MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Tom Browne at 12:00pm.

Review agenda
No changes were made to the agenda.

Approval of November 10, 2021 meeting minutes (attachment)
Laura Hernandez made a motion to approve the November 10, 2021 meeting minutes. Bret Payseur seconded the motion. The motion was approved with a vote of 8 yes, 0 no, and 1 abstention.

Subcommittee updates
Communications
The communications subcommittee had no updates.

Department planning
The department planning subcommittee will be discussing future activities with the associate dean for diversity, equity and inclusion.

Lunch and learn
The last event of the fall semester is on December 20, 2021, regarding Native Nations UW: continued dialogue and action.

Recruitment and retention
The recruitment and retention subcommittee looked at ways to pay for segregated fees. The amount of funds the college would need is quite large. The path forward is to address this at a campus level. For example, some other R1 institutions cover the fees, don’t have as high of fees, or include them in tuition. The subcommittee will put together a proposal on how to move forward, to discuss at a spring semester meeting. The subcommittee is putting together examples on how some other units have handled this.
The subcommittee drafted a letter to the dean on faculty salary equity for the committee to review. We are behind the university average. Faculty salary data is only provided by gender; however, we know our numbers are lower for underrepresented faculty. The percentage of women faculty is low though it has increased over the past few years. Assistant professor gender equity and salary spreads are improving. Associate professor salaries are difficult to assess because people transition in and out of that level. For full professors, the C-basis gender salary gap is growing over time. It would be helpful to include the new associate dean for diversity, equity, and inclusion in a regular faculty salary equity review process. It would also be helpful for departments to formalize their processes for setting new hire salaries and providing raises for existing faculty.

The subcommittee also drafted a letter to the dean on startup packages. The packages are often put together behind closed doors and the startup package ranges are large. We should be giving all faculty the same startup advantages. It would be helpful for departments to develop processes and mechanisms for startup packages.

Comments and questions:

• For the large range in full professor salaries, how much of this reflects the minority number of faculty who spend time increasing their salary, by getting external offers? Can we use an annual review process to increase salary instead of just retention?
  • Some departments still have an annual review of faculty, which often forms the justification for a pay adjustment through the faculty block grant.
• It would be helpful for the college to lay out guidelines for does not meet, meets, and exceeds expectations. One department removed the exceeds expectations category. Faculty should all be reviewed the same way. Another department is having crisis communications about this.
  • Departments can remove the exceeds expectations category if they wish.
  • The role of the college is to simply determine if someone meets expectations. The college has no decision on someone who exceeds expectations.
  • We want to say there is merit but there are no standards.
  • If we only have meets and does not meet expectations, there are no metrics to set someone apart who is exceeding expectations, as opposed to barely meeting expectations.
  • Someone may not meet expectations at times for reasons that are justifiable and sometimes they are the ones who need the most protection.
  • Evaluations often aren’t the factor in who receives a salary adjustment. Salary adjustments are usually based on faculty going to the chair and asking for a retention, and they are often not the ones who should be getting the salary increases.
• For assistant professors, we do sometimes hire people who have prior experience and are close to becoming associate professors, so that may skew the data as well. They won’t come here if we don’t offer a higher salary (for example, TOP hires).
  • Why do we bring them in as assistant professors then?
    • If you post position as assistant professor, then you have to hire them as an assistant professor.
• We should ask departments to develop processes for hiring, merit increases, and retention.
The senior associate dean is working on college retention guidance, including when the college will invest resources in a retention. This will be shared with the chairs next year and it could be shared with EDC as well.

Can professors get retentions without competing offers?
- They could. There are preventative retentions.
- The senior associate dean will soon propose that someone must have an offer in hand or an imminent offer.
  - From a student perspective, that is a toxic mentality. Professors should be able to have increases based on merit, not just based on meeting expectations or outside offers. To have to uproot oneself and get a competing offer, and then drive a wrench between other faculty (e.g., some getting retention and some not, some told to take the other job) seems wrong.
- There was a period of 10 years when there were no base pay raises, so a culture of outside offers was created – it drove behaviors that we don’t want.
- Seeking retention packages doesn’t lead to equity if the places professors are going are not equitable.
- If all funds go to retentions, then there are no funds left for merit.
- Market offers shouldn’t play such a big role in this.
- Some people provide much more service than others and there is no recognition or metrics
  - The college is pulling data to look into this.
- Women and minorities are less likely to seek opportunities for retention for various reasons. The idea that someone has to have an offer to receive a retention should be reconsidered.
- It would be helpful for retention packages to be transparent. They should be presented to the executive committee and it should be clear who makes the decisions on these.
- Why aren’t retentions transparent?
  - The topic is difficult for people to discuss – it can lead to hurt feelings.
  - We work under a department head model.
    - But even when we get new chairs, they do things the same way – they hide things the same way as the former chair.
      - The chair is beholden to the executive committee
      - Being a chair is extremely stressful. They are doing a lot with very little recognition, and it is a position that many don’t want.
  - Would some chairs want to change things?
    - Very few departments have policies that back the chair up, so makes change difficult.

Should this be a separate project for faculty on the committee, so the subcommittee could move forward on the non-faculty items?
- Maybe we can discuss it for 10 minutes at each meeting.

For startups, the college contribution is mostly fixed and VCRGE is percentage model. The big component is the department’s ability to contribute.

Startup is bankrupting some departments.
- It is also contributing to college debt.
- Most of our hires, though, live in a competitive market.
• People who get more money should be more productive.
  ▪ How can the rest of us compete with someone who has more resources?
• Some of the startup data might not be actual funds – some areas of research require expensive equipment
  o Maybe we could break up the data between the standard package and equipment.

College updates and questions from the committee
The associate dean for diversity, equity and inclusion position is in progress.

CALS climate survey feedback
The college would like to gain the committee’s feedback on the climate survey conducted in the fall of 2020. What was your experience taking the survey? Was the data provided useful? Did it impact departmental plans or activities? This topic was delayed due to time constraints.

Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 1:04pm.