

Value to Berkeley Assessment

Background

In the last few years we have seen extraordinary salary offers made to Berkeley faculty members by other institutions; these retention cases place increasing strain on campus resources and amplify issues of inequity within and across departments/schools/colleges. Therefore, Berkeley needs a systematic and effective strategy to address these issues. However, the campus has yet to develop a best practice for the evaluation of individual cases that would be fair and equitable, which at the same time addresses the budgetary and FTE impact of responding to such retention offers.

In consultation with the Budget Committee, we are adopting a "Value to Berkeley Assessment" (VBA) to treat retention cases that require "decoupled" increments. The VBA defines and rationalizes the criteria for evaluating these personnel actions. The VBA is designed to assess the merits of using campus resources for the retention of an individual faculty member, given the opportunities to use these resources to address other personnel needs. The VBA, by placing the proposed personnel action in the larger context of its estimated impact on campus resources and distinction, goes significantly beyond the assessment used in normal merit reviews, where the emphasis falls primarily on the past achievement and distinction of the faculty member, with minimal consideration on the impact of the "decoupling" decision on the institution, its resources, and mission.

Due to current budgetary constraints, all retention cases that include a proposal for a new or increased "decoupled" increment should be accompanied by a VBA as part of the recommendation. Chairs and Deans should focus VBAs on specific compelling issues raised by an individual case under consideration. We have developed a list of criteria that should be considered, but recognize that not all of those outlined below may be relevant to every case.

A VBA should consider the following (where applicable):

Berkeley Record and Achievement

- 1) How outstanding and exceptional are the research, teaching, and mentoring records of the individual?
- 2) How broadly does the faculty member's research program influence other research on campus (e.g., collaborations, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research)?
- 3) How do the teaching, research, professional and public service contributions of the faculty member promote diversity and equal opportunity on campus?
- 4) If the individual is currently at Professor Step VIII, VIII.5 or IX, can a strong case be made for advancement to above-scale status?
- 5) In fields in which outside funding for successful research programs is the norm, does the individual bring to the campus enough research funding to support his/her research program?
- 6) As a measure of the faculty member's excellence, what has been the pattern of accelerated advancements?
- 7) Does this current outside offer form part of a pattern of entertained outside offers on the part of the faculty member? Is there reason to think that a responsive salary increase in this case will end the cycle of retention battles?

Future Potential and Estimate of Loss

- 1) What is the value or contribution of the faculty member's field to Berkeley's mission and strength? If the faculty member resigned from Berkeley, would the field be replaced? Is the

faculty member the only person doing this research or possessing this expertise on the campus?

- 2) Is the individual being recruited or retained so valuable to the campus that she or he is worth two or more junior faculty?
- 3) Will the loss of the faculty member adversely impact the national or international standing of the unit?
- 4) What would be the impact of the individual's loss to the department(s) and the campus with respect to the attraction of graduate students, and recruitment/retention of other faculty in the research area? If the faculty member resigns, will others leave?
- 5) What is the faculty member's future potential in research? In teaching? In campus leadership? Is his/her accomplishment and impact over the most recent review cycle indicative of his/her future performance in each of these areas, i.e., there has been a change in research direction or the potential for new findings?
- 6) In the areas of teaching, research, and service, does the candidate meet the standards of "collegiality" as referenced in the APM and the AAUP Statement of Ethics?

Analysis of Competing Offer

- 1) Would the salary offered in response to the competing offer create problems with equity within the unit?
- 2) Is the offer from a peer institution? If it is not a peer institution, is it a peer department (explain)?
- 3) Is the offer an administrative position (and thus perhaps a "career change") and does the salary offer include a stipend or the equivalent for the administrative function? If so, provide a breakdown of the salary components, if possible.
- 4) What is the nature of the offer: tenure vs. non-tenure, indefinite or term, fiscal vs. academic year? If a conversion from fiscal year to academic year is needed, use the 12/9ths formula: $(FY/12)*9$.
- 5) Is the offer from a non-educational institution or organization?
- 6) Is the offer from a foreign institution? If so, explain how the requested Berkeley salary was derived (including the conversion rate and any other factors considered).

The VBA does not require a question by question response, but rather the issues raised above should be addressed in the retention case. As a reminder, a full case must be presented if the faculty member has been reviewed two or more years prior; if the faculty member was reviewed within the last year, the request for retention should focus on the need to retain.

This clear set of criteria, focusing on the "value" of the faculty member to the campus community, should make it easier for Chairs and Deans to evaluate high-salary competitive offers, to apply the justification for the request, and thus become better stewards of our campus resources.