassus Ave
San Francisco, CA 94143-0758
phone 415 476 5992  fax 415 476 0858
UCSF Study of Faculty Salaries by Gender and Ethnicity
Campus Plan
January 2013

Each of the four professional schools at UCSF (Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy) will conduct a study of total negotiated salaries (X+Y) plus stipends by gender and ethnicity. A Steering Committee with representation from the Academic Senate and the Administration will collaborate in producing a report based upon the school studies. As designated by the EVCP, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will have the lead responsibility for the project.

**Personnel.** A joint Academic Senate-Administration Steering Committee will be tasked with reviewing the studies from each School and preparing a campus-wide report. Membership on the joint committee will include:

- A representative from the Senate’s EQOP Committee.
- A representative from the Senate’s Faculty Welfare Committee.
- A representative from the Senate’s CAP
- Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach
- Vice or Associate Dean for Academic Affairs from each school
- Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- Academic Data Coordinator, VPAA Office

The membership of the Steering Committee may turn over during the multi-year period of its work. The committee may wish to consult additional faculty, staff, or administrators at various stages in the review as appropriate or needed.

**Study.** The conduct of the study in each school will be the responsibility of the appropriate Vice/Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, using data provided by the Vice Provost’s office as of July 1, 2014 and subsequent July 1 every 3 years. Each school will develop the methodology for its study, taking into account the unique population of the school. The Steering Committee will approve the methodology.

**Report.** The Steering Committee will be responsible for producing a report based upon the findings of the studies. The report will describe and interpret the key findings of the studies and recommend any changes in campus or school policies or practices that it deems advisable. In addition, it may draw upon other pertinent studies of faculty salary and advancement, and it may conduct individual interviews with faculty in order to illuminate key findings. The report will be available on the Academic Affairs website.

**Timelines.** The first studies will be completed by October 2014, and the attendant report by January 2015. The effects of any changes to policy or practice may be difficult to detect after just one or two years, given the timing of academic personnel reviews. Thus UCSF would plan to prepare new studies every three years in order to have a solid basis for evaluating the effectiveness of any changes to policy or practice.
UC Santa Barbara
Introduction

In response to several previous studies on salary equity, the administration has continued to analyze academic salaries to examine issues of equity, especially with respect to gender and ethnicity. This is the 9th year of this analysis. Best practices for analyzing the data have been determined from other studies and applied here. Moreover, the salary studies have been shared with the Academic Senate's Committee on Diversity and Equity and the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women, and their feedback has been incorporated into subsequent analyses.

Salary Data

The 2012 pay equity study at UC Santa Barbara was conducted for ladder rank faculty based on October 1, 2012 Payroll/Personnel data combined with data from the Office of Academic Personnel. The Payroll/Personnel System (PPS) database represents the most accurate and up to date information on faculty salary, and the October 1, 2012 data represents a snapshot at that point in time. The data analyzed here include only ladder rank faculty members who were on active pay status, and the salaries are the annual 9-month academic salaries; they do not include summer salary or administrative stipends. Every effort is made to assure accuracy in the input data.

The data are considered for the University of California Santa Barbara as a whole; and they are also divided into Colleges/Divisions: specifically, the Divisions of Humanities and Fine Arts (HFA); Mathematics, Physical and Life Sciences (MLPS); and Social Sciences (DSS) in the College of Letters and Science; the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE), the Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Engineering (BREN) and the College of Engineering (ENGR).

The salary data are shown for the campus and each division/college as a function of rank and step for White Males, Women and Male Minorities in Figure 1. The use of the term "minority" here includes Black/African-American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, and Hispanic regardless of citizenship or country of origin. This is consistent with federal affirmative action definitions, and with other studies referenced above. Analyzing subpopulations is complicated by increasingly smaller population sizes (and thus poorer statistics) and problems in self-reporting, including multiple affiliations.

---

1 In February 1996, The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel formed a Gender Equity Advisory Group, which reviewed and reported on salary equity study methods (Zelmanowitz to Crawford, 5/28/98). In April 2002, the Associate Vice Chancellors and Divisional Chair of the Academic Senate constituted a Salary Equity Advisory Group to develop a set of recommendations on salary equity analysis, which it reported in July 2002.
The average salary for each of these groupings for the campus and for each academic division is given in Table A below.

