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

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

Approval of Minutes
• Minutes Approved

Unit Adjustment Implementation Subcommittee Report

• Sub committee met 3 times but were unable to verify calculations due to:
  o Columns of data missing that were included in initial/original review (earlier versions calculated only those who started at assistant professor)
  o Despite subcommittee bringing 2019 salary freeze to IPB’s attention during first phase of calculations, the freeze was not accounted for in final calculations, raising concerns and questions or fairness
• Recalculating would result in 13 (vs. 26) faculty receiving an adjustment
  o Blocking adjustments going out would be difficult and would negatively impact morale
  o Faculty voted for the formula used but the formula changed after they voted
  o Focus this adjustment on larger principals, focus more on accuracy next round
• Subcommittee member feedback
  o Concern that junior faculty will not benefit
  o GFO communicated the formula options out well but, in terms of understanding the actual formulas, faculty weren’t given enough to make informed decision. More background info would have been useful
• Despite missing data and lack of consideration of the 2019 salary freeze, formula did work consistently across groups. Whether the calculations are accurate or not is still in question.

DISCUSSION:
• Concerning that it has been so difficult for IPB to appropriately apply an agreed-upon formula and provide actual data that could be analyzed by someone else
  o Need to suggest to VCPA that more than one person do this work
  o By the time subcommittee received data for initial review, it was too late to make recommendations
  o Need economist on subcommittee who reviews the formula and calculations
  o Alarming as this is a payroll issue and should be more iron clad
• Salary calculations not lining up is a big red flag and alarming. Suggest letting adjustments go out with caveat that, when right numbers are known, adjustments will be made
  o VCPA discouraged doing adjustments later
  o Inability to produce auditable numbers is a big concern
    ▪ What would next steps be?
      • CCPT obligated to report it to admin and if they do not take action to fix it, then we are obligated to report it to state auditors
      • Concern that if GFO involvement results in adjustment amounts decreasing, that looks bad for GFO
• Could be grounds for lawsuit if faulty are paid money they weren’t supposed to get
• Council agreed that best way forward is for Nitta and Carlisle to draft an email to VCPA from CCPB requesting:
  o Delayed implementation until further review and adjustments/corrections can be made:
    ▪ Ensure numbers are auditable, accuracy maintained
    ▪ Make correction for salary year 2019 due to freeze
    ▪ Review remaining components of formula to ensure accuracy
    ▪ Provide subcommittee with all information needed for audit
• Subcommittee should remain in place in order to audit the numbers. Simple audit, the numbers are either accurate or they aren’t
  o Tenured faculty may feel more comfortable doing this work

**Reports from School Representatives: What are schools currently doing to advance Salary Equity?**

- **IAS – Camille Walsh**
  o Did away with extra meritorious in 2012
    ▪ Such wide range of types of scholarship that extra meritorious is extremely difficult to determine
  o Faculty can always feel free to request an increase for extra work
  o Lot of historical activity looking at salary equity issues to include tenure vs. teaching track salaries
    ▪ Used leftover budget to attempt to address some of the issues a few times
  o In 2020, Personnel Committee decided IAS would not be doing salary equity analysis as there are too many complex issues
    ▪ Decision also made based on assumption that salary equity analysis would/should be done at campus level
  o IAS put out chart years ago, plotting all IAS individual salaries on same graph, color coded by rank, trend lines through different ranks, faculty could see their “dot” on the chart
    ▪ Activated teaching track faculty to understanding differences in pay
  o Several years ago, IAS standardized starting offers (not starting pay). Led to less variation but it was not completely uniform and that is why compression still occurred
  o That doesn’t mean everyone got the same starting pay, just the same offer
  o IAS EFC plans to revisit competitive offer policy soon to get better guardrails in place

- **SNHS – Stefanie Iverson Cabral**
  o School EFC is very new and have not been involved in salary equity analysis
  o Administrator reported that, for the past few years, faculty have received a default 2% meritorious. They can receive extra meritorious but it doesn’t come with any compensation
  o In discussions now about how to measure meritorious and extra meritorious
  o Dean gave perspective from time at UCSF where they apply a formula to everything to determine issues. Very effective, lots of data. Able to address inequities and compression
  o In 2015, SNHS had some funds to address compression but there was no demographic data available and it hasn’t happened again since
  o Dean used match pair analysis in attempt to look at salary equity based on race, gender, equity but SNHS is so small and limited, no issues arose
Business – P.K. Sen
- Talked with EFC chair and reviewed document that lays out distinction between meritorious and extra meritorious
  - Personnel Committee does overall assessment and unusual to have overall evaluation not be meritorious, even if individual is non-meritorious in a section
    - No financial consequences for this review, you get 2% regardless. Money has been separated from evaluation
      - Merit review still taken seriously because they are looked at in tenure review
  - A few retention-related offers by the Dean in the past few years
  - Discussion around compression has made faculty aware that the initial offer is key and some are questioning if the Dean should be the only one making that decision

- STEM – Mike Stiber
  - Will report in next CCPB meeting

- FYPP – Peter Brooks
  - FYPP does not have hand in merit review but do have general involvement
    - Do consultations or reviews of part time faculty working within FYPP courses and make recommendations
    - Follow IAS guidelines more than anything else
    - Salary and retention offers go through appointing school

DISCUSSION:
- Boundaries and paraments around retention need to be clear. Dean’s language can signal one thing or another and biases could be exacerbating salary equity problems
- All schools are thinking about merit and retention (especially as related to salary equity), some schools are focusing on initial salary offers as obvious way to intervene. Another thing to consider is timeframe that people are coming up for promotions but that can get difficult.
  - Many faculty are concerned about getting promoted because of the impact that Covid had on their scholarly production
- Curious as to how new AVC for Faculty Development position will play into all of this
- Provost Office proposing program targeted at full professors. Proposal has been put into full faculty process as legislation

Update on UW Financial Transformation
P.K. Sen, UWFT Rep
- UWFT team sends email updates occasionally and keeps website updated, shares videos
- Currently, cannot move forward without consolidation of 700 systems
  - Mid-May 2020, consolidation began. At first, much excitement and check-ins. Businesses processes, putting data together, grant consolidation and workday as a platform
    - A lot of individuals trained on workday (Gowri Shankar and Kendra Yoshimoto UWB focal people)
  - Middle of 2021, many briefings and trainings with administrators
Now (almost) ready to exit the architect validations stage and enter the configure and prototype stage, which will last through March 2023
   - Will get briefing in May to confirm whether or not exiting validation stage
- Planning toward an extended go-live date of Jul 1 2023
- Concept has shifted from a “hub” shared service operating model to a distributed share environment model
- Newly revised scope came out in Sept 2021, with additional $71 million added to budget and implementation move to July 2023
- In Summer 2022, will pause and reevaluate
- 2021 UWFT Annual report doesn’t state much. Huge amount or working going on but where we are in process is not very clear. Faculty haven’t had a briefing in 5-6 months

**DISCUSSION**
- Concerning to hear of delays, restrictions, additional investments. Disappointed that faculty haven’t been consulted recently
- No clear answers as to where the saving is going to come from. Makes sense on a conceptual level but difficult to get straight answers
- Original budget was $350 million, then $71 million added. Justification being hiring more people to get it done and consulting firm fees

**Nitta summarized:**
- Sen will provide another update to CCPB after UWFT meeting in May
- Nitta and Carlisle will draft response to VCPA regarding unit adjustment
- Council will come back discussion on school's salary equity efforts in future meeting

**Meeting Adjourned**

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting ended at 12:30pm
The next CCPB meeting will be Apr 13, 11:00-12:30pm