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?