### Table A

Average 9-Month Academic Salaries by Group and Academic Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Male Minorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>111,327</td>
<td>102,327</td>
<td>109,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>139,197</td>
<td>117,212</td>
<td>117,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>140,248</td>
<td>112,544</td>
<td>102,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREN</td>
<td>154,108</td>
<td>100,120</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>127,840</td>
<td>99,784</td>
<td>97,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>150,236</td>
<td>132,680</td>
<td>140,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>134,815</td>
<td>108,909</td>
<td>118,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At first glance salaries for women and male minorities appear systematically lower than their male counterparts for the campus as a whole as well as by academic division, and the salaries vary by academic discipline as well. However, the white male population tends to be older and hence had longer to advance in the salary scale. Table B shows the same average salaries with the average birth year included.

### Table B

Average 9-Month Academic Salaries and Birth Year by Group and Academic Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>White Males (Avg Birth Year)</th>
<th>Women  (Avg Birth Year)</th>
<th>Male Minorities (Avg Birth Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>111,327 (1957)</td>
<td>102,327 (1960)</td>
<td>109,452 (1959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>139,197 (1957)</td>
<td>117,212 (1962)</td>
<td>117,023 (1963)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREN</td>
<td>154,108 (1956)</td>
<td>100,120 (1966)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>127,840 (1955)</td>
<td>99,784 (1960)</td>
<td>97,725 (1958)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average salary is plotted against average birth year for each of the academic divisions below in Figure A. While the disciplinary differences reflect different salary scales (e.g., ENGR) and market forces, the data broadly show similar dependences on birth year (the lines are not regression fits, but sight guides). Hence, in examining salary differences among groups, it is important to account for differences in both discipline as well as
length in the system. This is the basis for the salary analysis methodology described below.

![Graph showing average annual salary plotted against birth year for each division/college/school](image)

Figure A. Average annual salary plotted against birth year for each division/college/school

**Methodology and Results**

The pay equity study employed here applies the methodology recommended by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP – see, for instance, [http://www.aaup.org](http://www.aaup.org)). A similar methodology has been followed by the University of California Irvine (see, for instance, [http://www.ap.uci.edu/Equity/studies/index.html](http://www.ap.uci.edu/Equity/studies/index.html)). The methodology is set up to test whether women and minority faculty members are paid differently than their white male counterparts. The methodology does not include any subjective measures of quality or merit. Therefore it is expected that some faculty members will have results that are not explained well by the methodology, which relies exclusively on quantifiable objective measures. Nonetheless, it serves as a tool for identifying broad trends.

The first step is to fit the salary data for white males on the campus or in a College/Division. In previous analyses, the fit has been made by a linear regression analysis to an equation of the form:

\[
\text{SALARY} = A \times \text{Appointment year} + B \times \text{Birth Year} + C \times \text{Degree Year} + D
\]
where $A$, $B$, $C$ and $D$ are regression coefficients. However, the UC salary scale increases with rank and step (and therefore normative length of appointment/age) faster than a linear scale. Hence, a linear fit to the UC salary scale produces a slight negative bias for early and late career appointments and slight positive bias in between as shown below in Figure B:

![Fit to Scale Comparison](image)

**Figure B.** Illustration of salary as a function of age for the UC salary scale versus a linear dependence.

Moreover, it was pointed out in a critique of a recent systemwide salary analysis\(^2\) that such non-linearities are better captured by using a log fit. For instance, if Salary ($S$) varies with age ($T$) in a non-linear way as:

$$S = A \ T^a,$$

where $A$ and $a$ are constants. Then taking log of both sides of the equation produces:

$$\log S = \log A + \log T$$

The figures below (Figure C) illustrate that the Log correlation better fits the curvature of salary versus Birth Year than the Linear fit.

---

\(^2\) Systemwide University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD), *Analysis of Pay Equity By Sex and Among Men, Ethnicity, 2009-2010*
Figure C. Illustrations of linear and log fits to annual salary data as a function of birth year.

