

**ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT PROFESSIONALS GROUP (AMP)  
(FORMERLY ACADEMIC BUSINESS OFFICERS GROUP / ABOG)  
ANNUAL LIST OF PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR 2017-18**

CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

History and status:

For several years, one of our highest priorities has been to have a comprehensive curriculum and leave planning database and online course approval system. AMP is pleased with the progress that is being made with Phase 1 of the new system, and we look forward to continued progress with Phase 2. A comprehensive campus curriculum and leave planning database and online course approval system will reduce staff workload, improve accuracy, and decrease turnaround times. It will facilitate the review, approval, and publishing of courses, class schedules, and catalog copy. Timely posting of courses and secondary discussion sections in the schedule of classes will improve the ability of UCSC students to plan for and enroll in courses and secondary discussions and decrease student enrollment problems.

AMP plans to maintain an active role on the project through the Curriculum Management Team. We are eager to see continued progress.

Proposed Actions:

We request that the project continue to move forward as quickly as possible.

Benefits:

The new system will eliminate duplicate and manual processes; increase accuracy and reporting; and improve student success through increased time for direct advising and the student experience with timely and accurate scheduling of classes and associated labs and discussions.

WAGES AND EQUITY

History and Status:

AMP members ranked this category their highest priority. While they are pleased that non-represented staff salaries have a continued focus within the UC system, and the merit based model (Pay for Performance) intends to reward staff for outstanding work, the control figure of 3% isn't sufficient to fund an effective pay for performance program. One must assume that the majority of non-represented staff perform at a "satisfactory" level or worse in order to fund 3.5% or 4.5% merit increases for staff who rate as "Consistently Exceed Expectations" or "Exceptional" within the constraints of the 3% control figure. This assumption is false and is demoralizing to hardworking non-represented staff. In fact, we are fortunate that the vast

majority of staff are very productive individuals committed to supporting the mission of the University. Since the performance of most staff is of a high quality, and there isn't enough funding to award staff 3.5% or 4.5% merit increases, most staff receive a salary increase of approximately 3%. The funds may as well be distributed across-the-board as a 3% range adjustment, not as pay for performance.

As the cost of living continues to increase without COLAs, non-represented staff salaries continue to lag. Santa Cruz is an extremely expensive place to live, whether buying or renting; rentals are among the highest in the nation. The poverty level for Silicon Valley is \$80,000 and the average salary at UCSC is \$60,000. Staff can no longer afford to live in the area, so they leave the university for higher paying jobs or relocate from the area entirely. We are not able to compete with industry salaries, so the challenge to attract and retain staff continues to increase.

Long-tenured staff who have demonstrated loyalty to the campus and have acquired valuable institutional knowledge are disadvantaged when it comes to compensation when incoming staff are hired at higher starting salary rates. In some cases, salary compaction occurs - the supervisee's salary begins to approach the supervisor's salary. Regular career equity reviews are needed to mitigate this situation.

The Office of the President has not been transparent with central campus and staff regarding proposed changes to benefits (for example, retiree health insurance). High quality benefits is one of the primary reasons that staff choose to work at the university despite lower salaries.

#### Proposed Actions:

We respectfully request that, in their meetings at UCOP, our Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor continue to advocate for merit increases for non-represented staff at a higher level so that pay for performance may truly be a merit based program and for the implementation of regular COLAs for all staff.

We ask for the establishment of a regular cycle of equity reviews in order to ensure predictability in the frequency of these reviews. This would address equity issues that may surface through labor contract-related salary compaction (salaries of represented versus non-represented staff supervisors) or through new staff being paid higher salaries than current staff.

Open communication with staff in advance of decisions regarding changes to benefits is essential.

#### Benefits:

Adjusting existing non-represented staff salaries to competitive levels is crucial to our ability to maintain the highly-skilled workforce that is needed as our workloads continue to increase. We

have a very devoted staff, but the larger incoming classes of students, combined with budget cuts and resulting cuts in staffing levels, impact our already large workloads. For example, we have increased workloads associated with space management of offices for more instructors; additional lectures, labs, and sections for classes; and increased space needs for DRC testing and proctoring.

