Questions and Comments with Answers from AVC Powell

Webcast Topic: Year 2 Equity Program
Webcast Date: 25 July 2016

Dear Administrative Staff,

As promised and in an effort to promote full transparency, I am disclosing all questions and comments submitted during my webcast on July 25, 2016, in raw/unedited format. Following each question, please find my written response to these inquiries.

I want to thank all staff for participating. We had 84 colleagues signed onto the webcast. The Year 2 Equity Webcast and accompanying PowerPoint presentation are now online and will remain so for your continued viewing and reference.

I understand that a couple of individuals were experiencing technical difficulties with the connection. It is also my understanding that you reached out to Edson Gonzales (IT) and Paul Garza (HR) for assistance and received resolution to the issue. I encourage you to view the webcast and to reach out to me if you have any follow-up questions to raise.

As with all administrative staff, if you have any additional questions or comments, please feel free to reach out to me directly.

Best regards,
Brian K. Powell
Assistant Vice Chancellor & Chief Human Resources Officer

Question 01: How many individuals received equity increases?
AVC Powell's Response:

- We are pleased to report that a little over 200 non-represented staff benefitted from the Year 2 program, representing 36% of eligible staff.

Question 02: How was the effective date determined for this year's equity cycle?
AVC Powell's Response:

- We chose 6/1/16 for one very compelling reason: we could impact a greater number of staff. Please let me explain how:
    - When Year 1 (2014-2015) equities were announced in early Summer 2015, campus leadership had agreed to make equity increases retroactive to January 1, 2015. Approximately six months of retroactivity comes with a larger cash outlay.

- There was just under $300,000 in Year 1 equity funds left over. We requested and received campus leadership approval to build those leftover funds into the Year 2 program. This was a significant benefit extended to the campus, and I want to highlight that as it reflects the shared commitment of the Chancellor, the Provost, and Senior Leadership in investing in our staff.
- In addition to these left over funds, the Year 2 Equity Program was given $500,000 to distribute. The total funds available were almost $800,000.
- No Year 2 commitments had been made as to the retroactive date of equity payments. While Year 1 may have established an expectation, it was not a binding precedent.
- Had we chosen to retroactively extend Year 2 equities back to January 1, 2016, versus June 1, 2016, more cash outlay would have been required (six months of retroactivity versus one month of retroactivity).
- The effect of this: fewer people would see a permanent salary base increase in the Year 2 Equity Program. I estimate the number to be approximately 60 fewer Year 2 Equity Program recipients had we expanded retroactivity to January 2016.
- In my opinion, it was preferable to impact more of our eligible staff, even if it meant a shorter retroactive effective date.
- Our leadership agreed, and the June 1, 2016, retroactive date was established.

Question 03: Where is the salary data coming from?

AVC Powell's Response:

- By salary data I am assuming that you mean market data (to my HR ears, they are one in the same).
- As I mentioned in the webcast, the UC system uses national salary survey data that consists of salary data from higher education, public sector, and private industry. UCOP has contracted with Mercer, an internationally recognized leader in survey assessments and meta-analyses. Mercer maintains this proprietary and privileged data in a system known as ePrism, on which all Compensation professionals are trained and authorized to access.
- The availability of this tool is invaluable. I cannot stress this enough. The benefit to you and to this campus is extraordinary. Individual survey data costs hundreds and thousands of dollars *per survey*. We could not even afford a tenth of what Mercer is able to provide and what Mercer is able to continuously update. This means that our salary data is always up-to-date and not subject to the constraints of limited data samples that may provide static, dated, and incomplete information.
- The access to regularly updated market data (from which our salary grades are DIRECTLY established) allows for continuous monitoring of all individual classifications and job families in order to make recommended changes (1) to our salary scales, (2) to individual grades, and (3) to each and every classification driven by real-time market data specific and responsive to our region, our state, our system, and the greater country.

Question 04: When the equity program began two years ago, we were trying to pay between the 35th to 45th percentiles to the salary grade. Why are we now looking at where we are compared to the market?