Therefore, for purposes of this analysis a fit was made to the white male salaries by a linear regression analysis to an equation of the form:

\[ \text{Log(SALARY)} = A \ \text{Log(Appointment year)} + B \ \text{Log (Birth Year)} + C \ \text{Log (Degree Year)} + D \]

where A, B, C and D are regression coefficients.

For most academic units, this fit does a reasonable job of correlating the salary of white males with a goodness of fit parameter, \( r^2 \), of 0.45 to 0.90 (see below). The goodness of fit is a statistical parameter that comes out of the regression analysis; it demonstrates how well a correlation fits the data, with a perfect fit leading to an \( r^2 \) of 1.0 and no fit at all leading to an \( r^2 \) of 0.

A standard error (SE) on SALARY is also calculated as part of the regression analysis. Since the salary is not entirely captured by the three independent variables (Appointment, Birth and Degree years), the standard error reflects the uncertainty of the predicted salary.

The example below in Figure D shows a plot of PREDICTED versus ACTUAL SALARY, with the bounds (dotted lines) corresponding to the standard error (SE):
Figure D. Illustration of predicted salary versus actual salary and the bracketing of the data by the standard error (SE)

As can be seen, although the linear regression predicts the broad trend, it is imperfect, with data falling off the solid line of "ACTUAL SALARY = PREDICTED SALARY." Most, but not all, of the data fall within one standard error of the line.

Figure 2 shows the ACTUAL SALARY vs PREDICTED SALARY for the campus as a whole and each of the divisions/colleges based on the data for white males. For comparison, the ACTUAL SALARY and PREDICTED SALARY (again based on white male data) for women and male minorities are shown on these same plots. The population of individual faculty making up each category in each division/college is given by the number N in each plot. A significant salary inequity in the women and/or male minority data would show up as a preponderance of data points on one side or the other of the "ACTUAL SALARY = PREDICTED SALARY" line. While such a preponderance is not evident for most of the data points in Figure 2, the correlation does systematically under-predict salaries of the highest-paid faculty (above $225,000), which are predominantly white males.

To further test the salary equity, residuals are calculated for the white male population, and then for women (white and minority) and male minority faculty members on the campus and in each College/Division. The residual is the difference between actual salary and salary predicted by the regression equation. A negative residual indicates that the actual salary is lower than the amount predicted for a white male faculty in the same academic unit with the same attributes. A positive residual indicates that the salary is higher than the predicted value.
The example below in Figure E shows the residual value of one data point, where the faculty member’s actual salary is $50,000 less than the predicted salary:

![Residual value graph](image)

**Figure E. Illustration of a residual in the plot of predicted versus actual salary**

As a final step, the residuals for each population (white males, women, male minorities) for UCSB and for each College/Division are plotted on a frequency histogram (the number of times a residual is calculated in a particular range of values), along with a line indicating the range of the standard error (SE) on salary. The distribution provides some measure of the salary equity – or inequity – for the campus or College/Division.

Typically, for a large population of faculty members in a College or Division, the residual distribution for the white male population will be symmetric and peaked about the origin (a residual of 0), and most of the population will fall within the standard error (SE). The residual frequency will fall off with greater residual value on both sides of the origin, and a relatively small number of faculty (low frequency) will fall outside of the SE at both the low (negative residual) and high (positive residual) ends.

If there is salary equity in the population, the residual distributions for women and minorities in the College/Division should show a similar distribution to the white male distribution. An example is given below in Figure F; here there are 26 faculty whose salaries fall within $5000 of the predicted salary (residuals equal to or less than plus or minus $5000) and 1 each whose salaries are more than and less than $35,000 of the predicted value. Most of the faculty have salaries which fall within $18,000, the standard error (SE), of the predicted amount.
Figure F. Example of a residual frequency plot for a population in which there is no salary inequity. The distribution of residuals is symmetric about zero residual and the frequency diminishes as the residual increases.

However, in all cases (white males, women and male minorities), for a smaller population of faculty, the distributions may not be symmetric, nor peaked at the origin. Even in these cases, the degree of salary equity should be reflected by the extent to which the residuals fall within a standard error of the origin. Two examples are shown below: one in which there is no apparent salary inequity (Figure G) and one in which there is Figure H:
Figure G. Illustration of a residual frequency plot in which there is no apparent salary inequity.

