

| |
|---|
| <p>2021-22 CCPB Membership Keith Nitta (Chair) – GFO Past Chair Jason Naranjo – GFO Chair Shauna Carlisle – GFO VC P.K. Sen – Business rep* *Camelia Bejan sub for Autumn 2021 Peter Brooks – FYPP rep Camille Walsh – IAS rep Stefanie Iverson Cabral – NHS rep Mike Stiber – STEM rep Wayne Au – Education rep Kristin Esterberg – Chancellor, Ex-officio Sharon Jones – VCAA, Ex-officio Gowri Shankar - VCPA, Ex-officio Segan Jobe – Planning & Admin, Ex-Officio</p> |
|---|

Campus Council on Planning and Budget Meeting

Oct 13, 2021, 11am – 12:30pm, via Zoom

Present: Keith Nitta (chair), Shauna Carlisle, Mike Stiber, Jason Naranjo, Camelia Bejan, Camille Walsh, Stefanie Iverson Cabral, Peter Brooks, Wayne Au, Gowri Shankar

Welcome and Introductions

Nitta welcomed everyone and led a round of introductions.

2021-22 CCPB Charge Letter: Goals and Priorities

Nitta stated that EC approved GFO’s 2021/22 priorities in Oct 12 meeting, with much support for focusing on faculty and faculty well-being. Based on those priorities, Nitta drafted list of priorities and goals for CCPB and asked council to provide feedback:

- Coordinate faculty review and input into the proposed salary unit adjustment
- Participate in the development of a UW faculty equity study
- Annual review of GFO budget, including course releases

DISCUSSION

- What is progressive salary equity analysis?
 - CCPB has been trying to move a faculty salary equity analysis forward since last year but Academic HR not interested in doing analysis or sharing demographic data.
 - Alternative approach is to stress to HR that this has been done at other institutions (i.e. U of Oregon) and UWB STEM did an analysis last year
 - Last year, CCPB considered using living wage as a threshold to peg salaries to cost of living rather than markets
 - Not appropriate for unit adjustment but appropriate for equity analysis
 - Obstacle is that living wage will be different depending on individual’s situations
 - Living wage being considered is based on MIT calculator
 - GFO will continue to pursue and strategize around getting access to data, it is public data
 - GFO Chair has engaged in tri-campus conversations to ask that pressure be applied to UW President and Provost to undertake salary analysis of all 3 campuses
 - UW far out of line with peer institutions with analysis of salary equity.
 - How does wealth beyond salary factor in? (i.e. faculty who bought homes when the housing market was affordable).
 - Could be part of progressive equity analysis. Difficult to assess.
 - Not analyzing and addressing faculty compensation bad for recruitment and retention
 People who can’t afford to live here and meet basic needs will go elsewhere
 - UWB is one of the few institutions of this size in a metropolitan area that doesn’t offer housing support.

Nitta will incorporate feedback into charge letter and send another draft to CCPB for review and will present final letter in Oct 26 EC meeting.

Unit Adjustment for Salary Equity

- Unit adjustment is one of 4 ways faculty get raises, other ways: promotion, merit, competitive offer
 - Intended to create more equity across salaries of faculty, measuring equity through compression or inversion
 - Inversion is when someone of higher rank is paid less than someone of lower rank
 - Compression is when someone who has more seniority/time is paid less than someone who is newer
- Process to Date:
 - Last unit adjustment at UWB was 2 years ago, took 2 years prior to that process-wise
 - Provost office let UWB know in Spring of upcoming opportunity for unit adjustment
 - Ensure UWB has plan that faculty have broadly seen and commented on
 - Provost doesn't fund unit adjustment but authorizes UWB schools to use their funds for unit adjustment. Deans are being consulted as it will impact their budgets
 - Nitta will collect feedback from CCPB and EC and send it on to VCAA and VCPA and Chancellor to make their final decision on what application for unit adjustment will look like
 - Report shared with CCPB earlier details informative analysis so far, describing methods and making clear what choices and decisions were made with calculating compression.

Nitta opened discussion to council, requesting feedback on proposed unit adjustments.