AVC Powell's Response:

- Please understand: our salary grades are based on market data. Career Tracks is a market-driven program, wherein all classifications are graded at the UC System-wide level based on that market data.
- The difference you are observing is not salary data vs. market data. They are one in the same and have been since the day we launched Career Tracks.
- The difference here is Year 1 methodology vs. Year 2 methodology.
- The Year 1 methodology was adopted by leadership in Fall 2014 prior to my arrival in January 2015, and it was couched in terms of *where you sit within your salary grade*. Our salary grades derive from market data, as I have stated above. So the assessments have always been market driven.
- *Where you reside within a salary grade range*, however, oversimplifies the complexities of our broadband system, in that each broadband salary grade is established in order to encompass/ cover a very large number of classifications whose benchmarked market salary data midpoints are permitted to differ by up to 10% and 20%. (In other words, the midpoints are close but not identical. Nor are they designed to be identical in a broadband structure.) Thus, the need for the broad salary bands. This also allows for each classification's entry and maximum market rates to fit within the very small number of grades.
- This means that each salary grade broadband will have within it a collection of very diverse job classifications, ranging from administrative to financial to IT to student services to research administration to recreation, and so on. The common denominator here is that they all have market salary ranges that fit within the band and have similar midpoints, plus or minus 20%.
- Understandably then, some jobs within a salary grade broadband will skew lower whereas some jobs within a salary grade broadband will skew higher.
- Likewise, some jobs may have very narrow market data, from entry level (25th percentile) to advanced level (75th percentile). To illustrate: the 25th percentile of a specific classification could be $35,000; the 50th percentile could be $39,000; and the 75th percentile could be $43,000.
- Conversely and within the same salary broadband, another job classification could have a very broad sub-band, based on market data, from entry level to advanced level. To illustrate: the 25th percentile could be $32,000; the 50th percentile could be $45,000; and the 75th percentile could be $62,000.
- Comparing the two above, they have a somewhat common 50th percentile midpoint, but they have vastly different salary widths from entry level to advanced level.
- Given the variety of positions within a single salary grade/broadband, to talk exclusively about one's placement within the range itself does not fully respect the market-driven nuances of each position and of each profession. You can unfairly advantage or disadvantage a job classification (and, by proxy, the occupant[s] of that classification) if you look at the overall broadband while excluding the individual market sub-band.
- We honored the Year 1 methodology because that was the right thing to do: campus made the commitment. However, we wanted to employ a more precise methodology in Year 2 and in

years to follow. That is what an individual job classification focus permits, and in doing so, it provides greater fairness (no one is blurred) and greater equitable pay practices. It represents HR Best Practices.

- The impact will be the same: we will progressively move our aggregate distribution (and by aggregate I mean taking all the salary grades and creating an average) up from the average distribution of the 31st percentile observed when we began this process in 2014 and towards the aggregate 45th percentile over time.

Question 05: Were educations levels and years of experience considered as part of Equity?
AVC Powell's Response:

- Yes, and no.
- Years of experience were certainly a factor when assessing the Loyalty Tax impact.
- Beyond that, we were unable to factor these criteria into our assessment.
- I believe this experiential data would make for a much more robust equity assessment. Unfortunately, it is data that is simply not accessible for data mining and data analysis.
- As I have candidly shared with campus colleagues in meetings and at brown bag events, UCM does not have an HRIS System that would readily provide us with this important information. To factor it, we would have to manually review a loose assortment of Word, Excel, and paper documents that comprise our personnel records, and I have no certainty that we have centrally collected personnel files for all employees over the past ten years.
- [In an important aside and to be crystal clear, this is not an indictment of or criticism of our wonderful colleagues at UCM IT. It is not IT's responsibility to provide such an HRIS System. It requires a commitment of campus financial resources that we have not been able to allocate since our founding because of other compelling priorities.]
- Absent an HRIS System, and unable to expend the man hours necessary to achieve this rigorous undertaking, we cannot apply experiential data at this time.
- What we achieve is the articulation of governing principles that apply to all eligible staff (e.g., the loyalty tax; the job family's deviation from market) and then proceed with crafting a methodology that can apply to all, **consistently and fairly**.

