

March 2, 2012

As announced in the Senate Meeting on February 29th, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) is undertaking a major initiative in re-defining the metrics for comparing faculty salary across the UC system. As you are aware, the current standard at UCSC is to utilize off-scale salaries as the metric to compare UCSC salaries with those of UCD or a composite consisting of the salaries at the 4-sister campuses UCD, UCSB, UCI, and UCR. This comparison has been undertaken by the APO office every Fall. The comparison report has been the key document in measuring the progress of faculty salary at UCSC against other campuses.

CFW believes that with increasing fragmentation in faculty salary policy and implementation across the various UC campuses, off-scale salary has become an inadequate measure for comparison. Therefore, CFW has introduced a pair of metrics – promotion growth and salary growth – in its attempt to lay a new foundation for comparing faculty salaries across the system irrespective of diverse and variable personnel policies and practices adopted at different campuses.

CFW has completed its preliminary analysis of UCSC faculty data. This analysis has confirmed our belief that this pair of metrics is worthy of investigation. Furthermore, CFW has obtained fresh insights on many issues related to faculty salary policy. This approach, if adopted, has important implications in determining the faculty salary policy at UCSC in the future and should be of great interest to all faculty at UCSC and in fact, system-wide.

CFW has presented this analysis the Senate Executive Committee and has begun to engage with the VC, EVC, and VPAA to discuss this new approach. The set of slides that capture this analysis follows.

CFW is aware that without a detailed report to accompany the slides, they may be difficult to understand. Even more importantly, some of the included results must be interpreted with great care and the numbers may shift with fine tuning. Yet we believe that the aggregate observations will retain their validity. Although we could have erred on the side of waiting until a much more polished report comes out, we have erred on the side of early engagement in the interest of transparency and with the hope that more eyes looking into data may provide fresh and deeper understanding.

Sincerely Yours,

Suresh K. Lodha
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare