March 6, 2023

To: Elizabeth Watkins  
Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor  
Daniel Jeske  
Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

From: Sang-Hee Lee  
Chair, Riverside Division

RE: Proposal - Senate Faculty Retention Processes - Updated Set of Comments

Dear Liz and Dan,

As previously shared, Executive Council discussed the proposed Senate Faculty Retention Processes on December 12, 2022, and engaged in significant discussion, during which it was agreed that it is important for faculty executive committees to opine on the subject proposal. I now attach responses regarding the proposed Senate Faculty Retention Processes from the Committees on Academic Personnel, Diversity Equity & Inclusion, Faculty Welfare, and Planning & Budget, as well as those received from the CHASS, SOE, and SOM faculty executive committees.

In service,

Sang-Hee Lee

CC: Katina Napper, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
February 6, 2023

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: John Kim, Chair
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: CHASS EC memo on the Senate Faculty Retention Process

The CHASS Executive Committee (EC) reviewed the preemptive and non-preemptive retention processes for Senate faculty that are being used at UCR, as illustrated through a series of flowcharts and FAQs drafted to enhance transparency and improve communication to faculty on how retention processes work at UCR.

While we appreciate the attempt to improve transparency and communication, the CHASS EC has the following concerns concerning the preemptive and nonpreemptive processes as laid out in the flowcharts and FAQs:

1. There remains a lack of sufficient engagement with DEI. The proposal does not include any mechanisms to address DEI concerns and thus reproduces the same DEI retention issues that have been raised by faculty;

2. The report adopts militaristic metaphors such as “strategic” and “threat.” While it is appropriate that retention decisions be informed by broader UCR needs and goals, we suggest that other ways of framing the criteria would be better;

3. Other common situations are not addressed in the documents, such as when faculty are approached to be considered as a target of excellence hire at another institution;

4. The current document refers to the flowcharts as “retention process” when in fact they are just diagrams that show a selected number of formal review steps and the order in which they shall occur as part of a retention action. We suggest that a broader conceptualization
of “retention,” as a process that begins when somebody is hired and throughout the person’s career, will facilitate engagement with the larger institutional issues that lead away faculty – especially faculty of color – who in a better workplace environment could and would continue to do excellent work at UCR.

5. Though the flowcharts are helpful in understanding the overall retention process, we feel strongly that each step in the flowchart requires a narrative explanation with normative expectations governing each step.

6. In relation to Points 1 and 5 (above), the overall retention process would benefit tremendously from the inclusion of an ethical principle guiding it, such as, “A good-faith effort shall be made at each step in the process to retain the faculty member in question, especially with regard to DEI concerns.”
January 13, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Division Chair of the UCR Division of the Academic Senate and Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of the UCR Academic Senate

From: Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D., Faculty Chair of the School of Education Executive Committee

Subject: [Campus Review] Consultation: Senate Faculty Retention Processes

The SOE Executive Committee reviewed the [Campus Review] Consultation: Senate Faculty Retention Processes. Committee members provided feedback via email because the deadline for comments fell between FEC meeting dates.

The Executive Committee overall thought the document was fine. The flowchart is very helpful and should be shared with all faculty because at present, most faculty are probably not aware there is a formal process, let alone the steps involved. Here are a few more specific comments:

- On the third page, the UCR Non-Preemptive Retention Process diagram doesn’t include the “joint letter” step, but says, “Terms are at the…formulated on the basis of joint letter.” The next point also discusses, “includes CV, joint letter, and Dean’s…” If a joint letter won’t be developed for non-preemptive retention, it should be removed from the notes under the steps “Dean’s letter of proposed terms” and “Liaison reviews terms w/ candidate.”
- On the first page, adding a comma after “in the preemptive retention process” would improve the readability of the following sentence: "It will be seen that in the preemptive retention process[,] a check-and-balance feature that extends campus input on the strategic value of a retention effort has been introduced."
- On the second page:
  - A period is missing at the end of the sentence "Letter is discussed with the candidate[.]
  - The first letter of "effort" is in lowercase in one place and in uppercase in another. I would suggest writing it in lowercase to be consistent.
  - Remove “and” before the second item in the following sentence: “Terms are at the discretion of…, [and] guided by and reviewed by the Liaison, and formulated on the basis of joint letter.”
  - A period is missing at the end of the first “notes” item (Also on the third page).
- The sizing and spacing of the text and figures should be improved before distribution.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D.
Faculty Executive Committee Chair 2022-2025
School of Education
University of California, Riverside
January 17, 2023

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division

FROM: Marcus Kaul, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine

SUBJECT: Response to [Campus Review] Consultation: Senate Faculty Retention Processes

Dear Sang-Hee,

The SOM Faculty Executive Committee has reviewed Senate Faculty Retention Processes.

