Campus Council on Planning and Budget Meeting
Feb 9, 2022, 11am – 12:30pm, via Zoom

Present: Keith Nitta (Chair), Mike Stiber, P.K. Sen, Shauna Carlisle, Camille Walsh, Peter Brooks, Jason Naranjo, Stefanie Iverson Cabral

Approval of Minutes
- Minutes approved

Unit Adjustment
- Update on Current Unit Adjustment
  - Approved by Provost last week
  - Deans received lists of faculty eligible for adjustment and have until Feb 15 to confirm that faculty meet eligibility criteria
  - VCPA will provide faculty list to CCPB on Feb 16 for review, CCPB response due Feb 23
  - Final list of faculty due to Provost on March 1
  - Nitta will ask VCPA for sample data now so CCPB can review how formula is being used and, later, will check to ensure formula was applied correctly to everyone

DISCUSSION:
- If inconsistencies are found in sample, raises questions as to whether right people are in pool. Check pool, THEN check consistency. Need to tell admin that if there are errors, we will accept the numbers for now but, if someone was missed, they have to make good

- Preparing for Next Unit Adjustment
  - CCPB summarize work done on current unit adjustment to help whoever handles next one
  - Next unit adjustment will probably come up quickly, need to strategize how to begin to have efficacy for decision-making ongoing
    - Need campus-wide policy for addressing merit and compression on an ongoing basis rather than waiting for a unit adjustment
  - Need to look at how each school is dealing with compression and merit now. Will help to better understand underlying inequities across schools.

- Other Steps Toward Salary Equity?
  DISCUSSION:
  - Concern around AAUP issue being tied to salary equity and unit adjustment
    - AAUP Issue: Full professor’s not being compensated at same rate as peer institutions. Provost proposed using unit adjustment funds to incentivize performance later in career
      - AAUP is subset of faculty, not everyone is part of conversation
      - Work on this was started in 2019 so it is outdated
      - Discussion at Faculty Senate is AAUP is not representative of all faculty
        - Conversation around appropriateness of using unit adjustment funds to address salary
      - Needs to come through as Class A legislation and full faculty discussions relating to labor rights, adjustment, and salary need to happen
• Faculty Senate will discuss interpretation of code, especially pieces that would allow this to go through without Class A legislation
  ▪ Need to be cautious as the attempt was to pass this without going through Senate
  ▪ Comparing UWB to other institutions: in some areas, faculty paid 15-25% less than peers in same disciplines at UWS. That isn’t compression, it is market within UW
  ▪ STEM DEI group did some work on this, unsure of outcomes
  ▪ Nitta requested reps gather info from schools on how salaries are addressed. Baseline can be described in a summary of what campus has done and what schools have tried to do
  ▪ Asking “Are we paid the right salary at every rank compared to our peer institutions?” is separate issue from compression, should not be put in unit adjustment
  ▪ We are losing faculty to competitive offers and that is not being tracked
  ▪ Salary that someone gets when they start has a lot of influence later. Varying philosophies of how to make starting offers could be revealed if we compared salaries
    ▪ STEM DEI suggested making procedures around salary offers more transparent
    ▪ Important to understand what latitude Deans have in setting starting salaries
    ▪ Good place to head off salary inequities is at the point of hire. CCPB could help provide policy requirements to establish equity, a level playing field for all faculty
  ▪ Is what faculty THINK they are worth to the institution reflected in their paycheck?
    ▪ Example: if faculty member has been here for 5 years, has contributed and invested particular skills, shouldn’t that investment be compensated/rewarded?
  ▪ 2% meritorious raises are not a reward, they are insufficient partial adjustment for inflation. Need to consider doing away with meritorious and expect inflation adjustment instead.
    ▪ Schools handle it differently (in IAS, everyone receives meritorious, no one receives extra meritorious. Thought of as partial inflation adjustment, not merit)
      ▪ IAS faculty not all happy about that, no real opportunity to discuss though
      ▪ Retention offers cause morale problems as well
    ▪ Should be negotiated that faculty salaries keep up with local inflation and that should be separate from meritorious.
    ▪ In SNHS, all faculty get 2% across the board. SNHS have strong feeling about competitive offers. There is dissatisfaction.
      ▪ Competitive offers are ineffective way to retain people
    ▪ In STEM, faculty proposed more time/resources should be spent on progress to promotion rather than on merit but that idea was voted down
    ▪ If no money tied to extra meritorious, it becomes meaningless, if tiny amount of money is tied to extra meritorious, could be even worse for morale
  ▪ Are all faculty getting the same advice and guidance on merit and promotion processes?
    ▪ How much time are schools investing in meritorious and extra meritorious process?
      ▪ IAS, SES, STEM: not much time, a lot of copying and pasting from other sources
      ▪ SNHS: for merit: CV, peer evaluation, student evals for year, 1-page reflection
        ▪ Faculty Code requires student eval for only one course
      ▪ Business: CV, 2 pages (one paragraph research, one teaching, one reflection)
    ▪ Faculty can get extra meritorious all the way up, then be denied promotion. Need to mentor faculty better through those processes. Make clear it is two separate processes
  ▪ CCPB reps gather information about how their schools seek/work to equalize salaries
    ▪ Things that work against: competitive offers, differing starting salaries
    ▪ Some schools convert extra meritorious pools into compression pools
Two potential cross-campus issues that should be policies in each school that GFO can gather
- Processes around merit
- Processes and philosophies around starting salaries

- Does CCPB have appetite for visualizing, summarizing salary inequities across schools?
  - What about earlier idea of sending individual reports to faculty so they know where they sit, salary wise and can make informed decisions on unit adjustment
    - Attempted this but it was impossible. Underlying issue is how we work with IPB or IR in sharing, collaborating, participating as faculty with administration. They have the data that directly impacts faculty but faculty cannot access those reports unless faculty participate in vetting
  - All we can do without data is describe salary inequity (by school and discipline) but not sure how useful or strategic that is if we can’t do anything about it
    - Our efforts would be better spent advocating for tri-campus equity study
  - Could put out a faculty survey asking what their priorities are. Salary equity, compression, merit, P&T. Could help CCPB prioritize tasks
    - Also gather and summarize existing practices in schools
    - Summaries would help prep for next unit adjustment
  - Salary equity needs to be priority. Need to make changes so that we prevent inequities, not have to rectify things over and over
    - Standard policies around initial hires and merit adjustments
    - Make it so faculty don’t feel they have to go get competitive offers

- EC approved (in concept) Class C legislation to bring to Senate to release demographic data and for central admin to launch a salary equity study
  - GFO leadership drafting legislation for EC approval, then will go to UWB Senators
    - Will take a long time to get through Senate

- Compression study is not equity study. Compression is market. There are equity issues that play in but it is still just a base issue of compression
  - Many reasons why starting salaries are lower, that can include individual assessment and biases. Current unit adjustment took care of that along with market differences. The two issues don’t have to be separate.
  - For future adjustments, need to spend just as much or more time on philosophical questions (i.e. implicit bias) as on formula

Nitta summarized with next steps:
- GFO leadership will draft Class C legislation for demographic data and equity study, get that approved by EC, and then forward it on to UWB Senators
- CCPB reps will gather information about salaries from their schools
- Nitta will collect/summarize school’s processes & procedures around salary equity efforts and merit
- Nitta will summarize current unit adjustment process to help with next unit adjustment
- Will continue discussions in CCPB around how to work with IR and IPB

Meeting adjourned
Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting ended at 12:30pm
The next CCPB meeting will be Mar 9, 11-12:30pm