When staff participate in preliminary discussions regarding changes to benefits, they have the opportunity to offer insights which more likely results in buy-in to proposed changes.

### REPRESENTATION OF AMP ON CAMPUS-WIDE COMMITTEES

History and status:

AMP representation on campus committees has proven valuable by providing well-informed perspectives on how current and proposed systems could impact curriculum; student, staff and faculty workloads; budgets; and efficiencies. AMP's proactive approach to obtaining information and providing insight on changes has positively influenced decisions and priorities on campus. We are pleased that AMP is perceived as an influential group, and we appreciate the productive relationships and communication with the campus administration, directors, and unit heads. This has resulted in thorough consideration, and effective implementation, of many proposed campus changes.

Proposed actions:

We ask that AMP continue to be represented on campus committees. Currently we do not have a representative on the Campus Welfare Committee, and we would like to have a representative on that committee.

Benefits:

AMP members deal directly with the issues that affect students, staff and faculty, and we work and communicate with the majority of staff and faculty in key units on campus. Our members have years of experience and can shed light on a wide variety of negative or positive impacts of any given proposed change; therefore, AMP representation and consultation supports campus objectives to adopt the best tools, processes, communication and solutions to effectively serve students, staff and faculty and foster an optimal working and learning environment at UCSC.

### NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS

History and status:

We have found that new program proposals, interdepartmental programs, and interdepartmental faculty appointments have been approved without adequate attention to the administration of these initiatives. Administrative staff are asked to assume additional work without additional

compensation or consideration for their time. The lack of clearly defined reporting structures results in inefficiency. Closer analysis of the administration of new programs prior to approval, including assessing administrative workload and consequences of dual/multiple faculty appointments, will benefit faculty, students, and staff by clearly defining the resources necessary for the successful implementation of these programs.

Proposed action:

We propose that a committee, consisting of experienced administrative managers, reviews proposals as part of the program approval process to ensure the proper allocation of resources to administer new programs.

Benefits:

Review of administrative needs for proposed programs by experienced managers will support successful implementation and provide clearly defined reporting structures.

STAFF HUMAN RESOURCES

History and status:

Managers had been experiencing long delays (6-8 weeks) between the time they submitted their hiring recommendation and when SHR made the formal offer. While waiting, often managers were concerned that the candidate would accept another job due to the long delay. Also, a great deal of stress was placed on remaining staff who assumed the work of the vacant staff position, often at peak work times. This is especially difficult in departments and units with very small staffing levels.

We have been working with SHR on this situation and it appears that they now have a full staff in talent acquisition who have been trained and are making offers. Their tracking measures do not capture the exact turnaround time, but their goal is for the turnaround time to be five days. We are very pleased that they were able to hire the additional staff and are hopeful that this will solve the issue of delayed formal offers.

There has been discussion regarding a possible change in the evaluation period (currently July 1 - June 30). AMP very much wants the review period to remain the same so that performance appraisals can be conducted at a time when activity on campus is slower and the review period is aligned with academic year goal planning. We operate on an academic year cycle, so it would not make sense to review staff two-thirds of the way through the academic year. Conducting performance appraisals during Spring Quarter would be especially challenging for academic departments as we are wrapping-up faculty recruitments, submitting annual appointments to meet payroll deadlines for temporary academic staff, preparing for fiscal close, and (in some

cases) planning graduation festivities in addition to the day-to-day interactions with students and faculty.

Proposed actions:

It is crucial that Staff Human Resources be adequately staffed in order to make formal offers in a timely manner. We are delighted that SHR has been able to obtain and fill the needed positions.

We ask that the current evaluation period remain July 1 through June 30.

Benefits:

Continuation of the improved turnaround times in Staff HR will benefit all campus units and will reduce vulnerability, stress, and frustration levels. It helps units achieve orderly succession, ensures that new employees have adequate time for proper training, and departments will be able to meet deadlines, complete work in a timely manner, and operate efficiently and effectively. We value SHR as a partner and are always available to support them.

Staff in academic units are most appropriately evaluated when the evaluation period coincides with the academic year: July 1 - June 30.