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.