



May 21, 2024

Delivered via email

To: SANTA CRUZ FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Re: Response to SCFA on Salary Equity and Campus Practice at Promotion

Thank you for your letter of March 22, 2024 as it explains SCFA's thinking about the salary equity review proposal. The University is concerned about both *intra-campus equity*, *inter-campus equity* and the intersection of those concerns due to the inter-campus equity issues not being uniform across all disciplines. As a result, the University does not believe a blanket approach is the most effective path for addressing inter-campus equity. The University also believes that any efforts to increase salaries at UCSC, such as the Salary Equity Program, will also help with inter-campus equity. *The Universities response focuses on intra-campus equity*, with the understanding that the allocation of budgetary funds into salaries in order to address intra-campus equity will also help with inter-campus equity.

The University **accepts** the SCFA's proposal to implement the 2022 Salary Equity Program approach every five years - *subject to funding availability* - or earlier if there is a mandate from UCOP to implement an equity program in a particular year. The University also **agrees** that this salary equity program limits subjectivity in the process and provides more transparency for faculty. The University appreciates that it is automatic, as faculty would not be required to request a review as that would eliminate the concern about whether reviews are being requested equitably. The University proposes that the next program be effective **no later than October 1, 2027** (again, subject to funding availability).

In terms of monitoring gender and ethnicity equity, the University notes that the campus equity study has been repeated in [2018](#) as well as [2022](#). The University expects that it will again repeat this process in or around 2026.

As we progress through another cycle of faculty reviews, we have continued to see faculty who have been promoted into the associate rank at step 3, and who will again be subject to campus salary increase limits at the associate level. One approach to address this issue would be to revisit the proposal to adjust the special salary practice. This would mean that at a promotion, there would be an option to provide the salary equivalent of an acceleration (including an A1) without giving the additional step when the additional step would place the faculty member too high in the next rank.

Given the SCFA's concerns with our proposal to modify the special salary practice at promotion as described above, the University suggests two other alternative approaches: 1) the UCLA model of normative advancement to Associate Step 1, and 2) cessation of the use of Assistant Step 5.

The UCLA campus policies provide that promotion to the associate rank is normally to Associate Step 1, even when advancing from the overlapping Assistant Steps 5 or 6. Faculty who qualify for an acceleration are moved to Associate Step 2. Their formal policy language in [Appendix 13.ii](#) states in part:

“Regular advancement will always be from one of the Assistant Professor steps to Associate Professor, Step I. All faculty can remain at the Assistant Professor rank for eight years (or less if they believe they are ready to advance to Associate Professor). Any proposed promotion from Assistant Professor to a step beyond Associate Professor, Step I will be considered an acceleration and will have to be justified as any acceleration in step or rank.”

The new total salary would be computed in a way that the advancement was from Assistant Step 5 to Associate Step 2 (or Step 3 for an acceleration), and then that salary will be apportioned into **on-scale** and **off-scale** based on placement at Associate Step 1 (or Associate Step 2 for an acceleration). Therefore, *faculty would receive the same total salary as under our current approach*. This new approach provides faculty with more time to move through the associate rank while reducing issues with confronting the promotion barrier too early. This is similar to our proposal but eliminates the need to make case by case determinations.

A third alternative would be to maintain current promotion practices while ending the use of Assistant Step 5. According to [APM 220-18-b.2](#): “Steps V and VI may be used in exceptional situations and with proper justification.” Therefore, Assistant Step 5 is supposed to be used only in exceptional situations, and not routinely. The University also notes that Assistant Step 1 is rarely used on our campus. We believe that the routine use of Steps 2-5 rather than 1-4 is tied to a past campus policy that no longer exists (which had limited off-scale salaries at each step). Higher steps were used in order to be able to offer competitive starting salaries. The University could shift the use of the assistant steps from the current steps 2-5 to steps 1-4 instead. The University would be clear that there would be **no limits** on salary increases for merit reviews at Assistant Step 4 so that faculty could continue to get salary increases without the need for moving to a higher step (analogous to the current treatment at Assistant Step 5). The effect would be similar to the UCLA policy, in that normative promotion from Assistant Step 4 is to Associate Step 1, and an acceleration would be to Associate Step 2. Again, this approach would provide faculty with more time at the associate rank in order to build their portfolios for promotion to full before hitting barrier step issues at the associate rank.

We look forward to discussing these three proposals with the SCFA.

Sincerely,



Stephanie Vick
Principal Academic Labor Relations Analyst

cc:

Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Kletzer
Vice Provost Lee
Assistant Vice Provost McClintock
scfa.assist@gmail.com