Question 06: This year looked at longevity and loyalty tax, do you know what we will be looking at in next year's equity program?
AVC Powell's Response:

- That is to be determined.
- I feel safe in saying that we will not employ a Loyalty Tax criteria in Year 3. To the best of our abilities, we provided some relief to the Loyalty Tax this year in the Year 2 program.
- What we will be using is market-driven data, upon which our salary grades are built.
- We may employ an incremental approach, thereby distributing the available monies ($400,000 to be allocated for the Year 3 Program) across a broad spectrum of affected, eligible staff (as we did this year), or we may focus our efforts on a smaller, limited number of Job Families and make rather significant and permanent equity gains within those limited Job Families.
- Again, it is to be determined, and we will communicate that to the campus as soon as we have conferred with the Chancellor and Senior Leadership.

Question 07: I received an equity increase, am I still eligible for Merit?

AVC Powell's Response:

- Yes, you will be eligible for a Merit increase, based upon your performance, of course.
- Too, that Merit increase will be calculated on your new, post-equity base salary. For example, if your base salary is $30,000, and if your equity increase was $3,000, then your merit potential will be driven by your new salary of $33,000 and not your old salary of $30,000.
- I want to stress to the campus: Merit is Merit, and Equity is Equity. Please do not use your Merit Pool to correct equity concerns. The criterion for Merit is performance; the criterion for equity is market-based deviations.

Question 08: Next year will be the third year of the Chancellor's Equity program. What will happen after that? Will you still be monitoring equity disparities?

AVC Powell's Response:

- As I outlined in my PowerPoint presentation, a myriad of past campus practices have resulted in the current states of inequity that we experience today.
- Indeed, I candidly stated in the webcast: it took us ten years to get into this mess, and it will take us twenty years to get out of it. That is not designed to be a disparaging statement; it's simply offered not only to set expectations but also to convey to you (1) the seriousness of the situation and (2) the recognition by leadership that we are aware of the seriousness of the situation and are committed to ongoing monitoring of equity concerns.
- We as a campus are fortunate. Although we face resource constraints, the Chancellor has committed a total of $1.7 million over three years ($800k in Year 1; $500k in Year 2; $400k in Year 3) from separate, central funds to address this issue and to invest in our staff.
- Other campuses within the UC do not have these central funds set aside for their equity programs. Instead, they must reduce the 3% salary merit pool by a fraction and use those monies to fund their equity programs. As an example only, this means that, instead of 3% fully going to the merit pool, a half-percent is subtracted and allocated to equities with the remaining 2.5% going to the merit pool.
- Will we have to do the same in future years? Perhaps. But, that decision has not yet been made. So, for now, let's focus on the benefit of a centrally funded Three Year Program as we await further instruction from the Chancellor and Senior Leadership.

Question 09: Employees have expressed concerns that decisions on equity adjustments have been made arbitrarily. Are you able to share the market data that you based decisions on?

AVC Powell's Response:

- My comments on the webcast stand, but I would like to add additional context and support the rationale presented in that very time-limited forum.
- I would respectfully dispel any assertion that decisions were made arbitrarily. HR developed a methodology for the Loyalty Tax as well as a methodology for distributing the remaining funds based upon Job Family deviations in a fair and consistent manner. We made a recommendation to defer documented, underperforming staff (based upon last year's performance appraisal and/or active progressive discipline [PIPs et al]). These were presented to the Chancellor for

review prior to our deployment. Once ratified, we proceeded. I know that our actions were judicious and consistent, not arbitrary, and I believe that the Chancellor would agree with that assertion.