The committee discussed the Preemptive Retention Process and agreed the proposed process is long and cumbersome. Some members also expressed serious concerns about the effectiveness of the proposed procedure and the ability to retain faculty.

The committee welcomed the idea of formalizing the ability to discuss and come to terms on a faculty’s retention when they are a finalist for another position. However, the committee would like to see a process that prioritizes communication between Department Chairs and Deans with a decision made in a timely manner between those entities, while maintaining confidentiality and flexibility during the negotiating process.

The committee feels that including unit-wide voting during the process would lead to delays and negative impact on moral as well as unintentionally jeopardize retention in the near and far term. An alternative that may mitigate these potential impacts, while also allowing a degree of transparency, would be a requirement for the unit Chair to inform and consult with a unit’s space & finance committees, executive committee, or similar unit entity. This would make the policy more nimble and be in step with peer institutions with whom we are competing with for talented faculty.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Kaul, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee School of Medicine
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

October 26, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
    Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Jang-Ting Guo, Chair
      Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: [Campus Review] Consultation: Senate Faculty Retention Processes

CAP discussed the proposed revisions to Senate Retention Processes. The committee supports their improved clarity and appreciates their spirit of transparency. Below are our comments and suggestions:

- **“Strategic value”** is a new criterion that drives every step in the preemptive retention process, but it is neither discussed nor defined, nor does it appear in the current “UCR Guidelines for Preemptive Retention Procedures for Senate Faculty.” We urge attention to it - “strategic” according to whom? Does this word indirectly signal university-wide strategic plan priorities? Could a faculty member be valued by their department in ways that do not align with strategic planning? Could this criterion be a place where any misalignment between departmental and College or campus priorities results in stopping the retention process? In sum, the introduction of this key criterion is unexplained and it raises numerous questions that need to be rectified.

- We note that **CAP review** is not part of non-preemptive retention processes (and presumably never has been). We suggest this should either be acknowledged explicitly or reconsidered.

- CAP views the **5-year moratorium** between retention requests as unnecessarily long and inflexible. After all, effective retention processes should prevent the loss of faculty members, and our best faculty will undoubtedly be courted by other institutions. We suggest 3 years rather than 5. For FAQ point #3, we urge the inclusion (and flexibility) of the word “normally,” *i.e.*, “If a retention offer is made and accepted, the period of time during which the faculty member is ineligible for consideration of another retention offer is normally 3 years.”

- In a similar vein, we urge the inclusion of the words “normally” and “salary” for FAQ point #4, specifically “... the faculty member normally returns to UCR at the same rank, step, and salary they were at when they left.”

- For the preemptive retention process, we note that a candidate’s review packet proceeds to CAP for assessment, regardless of whether the Department and/or the Dean support(s) retention or not. We suggest the retention process be stopped when both the Department and the Dean are not supportive.
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, & INCLUSION

November 14, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Katherine Stavropoulos, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

Re: [Campus Review] Consultation: Senate Faculty Retention Processes

The Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (CoDEI) met on October 27th, 2022, to discuss the document describing the faculty retention process in cases where faculty are shortlisted for interview elsewhere ('preemptive retention') or have a offer of employment elsewhere ('non-preemptive retention').

CoDEI appreciates the intent to provide greater clarity and transparency in the process, but committee members identified several concerns:

- There is a significant difference in the process between preemptive and non-pre-emptive retentions, and the reasons for that difference are not well explained or justified and may lead to inequitable outcomes. In non-preemptive cases, the process seems to have many fewer checks and balances – there is no involvement of CAP, the VPAP or the Provost in such cases, and the decision making power rests only with the Dean. CoDEI members raised concerns that having only a single individual making decisions in such cases, with no possibility for review, could increase the subjectivity of retention decisions with potentially detrimental outcomes for diversity, equity and inclusion.

