



Academic Senate

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

January 15, 2021

To: Thomas Smith, Interim Provost

From: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jason Stajich".

RE: President's Job Protection Program

Dear Tom,

The Executive Council (EC) discussed the proposed President's Job Protection Program (PJPP) and implementation of a curtailment plan to achieve some campus fund savings with the goal of protecting jobs, especially for the lowest paid workers on campus.

The EC and committees found that the principles of a shared commitment to campus fund recovery and savings are important. Many members were especially concerned about how this could impact junior faculty in the lower funding tiers. In addition, the potential hit to morale for faculty living through a pandemic raised some concerns as well. The practicality of implementing this with the inflexibility of UCPATH was also called into question.

The members were concerned that if the PJPP is not implemented, the campus closure curtailment during December 2020 represents an unfair burden to only staff or the few faculty on 11-month appointments.

Some EC members also expressed an interest in a proactive plan for future examination of how furloughs/salary cuts can be applied in a way that is equitable not only to current pay but also taking into context the inequities that already exist in the system. The salary bands as proposed by UCOP also had several inequities as pointed out by the CODEI committee.

Please find additional details around concerns raised by committees in the attached memos.

Thanks,
Jason



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

December 17, 2020

To: Jason Stajich
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Patricia Morton, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Request for Recommendations: President's Job Protection Program

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met on December 15, 2020 to consider the proposed President's Job Protection Program. While the committee understands the urgent need to find ways to meet the budget savings target issued by UCOP, we find this program has serious defects and is not a good means for closing the budget gap. Many questions remain unanswered regarding its implementation (such the number of days under consideration), making it more difficult to gauge its potential impact on faculty and staff. We believe the modest savings that might accrue from this program do not justify the time and effort (especially staff time) it would take to administer it. We are not confident that UC PATH will be able to implement this program without causing disruptive problems. If the program is implemented, the committee is concerned about the degree that it may impact junior faculty negatively. Finally, we believe it sets a dangerous precedent if a Chancellor is allowed to reduce faculty salaries within this program, which is intended to end on June 30, 2021 but could be extended beyond this fiscal year.



COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL RESOURCES PLANNING

Academic Senate

January 6, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Ben Bishin, Chair
Committee on Physical Resources Planning

Re: Campus Review: President's Job Protection Program

The Committee on Physical Resources Planning reviewed the Campus Review: President's Job Protection Program and did not note any concern relating to the Committee's charge of Physical Resources Planning and has no further comments.



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

January 7, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Yinsheng Wang, Chair 
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Request for Recommendations: President's Job Protection Program

CAP discussed the UC President's Job Protection Plan on Jan. 4, 2021. CAP recognizes the current financial situation of our campus and the needs for cost saving. CAP, however, noted some concerns about the proposed program:

- (1) The information provided in the current proposal is still limited, rendering it difficult for CAP to determine the impact of this program on merit/promotion of faculty and CAP's evaluation of these files in the future.
- (2) We have not yet reached a full understanding about the impact of COVID-19 on faculty's productivity, and the resulting effect on their merit advancements and promotions. While the impact of COVID-19 has already been seen for some merit/promotion cases in this year, it is possible that it could have a more pronounced impact for cases in the coming year or two. The proposed salary reduction may confer additional financial burden on faculty, which may compromise faculty morale and, in some cases, affect retention of our best faculty.



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

January 7, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Jingsong Zhang, Chair
Committee on Preparatory Education

A handwritten signature in black ink, enclosed in a thin black rectangular box. The signature appears to read "Jingsong Zhang".

Re: Campus Review: President's Job Protection Program

The Committee on Preparatory Education reviewed the President's Job Protection Program and have the following comments:

1. The proposal to limit layoffs to a temporary status is sensible, as does the desire to avoid disruptions in retirement service credit, etc.
2. Some parts of the memo need clarification. For example, what the exact breakdown of the salary bands will be. Also, layoffs are presented as a possibility and not a certainty, another important detail that could help with the evaluation of the plan. Is there any idea of where these layoffs would be concentrated? Finally, there is a line in the executive summary from the Board of Regents that says eligible represented employees are subject to collective bargaining requirements. Will represented employees be exempt from this plan? This final piece of information would also be helpful when considering the plan.



COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, & INCLUSION

January 7, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Xuan Liu, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

Re: Request for Recommendations: President's Job Protection Program

The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee has concerns about how the jobs protection program's plan to cut salary might disproportionately affect individuals who earn lower salaries compared to those who earn more. That is, a 0.38% cut for individuals making between 59-89 thousand dollars per year is likely to be more substantially felt than a 1.92% cut to individuals making more than 234 thousand dollars per year. We are also concerned that this disproportionality will be most problematic for individuals who historically have lower salaries (e.g. women, people of color).

Along these lines, we note that there is a fairly linear progression of the percent pay reduction along salary bands. We feel as though alternative models would help ensure that individuals with salaries in the lower tiers have less reductions (see tables, below).

Proposed originally by UC (note that the numbers have been slightly modified in the most recent proposal, but only by a few fractions of a percentage).

Table with 5 columns: Salary tier in thousands, Curtailment days, % earnings, Savings, So total expenditures is. Rows include salary tiers from < 59 to > 234 and a TOTAL row.

Suggested to make more progressive

Table with 3 columns: Salary tier in thousands, % earnings, Savings. Rows include salary tiers from < 59 to > 234 and a final row with a total savings amount.



Academic Senate

January 7, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Alejandra Dubcovsky, Chair
Committee on Library and Information Technology

RE: Campus Review: President's Jobs Protection Program

The LIT Committee discussed the proposal, and we had several questions:

1. Since it seems that the savings will stay within the units (locally) that make the cuts how will impact departments/units that are smaller? What will the impact be of unequal savings?
2. Re: UCOP Salary Bands. Those at the bottom tiers of their scales will be more impacted. For example, someone 59K vs. 89K will be hurt more.
3. How will local decisions about cuts/salary reduction/etc. be communicated?



Academic Senate

January 6, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Hai Che, Chair
Committee on Research

Re: 20-21. CR. Presidents Job Protection Program

The committee on research reviewed the President Jobs Protection Program and had no additional comments.

TO: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

FR: Richard M. Carpiano, Chair
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: Review of President's Proposed Job Protection Program

Date: January 8, 2021

The Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy reviewed the document detailing the President's Proposed Job Protection Program. We appreciate that there are difficult politics for proposing what is, fundamentally, a pay cut—i.e. a proposed measure that is unsurprising given the current campus financial situation. Our comments on this proposed plan focus on the substantive matter of how the proposed salary bands are divided. We recognize that the bands provided in the proposal are just an example. Nevertheless, in the absence of much detail regarding how the actual bands will be constructed, we hope that any actual bands will be less broad and more coherent and consistent than the examples in the memo. Altogether, these bands should be broken up into categories of \$15,000 or less and utilize a much more gradual scale than the examples offered.

Sincerely,



Richard M. Carpiano, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Professor of Public Policy and Sociology