- Specific to your question about sharing the market data upon which we based our decisions, it depends on what you mean by *sharing*.
- I believe in transparency, hence my active engagement with the campus at large, with leadership, and with managerial stakeholders. Consistent with that, I believe in collaboration and desire an environment in which we can meet and confer on decisions for the benefit of a unit, department, division, and campus.
- But, transparency has never meant unfettered access.
- As I outlined in Question 03, ePrism is a proprietary and privileged professional tool provided by The Office of the President's Human Resources operation via Mercer. It is provided to trained HR professionals. Accessing and utilizing this data in complex salary analyses is reserved to trained compensation and classification professionals within HR. I think…justly so.
- I'll briefly pause my answer here and offer this analogy to provide better insight into my perspective on this:
    - There may come a time when you have a dental ailment and go to a dentist.
    - You seek a consultation, and an examination follows.
    - Perhaps the result is the determination that a cavity exists.
    - Now, the dentist will provide her rendering and will advise a course of action. To that end, she will show you the tools that she will employ to rectify the problem: the Novocaine, the syringe, the drill, the filling compound, the spittoon, and so on. All of these things conjoin to provide a remedy – a complex remedy of many moving parts overseen and administered by a professional practitioner.
    - By identifying these tools the dentist is being transparent about the procedure: "Here's what we are using to solve your issue." But that transparency does not translate into the patient himself administering the drill, mixing the compound, and plugging his cavity. That kind of unfettered access would do more harm than good, and would not move him towards a desired state – a remedy. Relief.
- I feel similarly towards the Human Resources profession. Compensation analyses are complex procedures that require surgical precision. Market data is a leading, compelling, driving ingredient, but it conjoins with a myriad of other factors that must be considered in the analyses. These include, but are not limited to: policy adherence; potential compressions created; potential compounded inequities; and consistency in application to name only a few. If you have only the drill (the market data), then you have the lead tool but not a complete tool belt to most accurately and comprehensively provide relief. Trained professionals are needed to guide the exercise.
- I invite anyone and everyone to partner with us, and we will share the insight into our renderings. We will articulate the array of tools and considerations made that drove the methodology presented, approved, and employed. The "drill" (ePrism) can't be held by everyone, but that doesn't mean we are unwilling to share with you how we use it to achieve results. What I am offering is the essence of collaboration and transparency. This requires an

engagement with Classification & Compensation specifically and with HR generally. I hope that you and others will reach out and engage us in bridge-building and partnership.

- Now, my critics may say that I am obfuscating.
- To that I counter: my actions speak louder than my words. I am engaged with this campus community, I am frank and honest in my comments with you (some will say to a fault), and when I say I will do something, I have followed through.
- With that as the objective measure, I believe the many reasonable people on this campus will see this and the above and respond positively.

Question 10: Does creating inequity in the office create a better chance for other staff, either in the same position or with a similar title, to get an equity review and possible increase? For example employing a new staff at a higher pay than current and more senior staff.

AVC Powell's Response:

- My comments to this question in the webcast stand, but for those unable to watch but still wish to view the catalog of questions submitted, I'll paraphrase and comment as follows.
- I don't recommend this approach. Indeed, I find it misguided and imprudent.
- This is because there is no guarantee that we will be able to redress the artificial inequity created within the confines of the annual equity program.
- For example, what if we elect to concentrate Year 3 Equity Program monies on a limited selection of job classifications, and what if this one is not selected? You would have ostensibly, artificially, and unnecessarily created a long-term inequity within your unit that would likely create ill will, diminished morale, and talent flight.
- The risk is self-evident. Why would a manager take such a gamble with the team dynamic??!!
- Rather, I would encourage ALL hiring managers to seek HR consultation on ALL salary offers prior to their submission to the candidate. WE WILL HELP YOU using the tools at our disposal. We will explain our analysis and rationale. We will help you craft a workable strategy. There are no secrets. We are here to assist.

Question 11: I'm an MSO who's involved regularly in hiring and am a bit taken back by the comments that our problem is that we hire at or under the 25% level because that is almost always the level at which the compensation side of HR "recommends" we hire at (much to our disappointment) If that 25% target is too low (AND IT IS), why are the HR staff regularly recommending offers there?

AVC Powell's Response:

- I can't fully agree with your assertion.
- We have a longstanding and poorly conceived campus practice that states the following: if you offer a candidate a salary at or below the 25th percentile of the grade, you do not require a consultation with Class&Comp. Routinely, this is occurring on this campus, and in my professional opinion, it is a self-inflicted wound.
- I have charged my team with an express imperative: do not perpetuate this past practice, and do not unnecessarily hold us at depressed wages. For every experience you cite in your above assertion, I can name instances where this is not the case.
- As I stated in my response to Question 10, I encourage ALL hiring managers to seek HR consultation on ALL salary offers prior to their submission to the candidate. WE WILL HELP YOU.