- A second point of concern surrounding non-preemptive retention cases is that there is no review of the appropriateness of any retention offer made by the Dean. It is possible to imagine hypothetical cases where a retention is supported by a faculty member's home department, but the offer made by the Dean is not commensurate with that support and not reviewed by any other entity on campus.

- The primary criterion under which retention decisions are made is whether retention is considered 'strategic' by the Dean, or other campus entities (CAP, the VPAP, the Provost). Yet there is no guidance on what constitutes a 'strategic' retention, which makes the decision making process intrinsically subjective. CoDEI members recommend that DEI issues be explicitly considered in this process, and that more detail be provided on what criteria are used to assess if a retention is strategic.

- CoDEI notes that there are no recommendations surrounding spousal hiring codified in the policy. Spousal hires are often a motivation for faculty members to seek other positions and may be a means of increasing diversity in a department or campus.
Faculty Welfare reviewed the Senate Faculty Retention Processes at their November 8, 2022 meeting. We appreciate the administration’s efforts to clarify the retention processes at UCR, as even committee members noted discrepancies between departments. With respect to the department vote, some members expressed concern: if the department faculty voted not to pursue retention, and the outside offer later fell through, the potential for an awkward situation exists. Will the faculty vote be confidential and not shared with the candidate? Also, there is some concern about the potential to abuse the system, i.e., candidates who have negotiated a better salary through the retention process, stayed on at UCR another year or two, and then used their new salary in renegotiations with the outside universities. We feel that the policy could afford more discussions including, for example, case studies.
PLANNING & BUDGET

November 9, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Peter Atkinson, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

RE: [Campus Review] Consultation: Senate Faculty Retention Processes

Planning & Budget reviewed the Faculty Retention Process at their October 25, 2022 meeting and applauds the VPAP’s attention to this important campus-wide chronic issue. However, the committee has concerns which need to be addressed if the document is to provide more realistic guidance and assurance to faculty, chairs and college and campus administrators.

First, the flowcharts detail a process that still takes a considerable amount of time which can be delayed by inaction, for whatever reason, at any step. It is not a nimble process, yet our collective experience is one where time can be of the essence given that the recruiting campus often does not have the constraints facing our own. In this context, the committee is concerned that waiting until a faculty member is shortlisted for an interview is too late to begin a pre-emptive retention process. Could this flowchart begin upon a personal invitation to apply for a position?

Second, can some steps be removed? For example, does CAP need to be involved in every case? What formal course of action can be taken if the process is being delayed at any step?

Third, the flowcharts appear to be focused on compensation, rank and step. Indeed, these are important items for any retention and must be addressed, however faculty dissatisfaction can be rooted in other areas, such as a lack of respect, lack of support staff, poor facilities, and lack of community and campus culture. We recognize that none of these are amenable to “quick fixes” and doing so on a case-by-case basis may result in disparities between faculty, even within the same department. Nonetheless these issues cannot be ignored and need to be the focus of a collective effort by leadership to address and communicate them, now, with a transparency and sincerity that will provide faculty reassurance that their futures are at UCR and not elsewhere. Some non-salary issues like lab and office space can be decided by the Department chair, but others need to be handled at the campus level. These include housing (via the mortgage assistance program?), childcare (e.g., slots in the UCR Child Development
Center), partner employment especially when more than one college is involved (a Faculty Liaison Office (?) was started a couple of years ago but needs to have more resources to be effective), and parking. Having an established process whereby a chair knows exactly who to contact for each of these resources and the respective units have pre-established procedures for how to handle retention issues would be useful.

Finally, a smaller but important point in the flowcharts: who is the liaison? Can it be any faculty member (for example a colleague of the faculty member being courted by another campus) or is this a faculty member with a defined administrative appointment?
October 6, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair of Riverside Division

From: Elizabeth Watkins
   Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
   Daniel Jeske
   Vice Provost of Academic Personnel

Via: Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of Riverside Division

RE: Senate Faculty Retention Processes

Dear Sang-Hee,

The preemptive and non-preemptive retention processes for Senate faculty that are being used at UCR have prompted questions about clarity and transparency. The documentation for these processes that has been available is a 2017 memo that addresses preemptive retentions:


To overcome uncertainty about how these processes work, and some frustration with the variability in how they have been implemented across the campus, we propose use of the attached flowcharts that outline in more detail the steps that each should involve. It will be seen that in the preemptive retention process a check-and-balance feature that extends campus input on the strategic value of a retention effort has been introduced. An accompanying FAQ sheet addresses questions such as what is required to initiate a preemptive retention, and what type of discretion is allowed at UCR to approve a return to UCR in situations where a faculty member accepts an outside offer but later regrets doing so.