Figure H. Illustration of a residual frequency plot in which there is an apparent salary inequity.
The regression analysis, standard error and goodness of fit parameter are listed for each of the academic units below in Table C.

Table C. Regression analysis parameters by academic unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>SE (k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-70.5</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREN</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-166.6</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>-15.89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-36.7</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUFA</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-28.4</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>25.74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-80.3</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>-39.2</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS (No Econ)</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-59.4</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residual histograms for white male, women and male minority populations for the campus as a whole and for each of the Colleges/Divisions are given in Figures 3-9. Residuals are given in units of k$ = $1000. Again, the population of individual faculty making up each category is given by the number N in each plot.

The results of this analysis are consistent with findings from previous years. No systematic changes were detected from the results reported in previous reports despite the use of a Log versus a linear relationship between salary and birth/degree/appointment years.

In Figure 3, the residual distribution for White Males for the campus as a whole is not quite symmetric, and the center of the distribution is slightly biased toward the negative residual, which biases the distributions for women and minorities as well. The slight bias in the distribution for women is also further biased by the higher salary scales for engineering and economics, which also have higher than campus average populations of white males. Figures 4-5 and 7-9 show no apparent or systemic biases in salary for women or male minorities in the respective disciplines, at least within the statistical uncertainty of this analysis. The possible bias in the social sciences indicated by the distributions for women and male minorities in Figure 6a appears to be largely the result of including economics faculty in the analysis, since this faculty is on a higher salary scale and tends to have a white male component that is higher than the average for the social sciences. As shown in Figure 6b, removing economics faculty from the analysis produces more symmetric residual distributions.
Finally, there have been suggestions to further analyze the salary data by department in the larger colleges and divisions. The difficulty of interpreting these data is illustrated for male minorities in GGSE (Figure 7), women and male minorities in BREN (Figure 8) and women in ENGR (Figure 9). In each case, the residuals are approximately distributed equally on both sides of the zero residual line, but the sample sizes are so small that it is hard to make much statistical sense beyond this. There have been additional suggestions to consider account for time-off-the clock and for other indicators, such as prizes, marital status, children, etc. These data are difficult to assemble, given the nature of our data base, so these continue to be work in progress.

The results of this analysis will continue to be used by the administration to examine reasons for large negative residuals for individual faculty as academic personnel cases are processed in future years.
Figure 1 – Salary comparisons by rank and step for UCSB and Colleges/Divisions

HFA

MLPS and BREN
Figure 1 – Salary comparisons by rank and step for UCSB and Colleges/Divisions
Figure 1 – Salary comparisons by rank and step for UCSB and Colleges/Divisions
Figure 2—Predicted vs Actual Salary for UCSB and Colleges/Divisions
Figure 2—Predicted vs Actual Salary for UCSB and Colleges/Divisions
Figure 2—Predicted vs Actual Salary for UCSB and Colleges/Divisions
Figure 3 -- Residual histograms for UCSB for white males, women and male minority faculty.
Figure 4 – Residual histograms for HFA for white males, women and male minority faculty.
Figure 5 – Residual histograms for MLPS for white males, women and male minority faculty.
Figure 6a – Residual histograms for DSS for white males, women and male minority faculty.
Figure 6b – Residual histograms for DSS for white males, women and male minority faculty (without Economics in the white male data base)
Figure 7 – Residual histograms for GGSE for white males, women and male minority faculty.
Figure 8 – Residual histograms for BREN for white males, women and minority faculty.
Figure 9 – Residual histograms for ENGR for white males, women and male minority faculty.
UC Santa Cruz
January 15, 2013

Aimée Dorr  
Provost and Executive Vice President  
Office of the President  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street  
Oakland, CA  94607-5200

Dear Provost Dorr:  

RE: Faculty Salary Equity Study

At UC Santa Cruz, the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) recently completed a study of faculty salaries and faculty advancement through the ranks. That analysis looked in detail both advancement and salary growth relative to years of service/time since degree, both individually and aggregated by department. We propose to build upon that study by adding gender and ethnicity data, allowing us to analyze our campus for equity with respect to gender, ethnicity, and department. A summary of part of the CFW study is enclosed.