- If in that consultation you experience a hire at or near the 25th percentile, that may be driven by some compelling reasons:
    - Perhaps the finalist has only minimal related experience within that field. Entering at the 25th percentile may be a completely proper outcome.
    - Perhaps the classification in which you are hiring skews lower in the broadband (for additional information on broadbanding, see my response to Question 04). Here, too, entering at the 25th percentile of the salary grade may be a completely proper outcome.
- If there is still concern, I encourage you to reach out to me and I will further assist in understanding the recommendation and in identifying possible risks and solutions that can be explored, if available.
- For the MSO writing this, I hope you will take me up on my webcast offer and reach out to me in a 1:1. I want to understand your perspective and work together to ensure that we have the partnership between our offices that I desire and seek.

Question 12: Just a Thank you. I just wanted to thank you for your transparency in the process.
AVC Powell's Response:
- I sincerely thank you for this compliment. Thank you for watching, and thank you for your willingness to be engaged and informed.

Question 13: How do you know where you're at compared to the market value? And how can you find out whether you qualify for the increase?
AVC Powell's Response:
- I would refer you to the Year 2 Equity Program criteria outlined in my PowerPoint presentation and to my responses in Questions 04 and 09 above.
- Additionally, I would encourage you to reach out to our Class&Comp Team for additional information related to you. Their email address is Comp@ucmerced.edu. We will get back with you as soon as possible.

Question 14: Are you saying that it is a goal for new positions to be in the 45%th of market value pay? And if so, is this for new hires from outside the campus and hires from within UC Merced.
AVC Powell's Response:
- No, that is not what I am saying.
- Our three-year goal, as articulated in the Chancellor's Equity Program, is to have a salary distribution where the bell curve peaks at the 45th percentile when we average all salaries across all salary grades/broadbands. Ideally, we would have a true bell curve distribution where we peak at the 50th percentile. Achieving that will take additional time and additional investment, but we are making progress.
    - There is an important side note that I must address.
    - There is a myth in some corners of campus that the Chancellor and UCM committed to moving all employees to the 50th percentile as part of this program.
    - That is the stuff of urban legend: if everyone resided at the 50th percentile, we would not have a bell curve – we would have a flagpole.

- We would also not achieve greater equity. We would achieve the antithesis of equity in which individuals who should skew lower on the ranges (because of experience, market data for that classification, or both) would artificially benefit, and one in which individuals who should skew higher on the ranges (for similar reasons) would be artificially suppressed.
- Anyone expressing this view is not representing the clear and unambiguous message of the university and its equity programming.

- As we hire new employees, either from internal transfers, UC transfers, or purely external candidates, it will be very important for hiring managers to collaborate with HR to ensure that we are working together to achieve this overarching goal.
- But, please do not misinterpret the average 45th percentile with an express directive to hire all new staff at the 45th percentile. That is not what I am saying, suggesting, or professing.

Question 15: What does it look like at this moment for UCM meeting their bell curve goal?

AVC Powell's Response:

- If you look at Slide 4 of my PowerPoint presentation, we began this exercise with an average distribution at the 31st percentile. Our three-year goal is to get to the 45th percentile.
- I haven't run a recent distribution based upon the Year 2 equity distributions; I hope to do so in the near future.
- At last check, we were around the 38th percentile, on average.
- If we were to use the minimum and maximum salary grade ranges in operation in 2013-2014, we will likely achieve the 45th percentile by the end of this three-year program.
- But, as I said in the webcast, this seems inherently dishonest, doesn't it? Economic conditions have improved since 2013. It seems patently unfair to use old data as a frame of reference in an environment where conditions are improving.
- Rather than artificially suppress our salary ranges, we have actually been increasing our ranges for your benefit and to maintain the integrity of our compensation program. We did so in 2015 (for the first time in 3 years!), and we will do so again soon for 2016.
- This is only fair. To herald an achievement based on four-year old salary data is not much of an accomplishment. Instead, I prefer to have our salary ranges reflect present market realities.
- To that end, if we do not meet the average 45th percentile desired, we can at least be assured of two important things:
  - We are making progress – significant progress – in our equities.
  - We are being honest. This, to me, is just as valuable as the progress we are making.