DISCUSSION:

- Target salaries were calculated based on the most junior faculty hired. There is no average of what market value would be, rather, it is based on an individual who may/may not be a good negotiator. Seems too reliant on what happened to a single person.
 - Different faculty were put in different comparison groups set by Deans with an eye on putting similar salaries together
 - Is there an alternative method for calculating target salary?
 - Could try to get average across campuses?
 - Need to brainstorm and consult with colleagues
 - In some cases, there may not be a unit of comparison that is adequate since some fields haven't hired in recent years
 - Looking at the market would address that
 - Unit adjustment focuses on compression and inversion as measures of equity so unless UW faculty are the comparison group, it is not compression. That is a limitation of unit adjustment approach and why market comparison can't be used.
- Difficult for UWB to compare itself to other institutions, has been a question for 20 years
 - Looking at market is complicated. Instead, the model used looks within UWB disciplines to see if people's salaries reflect their number of years of service
 - What if an area hasn't had a hire in 10 years?
- Nitta will work on getting data and statistical model from IR to share with CCPB
- Amount allocated to address compression is insufficient, this will be an ongoing issue
- GFO will work with VCAA/IR to provide individual reports to faculty regarding their own compression. Hopefully this will get people involved and have their voices heard.
 - Faculty need to see both aggregated and unaggregated data for full picture
 - Need to educate faculty (especially junior faculty) on what unit adjustment is

- Feedback from both IAS and SNHS is that faculty need more data before they can form opinions or make suggestions.
 - IAS junior faculty more interested than senior faculty on personal data but all were curious about big picture
 - SNHS more interested in data and formulas used
- VCAA asked GFO to write a letter to pass onto AHR requesting demographic data which can help inform the unit adjustment
- Important to distinguish unit adjustment from market adjustment. This is a unit adjustment to address compression in faculty. Market rates is more about equity adjustment.
 - Motivation for considering unit adjustments is fairness as well. Necessary to see and understand the model.
- How do Business and STEM feel about the possibility of combining all fields within your schools into one comparison group, like other schools?
 - Business: may not work well because there are varied differences across fields
 - STEM: would make salary division between ranks so broad, wouldn't be useful
- Raises across units are based on merit and sometimes there is extra meritorious that schools use, all of the other ways for faculty to get a raise are targeted at the individual
 - Unit adjustment is meant for compressed individuals to get salary increases
 - We have over \$1 million of compression and \$240,000 so we need to figure out how to prioritize those funds
 - Options are to help those who need it most, help as many as possible, or a combination of those two options
- STEM faculty feedback: some think it best to focus on getting raises for those most impacted and others think focusing on getting as many individuals raises as possible, even if it's just a small amount, would be better
 - Small raises could make things worse. Could send wrong message about worth.
- IAS faculty feedback: slight preference toward doing combination of both
- Business faculty feedback: will have to follow up
- SNHS faculty feedback: slight preference toward combination of both
- EC feedback: need to provide individual compression data and aggregated data to faculty, getting demographic data is important, have requested campus-wide salary analysis even if not going toward unit adjustment. Need to move beyond band aid fixes for compression
- Compression is a downstream effect, need to consider where problem starts
 - Faculty of color and women come out on short end in negotiations with Deans
 - Only reason to give faculty a low offer is if we don't want them
 - Shouldn't put in on individual to negotiate with Dean
- Makes sense for junior faculty to be paid more now since cost of living has increased so much
- If market rate of salaries is increasing faster than raises, compression will occur
- How can we think about wealth beyond salary in a systematic way?
 - House prices, rate of student loan debt, etc.
 - Difficult to calculate
- Could gather faculty preference on unit adjustment options (1. help those in most need, 2. help as many as possible, 3. combination of both) via an advisory vote.
 - CCPB reps would need to educate their faculty on the issue
 - IR reports and letter from GFO to VC and Chancellor should accompany ballot

- Need to check with VCAA and Chancellor to ensure it is okay to share the data with schools/faculty
- EC reps need to get feedback from faculty to inform the draft letter.

Action Items:

- Reps gather feedback from schools on unit adjustment report and send to Nitta before Oct 20
- Nitta will incorporate CCPB feedback into unit adjustment report and prepare final version to circulate by Oct 28
- Nitta will incorporate CCPB feedback regarding charge letter, present to EC on Oct 26, report back to CCPB in Nov meeting.
- Nitta will request unit adjustment report data modeling information from IR

12:30pm: Adjourn

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting ended at 12:30pm
The next CCPB meeting will be Nov 10, 11-12:30