

March 13, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez

Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Daniel Jeske, Chair

Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Campus Implementation Procedures for the Negotiated Salary Trial Program

The Committee on Faculty Welfare considered the material provided for the Campus Implementation Procedures for the Negotiated Salary Trial Program. A majority of the committee approves of the proposal; however, one member expressed the following concerns:

The comments below evolved from reading the first part of the document, 'General Campus Negotiated Salary Program Implementation Plan.' There are not many, if any, differences between the general plan and the UCR plan.

P.1 talks about eligible faculty being able to participate at all campuses. But p.5 suggests departments have the option to participate or not. How does a department decide? If departments can vote 'no,' this disadvantages faculty members in the department that want to participate.

The title "Fund Manager/Department Business Officer," that is used in the document is unclear. See page 7, for example. Is this the same as our contract and grant analyst? Same as FAO? Same as someone in RED?

It is not clear when reading the document where the agency gets involved in the approval process. Does the Fund Manager/Department Business Officer ensure the proposed redirect of external funds is ok with the agency?

The role of CAP in all of this is also not clear. The documents note that each campus is given latitude to determine the role of CAP in their process. My understanding of CAP is they judge academic performance relative to advancement, and I understand they can also make O/S adjustment recommendations. Are we to infer that CAP will weigh the request for use of the NSTP program against academic achievement? Wouldn't the presence of the funds that support the NSTP request being indicative of whatever information CAP would want to use in their review of the request?