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 is supportive

Junction if retention is strategic
- Provost makes final decision

CV and Joint letter sent to CAP via APO
- Includes CV, joint letter and Dean's proposed terms.

CAP votes if retention is strategic
- CAP adds vote and letter
- VPAP adds vote and letter

VPAP votes if retention is strategic
- Provost decides retention is strategic

Provost makes final decision
- Provost makes final decision

End
- End

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

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. Dean is supportive

5. Yes
   - Liaison and Dean discussion
   - Liaison reviews terms w/candidate
   - Dean's letter of proposed terms
   - Includes CV, joint letter and Dean's 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.

6. No
   - Liaison discusses w/candidate
   - End

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.*