

Campus Council on Planning and Budget Meeting

Dec 8, 2021, 11am – 12:30pm, via Zoom

Present: Keith Nitta (chair), Mike Stiber, Shauna Carlisle, Jason Naranjo, Camille Walsh, Camelia Bejan, Wayne Au, Stefanie Iverson Cabral, Peter Brooks

Guests:

Welcome and Approval of Minutes

- Nov 10 minutes approved

Debrief Unit Adjustment Process - What worked well? What should we do differently next time? How should we prepare for the next unit adjustment?

- Start earlier next time and ensure all faculty across all schools are informed in the same ways
- UWB had most robust involvement and faculty input on unit adjustment across tri-campus
 - Dean of College of Arts & Sciences unilaterally decided to not do unit adjustment
 - Faculty were not consulted at UW Tacoma
 - Extent to which faculty voice is engaged is reflected in administrator's recommendations
- A lot of faculty didn't know what they were voting for. Need to give faculty opportunity to engage in conversations around unit adjustments.
 - Info sessions
 - EC and CCPB reps can go to school and division faculty meetings for info sessions/Q&A
 - Timing of receiving the data from IR hindered that this time
 - Need to ensure future unit adjustment conversations are broader than just compression
- Survey results showed that STEM and Business leaned more toward the unit adjustment being done at school level vs. campus level. Why?
 - STEM rep unsure but speculated that it could have to do with the wide range of disciplines and concern that faculty be clustered in appropriate groups for comparison.
 - Business rep expressed that the areas within that school are very small so they cannot apply the same formulas as for the rest of the schools. They are brainstorming a solution.
 - IAS opted for campus vs. school level because there was not enough time to turn around a school-based proposal. They don't have anyone who could do the budget work.
 - EC chair acknowledged the tough position school EFCs were put in with the short turnaround and wants to ensure that doesn't happen again
- Prepare now for next unit adjustment. Earlier engagement for analysis and decision making
- Other issues coming up regarding faculty compensation:
 - President and Provost will be putting in request for budget increase, looking at 2-4% faculty raises in the next cycle. Faculty senate is pushing on admin to make it 4%. 50% of increase would come from state and 50% from the university.
 - Full professors at UW Seattle vs. other universities are highly compressed. The Provost's solution is to do a deeper merit review that would allow units to adjust salary of full professors. Not fully worked out yet. This is why College of Arts & Sciences didn't do unit adjustment because they are instead doing the merit review.
 - A lot of solidarity from UW Seattle and Tacoma in regard to gaining access to demographic data. President's chief of staff is working on dashboard that will allow access to some demographic data.

2021-22 CCPB Membership

Keith Nitta (Chair) – GFO Past Chair
Jason Naranjo – GFO Chair
Shauna Carlisle – GFO VC
P.K. Sen – Business rep*
*Camelia Bejan sub for Autumn 2021
Peter Brooks – FYPP rep
Camille Walsh – IAS rep
Stefanie Iverson Cabral – NHS rep
Mike Stiber – STEM rep
Wayne Au – Education rep
Kristin Esterberg – Chancellor, Ex-officio
Sharon Jones – VCAA, Ex-officio
Gowri Shankar - VCPA, Ex-officio
Segan Jobe – Planning & Admin, Ex-Officio

- Robin Angotti should be included in conversation. A lot of separate entities are doing this work.
- For next unit adjustment, important to allow time for nuanced conversations about how different models benefit people differently. Even without demographic data, need to do our best to align with our equity goals
- Education only had 2 compressed faculty (2 most senior faculty) so everyone knew who it was and one was the CCPB rep so that put that person in the awkward position of informing junior faculty that they could vote for him to get a raise or not.
- Process was so compressed, it was difficult to tell how much was people not understanding and how much was timing
- Many faculty have never gone through this process before
- There was no time or space for conversations about equity in units or across schools.
- EC provided next steps guidance:
 - Short term next steps:
 - Disclose all information to faculty with cover letter
 - (CAD recommendation, GFO feedback, timeline, statement of concerns, updated IR report, summary of next steps)
 - Provide opportunities for VCAA to provide updates on final process
 - VCAA will forward updated models
 - Model 1
 - Convene analysis group through CCPB to replicate revised models
 - Investigate a requirement for a data sharing agreement
 - Demographic data from Academic HR (strategies in January,).
 - Access to UW staff demographic report (EEO report)
 - Long term next steps:
 - Identify peer institutions (informed by values) for future (and perhaps current) calculations
 - Identity
 - Compensation (Eg. Market data reports on target salaries)
 - Compensation for faculty in the summer and through calendar year
 - Solicit participation for calculations subgroup
 - Data or data simulation
 - Demographic Data from Academic HR: update on conversation
 - Agreed timeline for future unit adjustment process
- Nitta asked Bejan to explain the steps she took to gain access to data from IR for running the unit adjustment models
 - Bejan stated that she requested data from IR (no forms required) and was first given sample data and then was given all data. She ran the models and informed IR that their numbers were incorrect. IR sent new numbers which Bejan determined were still incorrect but she never received a response when she communicated that to IR. Bejan has theories as to why the numbers are wrong but IR hasn't engaged in conversation with her.
 - Nitta stated that, moving forward, there will be clear expectations for the process that the VC and Chancellors agree to so that this isn't a problem again.
 - Need to be clear about what we want and have a small group (Bejan, Nitta, Carlisle) to formally vet processes

- Considering the discrepancy in calculations, should we rerun the formulas before VCAA submits unit adjustment proposal to Provost? Have more eyes look at this?
 - Nitta stated that he spoke with VCAA and, unless faculty revoke, the faculty opinions will not change. The application to the Provost's office will not include projections, will only include formula. More words than numbers.
 - Faculty accepted the rationales of various players in process and voted based on that to now find out those rationales do not matter is aggravating
 - This decision needs to be made on basis of principles and numbers left out of it
- Chancellor will, most likely, go with method 2 since CAD and voting faculty showed preference for method 2. With that in mind and knowing there are problems with method 1 and method 4, why do we want to do next?
 - Run the formulas again to ensure outcome stays consistent, even if numbers are wrong
 - There were modifications to the models so what outputs do we want to check against since the outcomes will be different because of the modifications
 - Need to see if it reverses the outcomes or are the impacts are consistent with the impacts that faculty expected when they voted
 - Even if we cannot produce the new numbers in time, it is still important to rerun the models for oversight and reflect on it
 - Faculty voted on models explained with very precise methods and now those methods are changing after the fact so the vote becomes irrelevant. That should not happen.
- Next steps? Need to be clear, working up against a deadline and winter break
 - CCPB (Nitta) submit a position letter now to Chancellor stating concerns including:
 - Need for more precise mathematical formulas and multiple checks
 - Request that faculty voting be done after models have been fully vetted
 - Faculty voted in good faith on something that was changed after the fact
 - Consider including that Method 4 came out of nowhere. A working group was charged with formulating methods and those conversations were halted and a new method was developed without any discussion with working group or CCPB
 - EC (Carlisle) submit position letter now to Chancellor stating concerns around asking faculty to make these decisions without demographic data
 - Submit a second letter in a few months after fuller reflection and planning
- Nitta asked Bejan to help vet calculations in Winter quarter and then asked CCPB if there were any objections to providing Bejan with a course release for that work. There were no objections.
 - Bejan will clarify with IR what data she can and cannot share and then work with Nitta to vet the numbers

12:30pm: Adjourn Meeting

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri

Meeting ended at 12:30pm

The next CCPB meeting will be Jan 12, 11-12:30pm