Question 16: Where managers notified if any of their staff received the equity increase?

AVC Powell's Response:

- In consultation with the Chancellor we adopted a process whereby I personally notified each Division Head of the identified equity recipients within their respective divisions.
- The Vice Chancellors were then permitted to provide informal notification within their organization as they deemed appropriate.
- Formal notification was given to each recipient via personal, hand-delivered letter.

- I know that informal notifications were happening in all divisions. Our leadership was eager to get the word out.
- However, I would not be willing to say that all managers received notification as I simply do not know the communications mode utilized within each division.
- Once the equity spreadsheets are finalized and through payroll, I will provide each division with an updated spreadsheet and encourage that they share the information with their unit managers, who, in turn, may want to share this information with their unit MSO.

Question 17: If a letter has not already been received, should I assume that I am not a benefiting staff member of this equity increase?

AVC Powell's Response:

- A courtesy clarification: as we move to more competitive wages and diminishing inequities, we all benefit from this program.
- With that, I think you're asking the following: if a letter has not already been received, should I assume that I am not a recipient of a Year 2 equity increase?
- I think that is a fair assumption.
- There's no harm in asking your supervisor or manager if you want additional verification.

Question 18: We keep hearing about "market data" but we were told for years that one of the key features of Career Tracks was that we'd have transparency around salary ranges. As soon as the new HR team came in, the JUST ESTABLISHED Career Tracks ranges were replaced by the new but just as mysterious "market rate" targets. For about half a minute there was transparency on campus about salary ranges and then we went back to a mysterious black box that only HR gets to see again. It's so disappointing and completely opposite of the transparency we say we're pushing for.

AVC Powell's Response:

- I respectfully disagree with this assertion and think you have a misunderstanding about Career Tracks and market ranges.
- As I stated in my response to Question 04, our salary grades **are** based on market data. Career Tracks is a market-driven program. The salary ranges deployed at the time of Career Tracks deployment (circa October 2012) have remained the same ranges in operation today, albeit with range increases consistent with the underlying market data that drives Career Tracks.
- Now, as I stated in my response to Question 03, continuous monitoring of the market data from which our salary grades are DIRECTLY established allows us to monitor individual classifications and job families and make recommended changes to our salary scales and to individual grades driven by real-time market data, which we have done to be fair and honest with our salary grade broadbands (see my response to Question 15). This process consists of an annual system-wide collaboration amongst all campus Compensation units and UCOP Human Resources.
- Ergo, when you look at our salary grades/broadband (for more information on broadbanding, see my response to Question 04), you are seeing a very real and timely reflection of market realities. There's no mysterious black box; it's as transparent as can be and available for any to peruse at anyone's desire: see UCM salary grades for this information.
- I have said before and consistently: we are partners; we will share; we will help inform. We will be transparent. For additional commentary, I refer you to my complete answer to Question 09.

Question 19: If you received an equity this year, are you eligible for equity consideration for next year?

AVC Powell's Response:

- Yes, you would be eligible under the current methodology. Is it *likely*? Perhaps not, but I think it's a little early to say more until we determine the approach to be undertaken: wide distribution across many job families or focused distribution within a narrow group of job families (for more information, see my response to Question 06).

Note on the following three questions: there is a lag time between submission of a question and receipt. Unfortunately, the following three questions arrived after the webcast was concluded. My responses to these additional questions are below.

