

TO: Kristin Esterberg, Chancellor
Sharon Jones, Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs
Gowri Shankar, Vice Chancellor Planning and Administration

FROM: Keith Nitta, Chair, Campus Council Planning and Budget, General Faculty Organization
Jason Naranjo, Chair, General Faculty Organization
Shauna Carlisle, Vice-Chair, General Faculty Organization

DATE: December 6, 2021

RE: Faculty Feedback on Proposed Salary Unit Adjustment

On November 16, Vice Chancellors Sharon Jones and Gowri Shankar requested the GFO collect faculty advice on four issues: *What is a sustainable unit adjustment pool; should the pool size be distributed at the school or campus level; how should we compute the target salary for compression adjustments; and what principles should we use in determining partial adjustments if the size of the adjustment pool is insufficient to fully address compression?* This memo provides faculty feedback on all four issues.

On November 23, the GFO Executive Council approved the following statement:

“Over the last several weeks, the GFO has discussed, debated and compromised our way through a dialogue about the opportunity for salary unit adjustments presented to us by the UW Provost’s office. The parameters of this unit adjustment exercise are indelibly rooted in the same systems of oppression that have led to salary inequity. Most importantly, **faculty and administration at UW Bothell have been repeatedly refused access to faculty demographic data, making it impossible to ascertain any pattern of racial, gender, age or disability status salary inequity, as well as to understand the effects by race, gender, age or disability status of different approaches to unit adjustment.** We believe Academic HR’s decision to withhold demographic data contradicts the University of Washington’s public commitment to social justice and equity. Given this significant limitation, the GFO Executive Council membership, many of whom are faculty of color, has been placed in an untenable position as individuals, representatives and colleagues, representing a form of tokenism that is undeniably unjust. We have been asked to speak to and gather feedback from faculty about their choice of one of several incomplete solutions that address only a small proportion of salary inequity, without having the information to understand the effects of our choices. Unit adjustments and reducing salary compression are small band-aids on an ongoing, systemic issue at the University of Washington, and are only one aspect of the GFO’s work to address salary inequity.”

Throughout fall quarter, the GFO has gathered faculty feedback on unit adjustment. While there have been challenges in this process, we want to recognize that this has been one of the most collaborative and transparent unit adjustment processes this campus has engaged in. We describe those processes in detail in the faculty survey preamble (attached), which outlines the time constraints and limited to no access to the compression data to properly assess the models and calculations.

While we gathered feedback in many ways and venues, we believe the recently completed faculty survey provides the best, most up-to-date information about faculty preferences on the four issues outlined in your Nov. 16 memo. The survey was open from Nov. 29 to Dec. 3. A link was emailed to 188 eligible faculty members and **102 faculty completed the survey (54% response rate)**, though not everyone answered every question. Administrators, including school deans and vice chancellors, were

included in the survey as voting members of the GFO, though they may have also provided their preferences through the Council of Academic Deans or directly to the Chancellor.

The attached table, *GFO Unit Adjustment Survey Results by School and by Rank*, provides survey results in detail. In summary, **the majority of the faculty respondents campus-wide prefer larger compression pools and a campus-level process, but there is no campus-wide consensus on preferred methodology to calculate target salaries or on preferred scenarios for distributing adjustment funds.** Specifically:

1. **On the preferred methodology to calculate target salaries, a plurality of faculty respondents campus-wide (39%) preferred Method 2.** By school, Business (86%) and Nursing and Health Studies (88%) overwhelmingly preferred Method 2. A plurality of IAS faculty (38%) preferred Method 1. By rank, the majority of Assistant Professors (56%) and a plurality of all tenure track faculty (43%) preferred Method 2. Method 3 was the least preferred across all five schools. The qualitative responses showed this was the most controversial question with many strong opinions.
2. **On the size of the compression adjustment pool, a majority of faculty respondents campus-wide (55%) preferred the largest pool of 2% total annual faculty compensation.** By school, STEM (67%), IAS (45%), SES (100%), and NHS (72%) preferred the largest pool size. However, a majority of the Business faculty (69%) preferred the smallest 1% pool. By rank, a majority of the teaching track faculty (79%) and plurality of tenure track faculty (45%) preferred the 2% pool.
3. **On the distribution of the adjustment pool, a plurality of faculty respondents campus-wide (39%) preferred Scenario 3, the compromise option.** By school, a majority of the Business school faculty (54%) preferred Scenario 1. There was no consensus in other schools. By rank, Professors (60%) preferred Scenario 2, while Assistant Professors (47%) preferred Scenario 1. Pluralities of both the teaching track faculty (38%) and tenure track faculty (37%) preferred Scenario 3.
4. **Finally, on level for implementing the unit adjustment, a majority of faculty respondents campus-wide (57%) preferred a campus-level decision.** By school, majorities of the Business faculty (71%) and STEM faculty (59%) prefer a school-level decision, while majorities of the IAS (81%), SES (100%), and NHS (75%) faculties want a campus-level decision, for this year at least. By rank, majorities of both the teaching faculty (56%) and tenure rack faculty (57%) preferred a campus-level decision.

The qualitative responses to the faculty survey and the face-to-face feedback from the GFO meeting, as well as EC and CCPB meetings raise several issues beyond the four above:

1. **The UWB faculty want demographic data on faculty race, gender, disability, age, etc.** to be used in any analysis of salary equity, including the unit adjustment. The GFO has requested your assistance in accessing these data from Academic HR and the Provost's office. We realize that getting access to these data will likely not occur before decisions are made about the unit adjustment, but the faculty clearly believe that salary equity analysis cannot truly be done without these demographic data
2. **The UWB faculty want to address salary inequity beyond the unit adjustment.** They wonder the reasons for salary compression, for example inequitable capacities in starting salary negotiations. Further, we need to distinguish between "equity" and "compression" and understand equity from the perspective of faculty of color in particular.
3. **Many faculty struggled to understand the questions regarding unit adjustment, but there was broad engagement and participation across the UWB faculty on this issue.** The GFO EC, CCPB, school Elected Faculty Councils, and individual faculty provided venues for discussion and debate.