Chancellor's Staff Advisory Council
Minutes for December 10, 2015

Members Present:
Barb Beainy, Brett Beisecker, Tracee Davis (co-chair), Erica Diaz, Nora Drake (co-chair), Judy Ann Dutcher, Alejandra Greene, Monica Solorzano, Carol Sauceda, Rocio Torres, Alma Villa, Mia Weber, David Whitman, Viena Zeitler

Non-Voting Members Present:
Diane O'Brien, Amanda Kritzberg, Christine de la Cruz, Erica Losada (Staff Assembly)

Absent:
Nancy Emerson, Tom Kenna, Mayra Magana, Taggart Malone, Nicole McCoy, Carolyn Meisner, Jennifer Ramirez

Guests:
Cynthia Seneriz, Todd Lee, Marc Fisher, Chancellor Henry Yang

Meeting called to order at 10:04 a.m. in Cheadle Hall Room 5123

(November minutes approved via email due to busy agenda)

I.   Should we invite Santa to Winter Warmer?
   a. Committee is generally in favor
   b. Some concerns about whether Santa will be too pro-Christmas and not inclusive of all traditions
   c. Possibly include some posters for other religious traditions?

II.   Other Winter Warmer notes and reminders
   a. Remember to bring baked goods and donations for AS food bank (and your mugs!)

III.   Questions for Chancellor
   a. Merit-based pay increases and transition to them
        i. Most recent was in 2011, and then it was frozen
        ii. We will await systemwide guidelines from OP
            1. They vary somewhat
            2. Usually is a control figure that every department has
            3. Merit is based on performance evaluations but other factors can be considered including position in salary range and other performance factors (long term, sustained, high performers)

        4. There is usually a cap on the amount of pay increase any one person can receive

  iii. HR is currently engaging with management on performance evaluations

        1. Control point will question managerial decisions if there are inconsistencies (i.e. two managers in a division—one who always give high ratings, one who always gives average ratings)

  iv. Evaluations and merit-based raises will roll up to control points so there is someone with an overall understanding of how the entire division is doing in terms of performance

  v. In past years, it has generally been evenly distributed (very few got less than 3%, very few got more)

        1. But President Napolitano does not want to encourage across the board raises

  vi. New evaluation form is more clear and has language that clarifies expectations

  vii. Ultimately, we hope to move to online performance evaluations (thorough UC Path)

b. Staff salaries at UCSB

  i. Subcommittee for staff issues

        1. The subcommittee asked OP for a report of average salaries of the top 15 most populated positions

            a. We are not the lowest paid, but we generally line up with UC San Diego, UC Riverside, UC Santa Cruz

            b. We have a lower cost of labor and lower competition for jobs here, which keeps salaries lower than large cities

        2. May make recommendations

        3. Career Tracks will help because it will make the job titles and grades the same across the UC, and it will be more transparent, which will give us a better understanding of the big picture

            a. Will also help with career paths within divisions and specializations

            b. Managers will receive a lot of training around Career Tracks

        4. What about retaining employees?

            a. Funding will always be an issue, so managers may have to compensate with other opportunities

        5. Our turnover is not high compared to systemwide levels (we are around 8.6%, systemwide average is 8.5%)

        6. Why is there a 25% cap for salary increases?

            a. Systemwide policy

            b. Does not include 3% cost of living increase

  ii. Increase staff to deal with increase in student enrollment?

        1. Yes

        2. 3361 staff members (up from our low—2600 staff members in 2002)

        3. In the last year we have increased by 300 staff

        4. Taking steps to deal with low staff numbers

        5. Long Range Development Plan has plans to increase staff numbers to 6 students to 1 staff member ratio over the next 10-15 years

6. The question is where to add staff members to make the most impact
    a. Decisions are made based on funding in divisions, practical concerns about understaffed areas (for example, IT area, police department)

c. Plans to increase diversity and training around diversity on campus
    i. UCOP is looking at implementing their own Supervisory Certificate Program
    ii. HR is looking at workshop series to train staff around issues of diversity and sensitivity
    iii. No UC campus has mandated diversity training but David Whitman would love to see something similar to Cyber Security Training
        1. Some sort of institutional expectation that everyone on campus values issues of campus inclusion

d. Plans for employee retention and engagement?
    i. Engagement survey committee will have a Town Hall to hear issues from staff
        1. They expect to have a lot of interest in this area
    ii. Possibly make recommendations next year after results of the staff surveys come out (timing is a little bit early right now)
    iii. Retention is difficult
        1. Managers can always call HR to try and retain exceptional employees

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m

Minutes submitted by Nora Drake