We propose the following implementation committee:
• Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (Chair)
• Academic Personnel Director
• Representative from the Committee on Academic Personnel
• Representative from the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
• Representative from the Committee on Faculty Welfare
• Director of Institutional Research
• Analyst from Institutional Research

Our goal would be to complete the analysis by the end of Fall 2013, to discuss the results in winter 2014, and to develop and implement any needed plans to address the findings in the rest of calendar year 2014.

If you have any questions please contact me at (831) 459-4083, vpaa@ucsc.edu.

Sincerely,

Herbert Lee  
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Enclosure

cc: Chancellor Blumenthal  
UCOP Vice Provost Carlson  
Vice Chancellor Delaney  
CP/EVC Galloway  
Academic Senate Chair Konopelski  
Assistant Vice Chancellor Peterson  
Academic Senate Office
Metrics for Evaluating Faculty Advancement (Promotion and Salary)

UCSC – CFW
March 2012
Context

UC-wide Faculty Salary
• Comparator-8 Institutes

• 3% merit-based increase (Oct 2011)
• Incorporates market
• Does not incorporate ranking

UCSC Salary Boost Plan
• Comparator-4 UCs

• 3+3 year merit boost plan
  – CFW requested, received, and has initiated the analysis of Faculty Salary Data (Summer 2011)
What is the right metric?

Current Metric
- Off-scale Salary
  - Compares off-scale salary at same rank-step; but faculty with very similar performance may be advanced to different rank/steps

Proposed Metrics
- Salary Growth
- Promotion Growth
  - Becomes important because there may be a tradeoff between promotion and salary growth
Figure 3. Distribution of merit-review outcomes between 2006 and 2011.

Goals

• Main goal: compare UCSC faculty advancement (promotion AND salaries) with other campuses to better understand promotion and salary differences and make informed policy recommendations with measurable objectives.

• Subsidiary goals:
  – Understand causes of variability across departments to identify aggregate groups that may have been disadvantaged in advancement (promotion and salary) and potentially suggest measures including policy recommendations in the overall context
How to generate new metrics?

• **Approach 1**: individual trajectory analysis
  - Extremely time consuming
  - Impossible to get necessary data from other campuses

• **Approach 2**: uses information about salary and rank/step currently and at initial hire, along with years of service.
  - UCSC data available, but available only sparsely for other campuses
  - Improves approach 3 below by including faculty who were hired later in their career

• **Approach 3**: uses information about salary, rank and step currently and years since highest degree,
  - Available for other campuses
  - Even though the picture can be different for each individual, population-level features robust and similar to approach 2

CFW has carried out analysis using Approach 2 and Approach 3.
PROMOTION GROWTH FACTOR
Promotion Growth

- How fast are faculty members promoted?

\[
PG = \frac{\text{time equivalence of rank/step (years)}}{\text{years since degree}}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assist 1</th>
<th>Assist 2</th>
<th>Assist 3</th>
<th>Assist 4</th>
<th>Assist 5</th>
<th>Assist 6</th>
<th>Assoc 1</th>
<th>Assoc 2</th>
<th>Assoc 3</th>
<th>Assoc 4</th>
<th>Assoc 5</th>
<th>Full 1</th>
<th>Full 2</th>
<th>Full 3</th>
<th>Full 4</th>
<th>Full 5</th>
<th>Full 6</th>
<th>Full 7</th>
<th>Full 8</th>
<th>Full 9</th>
<th>Above Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promotion Growth

Values close to 1 represent "normal" progression through the ranks.