Question 20: I have noticed that employees in single classifications (only one of this position on campus) tend to be more highly compensated than employees who are in classifications with multiple positions throughout campus. For example, one of my co-workers who holds a similar position to mine, same grade but slightly different classification, is paid almost $10K more than I. I have more education and years of experience than he. I hold a classification where there are two other positions on campus. Our position requires a Bachelor's degree. I have a Master's degree and over a decade of experience while one of my colleagues who holds the same position does not even have a college degree; yet, this colleague received an equity adjustment last year while I did not. When I was offered my position, I asked to have my education and experience taken into consideration for a higher starting salary. However, I was told that a higher salary could not be offered due to a concern for internal equity. I feel like my salary potential is repressed due to the lower education level and lesser experience of my colleagues. Will we ever get to a position where previous experience and education is taken into consideration for future salary advancements?

AVC Powell's Response:

- At the heart of this question is a personal experience and a desire to know more. May I ask you to reach out to me and we can discuss in greater detail?
- I do so because I don't want to over-speak without all components available. Some of my concerns and considerations:
  - Working titles are a poor reflection of underlying classification. Since the founding of the campus, HR has not exercised oversight of the working titles employed on campus. I support the establishment of guidelines to help give you and others on campus some degree of consistency and predictability regarding working titles, but that is forthcoming and doesn't assist you currently. I just assure you that working titles are not dispositive.
  - When individuals are in different – even similar but different – payroll classifications, that opens up an entire host of issues. Whereas working titles may imply a degree of similarity, the underlying and different job descriptions and resulting classifications can highlight a degree of differentiation that may not be detectible from mere observation.
  - There are variety factors that could fully support the salary differences. For examples: the singularly held position classification may have a higher salary market range, or the position classification has a specialized component that was required; or the Master's degree is not a requirement, or even a preferred Educational level.

    - Possession of a Master's degree, in and of itself, or other qualifications and skills that may exceed the requirements for a classification, will not necessarily result in a higher salary. In addition, substitution of degrees with possession of the equivalent, requisite years of experience is allowable; thus, not all incumbents in the same classification may have degrees, but could be deemed equally qualified for a position having met one factor, or the other. This is another compelling example of the complicated analyses and reviews conducted by Class&Comp professionals and the need to collaborate/partner with HR when making hiring decisions and offers (as mentioned above in question #09).
- To your closing question, the answer is yes. We already assess previous experience and education when hiring managers on campus partner with us in advance of extending a job offer. To do so globally in equity considerations is my ultimate goal for the campus, and I believe that the addition of an HRIS System that will accompany the UC Path deployment will greatly assist us in this effort (for additional context, please see my response to Question 05).
- Again, I encourage you to reach out if you would like to share the particulars of your situation so that we can provide whatever guidance we may be able to provide. Thanks!

Question 21: Did we just really hear that the only way to understand where one fits in the mysterious new "market range" is to ask HR person by person - and maybe they'll share the secret recipe on a one-off basis?! WHAT HAPPENED TO TRANSPARENCY ON CAMPUS?!

AVC Powell's Response:

- Again, the concept of a "black box" or "secret recipe" is a scurrilous accusation that has no basis in fact. I assure you: there is no conspiracy. Secret knocks, playing the record backwards for hidden messages, or other enigma have no role in this HR administration. If you will come in and talk to us, we will engage you, explain how we use the tools of our profession in our analyses, and how these converge on recommendations and decisions set forth. If that isn't transparency, I don't know what is.
- To that point and on questions of process and transparency, on how market ranges and salary ranges are one-in-the-same, and on how we have consistently maintained salary ranges since the deployment of Career Tracks, please see my responses to Questions 09, 18, 03, and 04 – ***in that order*** – for your own self-learning and -information.
- If you still have concerns, I extend an open invitation to reach out and partner. I hope you are willing to do that. The partnership we offer is available to all.
- If you do not, then understand that you have made an express decision to remain uninformed.

Question 22: Does supervising staff have an impact on equity?

AVC Powell's Response:

- Ostensibly yes, as it should be reflective in your underlying classification in the first place.
- Supervision is not an express criterion for calculating equity.
- Keep in mind: the supervision of part-time students is separate and distinct from ongoing supervision of professional staff.
- If you have specific questions, I would encourage you to reach out to the Class&Comp team or to me in order to see how we may assist you on this issue.