We invite comments from the Senate on this effort to improve the communication to faculty on how retention processes work at UCR.

Thank you.
UCR Preemptive Retention Process

Discussion between the candidate and their liaison
Initiated by candidate being shortlisted for an interview. Review of exigent threat, and identification of candidate’s ideas about possible retention terms.

Department meeting, vote by ladder rank faculty, letter
Vote is on if the retention effort is strategic. Letter includes pertinent threat and market analysis. Letter is discussed with the candidate.

Liaison and Dean discussion
Liaison represents the candidate, the department view, and their own view. Liaison extends invitation to candidate from the Dean to meet. Dean develops an opinion on if the retention effort is strategic.

Joint letter from Liaison and Dean
Department and Dean perspectives on if the retention effort is strategic are both described. Joint letter is discussed with the candidate.

Dean is supportive

Dean’s letter of proposed terms
Terms are at the discretion of the Dean, possibly in consultation with the VPAP for salary plan, and guided by and reviewed by the Liaison, and formulated on the basis of joint letter.

Review packet sent to CAP via APO
Includes CV, joint letter and Dean’s proposed terms.

CAP adds vote and letter

VPAP adds vote and letter

Provost makes final decision

CV and Joint letter sent to CAP via APO

CAP votes if retention is strategic

VPAP votes if retention is strategic

Provost decides retention is strategic

yes
End

no

Notes:
1. Candidate’s liaison is normally the Chair but they have the option to choose an alternate liaison (e.g., Equity Advisor or Associate/Divisional Dean)
2. To facilitate an expedited review, parties are requested to work toward completing the preemptive review process in 2 weeks.
3. At any point in the process the candidate may request the process be stopped.
UCR Non-Preemptive Retention Process

**Discussion between the candidate and their liaison**
- Initiated by an offer letter. Review of exigent threat, and identification of candidate’s ideas about possible retention terms.

**Department meeting, vote by ladder rank faculty, letter**
- Vote is on if the retention effort is strategic. Letter includes pertinent threat and market analysis. Letter is discussed with the candidate.

**Liaison and Dean discussion**
- Liaison represents the candidate and the department view, and adds their own view. Dean develops an opinion on if the retention effort is strategic.

**Dean is supportive**

**Liaison reviews terms w/candidate**
- Includes CV, joint letter and Dean’s proposed terms.

**End**

**Liaison discusses w/candidate**

**Dean’s letter of proposed terms**
- Terms are at the discretion of the Dean, possibly in consultation with the VPAP for salary plan, and guided by and reviewed by the Liaison, and formulated on the basis of joint letter.

**Notes:**
1. Candidate’s liaison is normally the Chair but they have the option to choose an alternate liaison (e.g., Equity Advisor or Associate/Divisional Dean)
2. At any point in the process the candidate may request the process be stopped.
1. What evidence is needed at the initiation stage of a preemptive retention review in order to demonstrate that a faculty member is being considered for another job opportunity?

   *The candidate needs to provide evidence that they have been shortlisted for an open position.*

2. What happens to the preemptive retention review if it has not completed before the faculty member receives an offer letter?

   *The offer letter is added to the review materials and the preemptive process review continues, with extra attention paid to the expedited nature of the review.*

3. If a retention offer is made and accepted, what is the period of time during with the faculty member is ineligible for consideration of another retention offer?

   *Five (5) years.*

4. Can a faculty member turn down a retention offer, leave UCR, and then within a year of their departure date decide to come back to UCR?

   *This can be negotiated with the Dean, but in cases where it is approved the retention offer is rescinded, no alternative retention offer would be discussed during the time away or upon return to UCR, and the faculty member returns to UCR at the same rank and step they were at when they left.*