Assumptions: Rank/step at hiring is similar across dept/divisions; Time spent on other jobs before joining UCSC captured in the rank/step at hiring (e.g., a faculty hired as Assistant Professor Step 3 graduated about 5 years before).
Promotion growth against time since degree

Although sliding pattern is a consequence of the chosen formula, gradual decrease in promotion factor does occur with time.
UCSC: Rank at hire for current faculty

| Assistant | | Associate | | Full |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 45 143 227 27 3 1 | 11 16 14 1 3 | 8 8 9 6 7 13 4 5 4 |

- About 75% (415) of the faculty currently on campus were hired as assistant professors step 1, 2 or 3.
- Suggests that using years since degree as a proxy for years of service is not necessarily a bad idea (more on this later).
Approach 2

\[ PG^* = \frac{\text{time eq. of rank/step in Jul 2011} - \text{time eq. of rank/step at hire}}{\text{years of service}} \]

Faculty with 3 or less years of service were excluded. About 63% of the current faculty have a p-factor equal or smaller than 1. Noise from leaves of absence probably negligible.
Correlation between p-factors

**All faculty**  
**AY-BEE faculty only**

Faculty with 3 or less years of service were excluded. Data suggests proxy is robust, but might present slightly rosier picture than the preferred measure.
SALARY GROWTH FACTOR
UC Salary Scales as of July 1st 2011
UC Salary Scales
(implicit rates of growth)
Unadjusted salary growth factor
(includes COLA and market adjustment)

Current Salary = Salary at Initial Hire \left(1+\frac{\text{Salary Growth}}{100}\right)^{\text{years of service}}

Median = 4.6%

Faculty with 3 or less years of service were excluded. The increasing trend in the right plot suggests the need for non-linear inflation adjustments. UC assumptions for salary growth in retirement planning documents have the range of 4.35 to 7.0% with expected average as 5.5%. 
Salary Growth

Current Salary = Base Salary \left( 1 + \frac{\text{Salary Growth}}{100} \right)^{\text{years since degree}}

• Base Salary = 65,000 for regular scale;
  80,000 for engineering-econ scale
• Base salary in today’s dollars eliminates the need for inflation adjustment
• Makes salary growth comparison with respect to salaries offered to recent initial hires at Asst Prof 1
Salary Growth

- Six AY faculty currently had salaries below $65K as on July 1st, 2011.
- This is an annualized percentage of growth. Values roughly below 2.7 for AY (2.1 for AY-BEE) represent growth below the rate implied by the salary scale.

Assumptions: (i) Initial salary approx. constant for all hires in a given year, (ii) Base salary constant (in real terms) over time, (iii) As with promotion growth, time spent on other jobs before joining UCSC captured in the rank/step at hiring.
Salary growth factor against time since degree

AY faculty

AY–BEE faculty
History of starting salaries for AY faculty

Given the history of increases on initial salaries for AY faculty at UCSC, the net present value is approximately $69,000.
Given the history of increases on initial salaries for AY-BEE faculty at UCSC, the net present value is approximately $90,000.
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROMOTION GROWTH AND SALARY GROWTH
Promotion Growth vs. Salary Growth
Description of the faculty in various quadrants is included below (terms such as high and low are all relative):

**AY-Scale (Total 413)**

Quadrant 1: Total 76 (high promotion and salary growth)
Asst 7, Assoc 10: Full: 59 (Full 1-5: 19; Full 6-9: 25; Above Scale 15)
(Earth 8, Astr 7, Phys 6, Lit 6, Psych 5, Anth 5, MCDB 4)
Top 7 add to 41 (54%)

Quadrant 2: Total 142 (high promotion growth; low salary growth)
Asst 29, Assoc 30, Full 83 (Full 1-5: 38; Full 6+: 45)
Ling 10, EarthSci 10, Lit 9, Physics 9, Psychology 8, Anthro 8, Chem 7
Top 7 adds to 61 (43%)

Quadrant 3: Total 192 (low promotion and salary growth)
Asst 28, Assoc 59; Full 95 (Full 1-5: 69; Full 6+: 36)
Lit 15, Chemistry 14, MCDB 13, HIST 12, Psy 11, Soc 11, Educ 10
Top 7 adds to 86 (45%)

Quadrant 4: Total 3
PBSCI 2, American studies 1
Asst 4; Assoc 1

**AY-BEE Scale (Total 106)**

Quadrant 1: Total 50
Asst 9, Assoc 15, Full 1-5 11, Full 6+ 15
Econ 17, CMPS 14, Ele 5, CMPE 5, AMSD 4, BME 3, ENG 2

Quadrant 2: Total 20
Asst 0, Assoc 4, Full 1-5 12, Full 6+ 4
CMPS 5, CMPE 4, AMSD 4, ELE 3 ECON 2, BME 2

