

UBAC Committee Meeting
November 29, 2016, 10:00-11:30 a.m., HCC 210

Committee Members Present: Will Mackintosh, Janet Asper (chair), Wei Chen, Brian Rizzo, Antonio Causarano, Jane Huffman
Visitors: Paul Messplay, Leah Cox

1. Janet Asper called the meeting to order at 10:07 AM
2. Janet presented on Jonathan's alternative models for moving faculty salaries to the benchmarks established by the 2011 faculty salary study (updated in 2015)
 - a. Benchmarks were established based on both discipline and rank, in comparison to a group of peer institutions
 - b. Broadly: ~110-115 faculty are at benchmark (mostly long-service associates and assistants who were hired at benchmark). ~110-115 faculty are below benchmark
 - i. Under \$1,000 gap below benchmark: 12 faculty
 - ii. \$1,000-\$2,999 gap below benchmark: 25 faculty
 - iii. \$3,000-\$5,999 gap below benchmark: 36 faculty
 - iv. \$6,000-\$8,999 gap below benchmark: 26 faculty
 - v. \$9,000-\$11,999 gap below benchmark: 12 faculty
 - vi. \$12,000-\$14,999 gap below benchmark: 11 faculty
 - vii. Over \$15,000 gap below benchmark: 7 faculty
 - c. Broken down by rank
 - i. Assistant Professors
 1. 16 of 42 are behind benchmark (all in CAS)
 2. Total Assistant salary gap: \$27,711 (\$1,731 average)
 - ii. Associate Professors
 1. 67 of 93 are behind salary benchmark (79% CAS, 12% COB, 9% COE)
 2. Total Associate salary gap: \$393,534 (\$5,873 average)
 - iii. Full Professors
 1. 48 of 73 are behind salary benchmark (83% CAS, 6% COB, 10% COE)
 2. Total Full salary gap: \$449,541 (\$9,365 average)
 - d. It will cost \$1.5 million to fix all the gaps listed above; at best, we have \$125K to work with to do this first round of correction.
 - e. Jonathan Levin has proposed two potential models for deploying the first tranche of money this year
 - i. Model 1: distribute small increases to 139 faculty
 1. Option 1:
 - a. \$1,000 bump for 110 faculty members
 - b. \$2,000 bump for 19 faculty members who are most behind (all over \$12,000 behind)
 2. Option 2:
 - a. \$1,000 bump for 38 people who are \$3,000-\$5,999
 - b. \$1,500 bump for 57 people who are more than \$6,000 behind

- ii. Model 2: increase incremental raises for promotion to prevent further falling behind, then adjust for compression within rank in each department as promotions take place
 - 1. Promotion to Associate raised to \$3,000
 - 2. Promotion to Full raised to \$5,000
 - 3. Fix inversion and compression department by department, using a formula for seniority like \$200 per year of service at rank
 - f. According to Jonathan Levin, the work of COB faculty adjustment is done; they are at benchmark as a result of the AACSB adjustment process.
 - i. If we go with Model 2, it will include COB.
 - g. Brian shared a discussion of chairs' workload and compensation issues from the most recent chairs' meeting.
- 3. Leah Cox presented about Title IX
 - a. Over the past few years, we have added 2 new additional personnel to staff Title IX, to manage the mandate of dealing with cases, adjudication, remediation, and education within a federally mandated 60-day timeline.
 - i. Full time investigator who investigates and writes reports.
 - ii. Sexual assault and prevention specialist, working with complaints and also doing education, training, and grantwriting. Has created a peer educator program, is building training programs for students, faculty, and staff, and works with community and police regarding off-campus cases.
 - b. Leah walked the committee through the process of dealing with a Title IX complaint: complaint, investigation, adjudication, remediation.
 - c. The Office of Civil Rights can demand full documentation of any investigation, which places a heavy transcription and paperwork burden on the university's Title IX staff.
 - d. The Title IX staff is also working on aligning the faculty handbook with our Title IX policy.
 - e. The numbers are fairly large. Any discrimination or assault cases get funneled through the Title IX office. There are 25 or so incoming cases per year, of which 5-6 are sexual assault cases (that the Title IX office can adjudicate, meaning everyone involved are members of the university community).
 - f. We are subject to sanction (fines and loss of federal funding) if we do not meet federal benchmarks for resources, education/training, complaint processes, support, and timeliness. Meeting all of these benchmarks requires significant financial resources.
- 4. Scheduling
 - a. Janet will work on scheduling meetings in the new year.
 - b. January: two meetings for marketing and IT; then a cluster of meetings perhaps in March regarding next year's budget and the 6-year plan.

Adjourned at 11:25 AM