Executive Council Meeting
Nov 23, 2021, 8:45 – 10:45am, via Zoom

Present: Shauna Carlisle (chair), Jason Naranjo, Keith Nitta, Jason Daniel-Ulloa, Tyson Marsh, Linda Watts, Sophie Leroy, Santiago Lopez, Shima Abadi,

Guests: Sharon Jones, Cinnamon Hillyard

Welcome, Check-in, and Adoption of Minutes
• Nov 9 minutes approved

Unit Adjustment Follow Up
Jason Naranjo, GFO Chair, Shauna Carlisle, EC Chair, Keith Nitta, CCPB Chair

• Updates since last EC meeting
  o Nitta and Daniel-Ulloa drafted demographic portion of preamble, Carlisle drafted timeline portion of preamble. Pieces reviewed separately.
    ▪ Nitta will create summary of all faculty voice collected over the course of quarter
  o VCAA shared 2 documents
    ▪ Charge asking EC to collect feedback on 4 questions:
      • What should be the size of the compensation pool for compression?
      • What should be the scenario for distribution?
      • What formula should be used?
      • Do faculty prefer a campus-wide unit adjustment or school by school?
  o IR and VCAA provided report containing more detail about modeling and implications around the different formulas
  o CAD drafting unit adjustment recommendations. Expectation is that CAD include EFCs in development of any proposal.
    ▪ EC Chair requested EC reps engage school EFCs to gauge interest and gain perspective on possibility of putting unit adjustment at school level.

Carlisle opened discussion to council:

DISCUSSION:
• EC reps should have access to and share all Unit Adjustment documents with schools at this time
• Question regarding campus-wide vs. school level unit adjustment raised because Provost allows sub unit level adjustment
  o Chair of CAD indicated that Deans will advise a campus-wide approach, not a school-level approach. That doesn’t mean GFO can’t advise a school-level approach.
    ▪ Some Deans consulted with school EFCs or EFC chairs
• School of Business faculty want to engage more directly and have more time to consider how best to handle compression, especially in the context of other inequities
  o Questions raised: What are the trade-offs from budget stand point? Will there be money left to handle other inequities? How will this be managed in the future?
  o A lot of faculty voice in support of school-level unit adjustment to allow for flexibility to address inequity issues.
- Teaching faculty in School of Business completely excluded from this exercise and fear being forgotten and concerned about increased inequities.
- School of IAS EFC chair and co-chair met with Deans and Associate Deans and feedback supports a campus-level unit adjustment vs. school level as there is not adequate time or resources to do unit adjustment at school level.
- School of Educational Studies is in general agreement that unit adjustment should be at campus level vs school level. SES only has 2 compressed faculty so decision was easy.

**MOTION by Carlisle: EC Advises that Unit Adjustment Occur at the Campus Level**
**SECONDED by Marsh**
**PASSED: 8 Yes and 1 Abstain**

- How should EC clearly communicate what has transpired regarding the Unit Adjustment process?
  - Faculty survey will contain summary of history to this point to communicate what has been done and steps that have been taken to address faculty concerns and vet the models.
    - EC reps can/should communicate all Unit Adjustment information and make all documents available to all faculty to view whenever they'd like. Nothing secret or confidential. All documents will also all be linked in survey
  - Survey will include the 4 models to date but the actual statistical formulas will not be included. We don't have annotations for where the formulas and ideas came from
  - This is not set up like an academic paper but, rather, a report set up from institutional research. This report is not considering market factors.
    - Missing demographic data and missing comparisons to peer institutions. UWB has not yet determined/identified peer institutions. Hope is that a shared governance approach can be used to determine peer institutions.
      - Comparison is 2-fold: Geographical market (salary, housing, etc.) and academic identity (primarily undergraduate). Need to be mindful that we are making accurate comparisons.
  - 3 of the methods anchor target salary to most recent hire in a particular group of faculty while 1 method is based solely on salary that someone started with and is more of an inflation analysis vs. a compression analysis.
    - Does preamble adequately recognize the concerns raised over the lack of availability of demographic data?
      - Important to keep salary compression centered as a salary equity issue
      - May want to include age and disability in preamble

**Next Steps:**
- Keep focus on creating a sustainable process that includes a review every 3 years. Also need to determine strategies for advocating that schools consider market changes so that we aren't put in this position every 3 years.
- Continue to push for Provost to provide demographic data. Faculty being asked to make decisions without data is inexcusable. Faculty of color are being used as tokens
  - Strategize around what groups to engage to get the demographic data
- CCPB will keep salary inequities on agenda and continue to discuss how, institutionally, we can address salary inequities and get out of this box
Once sustainable language supported by data is established, EC needs to make solid policy recommendations and get solutions codified.
- Deans provide clearer ranges for making all salaries and salary ranges public
- Advise that new faculty be paid as much as possible to avoid huge difference
- Policy recommendations codified so that there are institutional guardrails across tri-campus system

UWB chancellor working to get access to demographic data but institution is risk-adverse and making it difficult which makes it impossible to engage in problem solving

Active partnerships are key, they provide new ways of looking at the situation

Faculty will look to EC reps for help in explaining complex comparison tables that will go out to faculty in Unit Adjustment survey? How can the VCAA help prepare reps?
- CCPB discussed creating a “voter’s guide” to accompany survey

When gathering the comparison table, VCAA’s office was first thinking it terms of values but then realized that focusing on facts in order to avoid biases made more sense.
- Summary of table:
  - 1st Method: Find junior member starting salary and then add 2% per year of service plus 10% per each raise
    - Some faculty had 6% or 7% bumps and that was never addressed so now 10% is used
  - 2nd Method: Way to account for inflation using CPI. Accounts for merit and promotion and adjusts for inflation
  - 3rd Method: take most junior professor starting salary, add 10% for each promotion. No 2% for merit, no adjustment for inflation.
  - 4th Method: Not anchored to junior faculty. Looked at senior faculty to see what the actual starting salary was and adjusted the salary, using CPI, just relying on inflation but also adding in promotion bumps
    - May be benefit to this method but, in many situations, the highest paid member of grouping will still be considered compressed

  - Compression has to be at least 2%
  - Big difference in the models as to how many faculty are compressed

2nd page clarifies what the models don’t address: demographics, peer institutions, prior service, Provost constraints

Not enough time to do trend analysis as to who is benefitting the most with each model

Did not include actual faculty salary number in the first 3 methods because we wanted to avoid the faculty member being identified
- Salary data is public

Descriptions of each column in table would be helpful as those variables have big impacts

Models 1, 2, 3 depend on how well junior faculty negotiated their faculty and teaching track usually don’t negotiate their salary

What should be included in survey?
- 2 memos, preamble, timeline. Anything else?
  - Implications of each column described
  - CPI definition
  - Links to most recent salary
- May not want to include salary, as it may encourage people to think about their own compression rather than best interest of the collective
  - Annotations around where 4 different methods came from
    - May not want to indicate who came up with which method, to ensure methods judged on merit
  - Opportunity costs that come with spending funds in this way
  - Question of school-by-school vs. campus – do we want to include that? If so, how?
- No time to put together a group to work on survey, needs to go out ASAP
  - Nitta will add age and disability to preamble and add definition for CPI and prepare survey to go out
  - Nitta will circulate the 2 memos to CCPB so that they are aware

All other agenda items moved to Dec 7 EC meeting.

**Meeting Adjourned**

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:45am
Next EC meeting will be Dec 7 @ 8:45am