Quadrant 3: Total 35
Asst 5, Assoc 8, Full 1-5 17, Full 6+ 5
ELE 7, CMPE 7, ECON 5, CMPS 5, BME 5, AMSD 4, ENG 2

Quadrant 4: Total 1
Assoc 1
Econ
Promotion Growth vs. Salary Growth by Department

- Left (right) panel uses means (medians) to summarize over each department. Lines correspond to mean (median) values over all faculty studied. Colors represent Division.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Mean Salary Growth</th>
<th>Rank: Salary Growth</th>
<th>Mean: Promotion Growth</th>
<th>Rank: Promotion Growth</th>
<th>Median: Salary Growth</th>
<th>Median: Promotion Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBSCI</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.164</td>
<td>1.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ</td>
<td>3.611</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>1.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>2.094</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Salary Growth</td>
<td>Rank: Salary Growth</td>
<td>Mean Promotion Growth</td>
<td>Rank: Promotion Growth</td>
<td>Median Salary Growth</td>
<td>Median Promotion Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3.611</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>1.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>2.535</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.411</td>
<td>1.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>2.039</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.745</td>
<td>1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>1.905</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.785</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.606</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Salary Growth</th>
<th>Rank: Salary Growth</th>
<th>Mean Promotion Growth</th>
<th>Rank: Promotion Growth</th>
<th>Median Salary Growth</th>
<th>Median Promotion Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>3.592</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.084</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences</td>
<td>2.581</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2.384</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.483</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>2.371</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American St</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>1.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>2.270</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LALS</td>
<td>2.245</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>2.206</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>2.213</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.206</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Sc</td>
<td>2.184</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.739</td>
<td>1.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env Sc</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.973</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2.116</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>2.027</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Sci</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.163</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>2.044</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of C</td>
<td>2.005</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.741</td>
<td>1.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCD Biology</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEBiology</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.803</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1.958</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>1.805</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETox</td>
<td>1.843</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Arts</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.709</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist St</td>
<td>1.648</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>0.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History AVC</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>0.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community St</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>0.620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At-Large (Salary Growth only)
Eng 2.123; Hum 2.096; SSD 0.728
Future Direction: What is the right metric?

**Current Metric**
- Off-scale Salary
  - Compares off-scale salary at same rank-step; but faculty with very similar performance may be advanced to different rank/steps

**Proposed Metrics**
- Salary Growth
- Promotion Growth
  - Becomes important because there may be a tradeoff between promotion and salary growth

Pair of metrics – promotion and salary – provide better insights than off-scale salary alone. Future faculty salary policy recommendations to take into account both of these metrics rather than only one or off-scale salary alone. Certain cohorts may benefit more by focusing on promotion rather than salary or vice-versa.
Questions?/Discussion
February 13, 2013

Gary Forman, DDS, MBA
Executive Director
Campus Life Services
1855 Folsom Street, MCB 306
San Francisco, CA  94143

Re: Revisions to Current Housing Policies, UCSF

Dear Dr. Forman:

The Faculty Welfare Committee of the San Francisco Division of the University of California Academic Senate appreciated hearing your presentation at its February 7, 2013 meeting.

Upon discussion, Committee members concurred with the proposal to limit housing for students to:

- Six years (if a PhD student)
- Five years (all other students)

Committee members also supported having a rotating volume of housing units be available each fall, for incoming students. However, Committee member differed in their assessment of faculty housing needs.

While Campus Life Services proposed a three-year term limit for faculty, Faculty Welfare Committee members thought two years was a sufficient amount of time for faculty to determine residence location and to purchase or rent a residence within the area.

If you need further information or documentation from Committee members, we are happy to provide.

Sincerely,

Committee on Faculty Welfare

Paul Green, PhD, Chair
Leah Karliner, MD, Vice Chair
Maria Dall’Era, MD
Elissa Epel, PhD
Kirsten Green, MD
Melvin Grumbach, MD
Grayson Bill Marshall, DDS, PhD, MPH
Octavia Plesh, DDS, MS
Roberta Rehm, RN, PhD, FAAN
Shuvo Roy, PhD
Lisa Thompson, RN, PhD, FNP