

<p>2020-21 CCPB Membership David Socha (Chair) – GFO Past Chair Keith Nitta – GFO Chair Jason Naranjo – GFO VC P.K. Sen – Business rep Peter Brooks – FYPP rep Shauna Carlisle – IAS rep Selina Mohammed – NHS rep (Autumn) Nora Kenworthy – NHS rep (Win & Spr) Jennifer McCloud-Mann – STEM rep Wolf Yeigh – Chancellor, Ex-officio Sharon Jones – VCAA, Ex-officio Gowri Shankar - Acting VCPA, Ex-officio Segan Jobe – Planning & Admin, Ex-Officio</p>

Campus Council on Planning and Budget Meeting

Jun 9, 2021, 11am – 12:30pm, via Zoom

Present: David Socha (chair), Shauna Carlisle, Linda Watts (sub for Peter Brooks), P.K. Sen, Jennifer McCloud-Mann, Jason Naranjo, Keith Nitta, Nora Kenworthy, Wayne Au, Mike Stiber, Gowri Shankar

Guests:

Call to Order, Approve Agenda, Approve Minutes: Agenda and minutes approved

Announcements/Updates

- Socha reported that, in May 18 EC meeting, the updated GFO Course Release Policy and the course release for P.K. Sen’s service on the UW Financial Transformation team were approved

UW Financial Transformation Update

P.K Sen, UWB rep on UW Financial Transformation Team

Sen provided summary and update of what is happening in UWFT, encouraged council to go to public UWFT webpage at <https://finance.uw.edu/uwft/> to view organizational chart and other pertinent info

- UWFT has new Executive Director and now has an Executive Sponsor (previously only had program sponsors).
- “Foundation Data Model Working Group” is faculty working group, can be found in the “Advisory Working Groups” section of UWFT webpage.
 - UW Bothell very well represented
- UWFT shared services. Why transform? Why spend so much money?
 - Anticipated 15% cost savings
 - Current financial accounting system created in 1974, no longer efficient.
 - UW spends twice as much as peer institutions on financial administration costs
 - It is an investment
- Why Workday?
 - Recommended by consultants and UW already uses Workday for payroll
 - UW Financial Transformation will change the way UW buys and requisitions, closes books, budgets, interacts with other business system tools, describes finance
- Why shared services?
 - Benchmarking study shows several inefficiencies in UW financial administration
- Architecture of shared services
 - Initially considered model in which regional hubs would process everything (accounts payable, disbursement, etc.) instead of local colleges or units doing that work
 - Problem determining how to design/define hubs
 - When surveyed, units expressed resistant to hubs model due to:
 - Uncertainty around what shared services would mean
 - Concern that admin jobs in unit would be lost
 - After over a year of considering and gathering feedback, UWFT moved away from hubs model and toward a criteria model

- Criteria model consists of one central finance and different levels of shared environments for different combinations of units
 - Dependent upon affinity and ability of units to combine
 - Architecture of combinations that will make up the multiple shared environments still being worked on
 - Some will be automatic (i.e. UW Medicine, UW Engineering, etc.) while others are yet to be determine. Unsure if UWB will be one.
 - Unit's capacity to be its own shared environment depends on 4 things:
 - Does unit have enough transactions?
 - Does unit have the process expertise?
 - Does unit have the compliance knowledge?
 - Is unit able to sustain the work?
 - Units may be able to combine to form a shared environment
 - UWFT examining which units meet criteria to be a shared services environment and which need to combine with other units.
- New UWFT leadership need time to reorganize and determine new timeline for work.

Questions/Feedback

- How will changes impact shared governance? How can faculty leadership engage and steward schools/campus through changes?
 - Goal is for faculty to be unaffected. Faculty advising group continues to examine how faculty may be impacted.
- Faculty governance won't be impacted but faculty life (grants, travel, etc.) will be.
 - Face-to-face interactions will be lacking, may be directed to websites instead of people for help. Need to prepare faculty for that.
 - Faculty won't have to pay for expenses out of pocket up front
 - Faculty with grants will be most impacted
- Will jobs be eliminated due to transformation?
 - Goal is that no jobs will be lost but some positions may not be filled again
- How will allocation to UWB be impacted if services are centralized?
 - UWB has to show that savings is actually better than the tax, that work can be done without impacting current capacity and administrative support and can pay the tax.
- Who is paying for this?
 - Will be paid out of central budget. School/unit budgets will not be impacted.
- Will transformation make it easier for faculty to obtain and understand data?
 - Goal is that data transparency will improve. Don't have knowledge about what new workday system will look like, has not been designed.

Faculty Compensation Analysis Update

Naranjo reported that GFO Chair, VC, Past Chair co-signed letter with Faculty Council on Women in Academia asking tri-campus support continue to be extended to faculty caregivers and marginalized people throughout system as result of pandemic. Called upon UW to conduct equity analysis of faculty compensation at tri campus level.

Socha reported that, due to heavy workload, IR hasn't responded to request for clarification on compensation equity analysis questions. Socha suggested using meeting time to review response written by GFO officers to VCAA's request for considerations for UWB unit adjustment and asked council to provide feedback on following:

- Unit adjustments for all eligible faculty
 - Previous unit adjustment focused on salary compression and did not include faculty at assistant prof level.
 - Address compression and inversion
- What is the target?
 - Linear model that fits to rank and track and years of service at UWB is reasonable starting point for expected pay
 - Do not have demographic data needed to do desired equity analysis
 - Previously discussed whether to include years in rank at prior institutions, decided not to as it would be too difficult for administrators to get that information.

Questions/Feedback

- Faculty received 0% raise last academic year so at least a 2% raise for all should happen
- What is the purpose? Is this about providing everyone with a bump or fixing equity issues?
- Questions to guide council:
 - What do we mean by "expected pay"?
 - Linear regression based upon rank, track, years at rank at Bothell
 - Alternatively, could see if Associate Professors in teaching track are at least 7.5-10% higher than median of Assistance Professors in their track
 - Difficulty is there is no equivalent way of doing this with Assistant Professors as there is no rank below them
 - Who is eligible?
 - Maybe anyone below median, expected pay? Or a certain percentage below?
 - Within 2% might make sense, beyond that, gets hard to justify.
 - There is a linear fit and there are points below that, we can try to move the farthest points closer to the line or do that with some of the money and distribute the rest amongst all.
 - Years at "X". What is "x"?
 - Originally thinking years at rank at UW Bothell
 - Or years at UWB before current rank (ex. At UWB for a long time, just promoted, previous years could be included)
 - Could separate years at current rank and years before your rank
 - Should we group different tracks together for analysis?
 - Would address difference in salaries between teaching and tenure track
 - Vast majority of money would probably go toward teaching track

Questions/Feedback

- What is the "unit" in "unit adjustment"
 - In this instance, UWB is a unit while individual schools within UWB are not
 - In regard to unit of comparison, we are not making external comparisons
 - Taking a grand mean of all fields might not be useful for identifying the high ends and low ends.

- If purpose is retention, comparing within field makes sense. If purpose is equity, referring to reigning salary points across different fields reinforces inequities
 - If goal is equity, bring all faculty up to regional living wage
- Equity is the purpose with goal of moving those most deeply impacted closer to a standard
- People coming in now need higher rate than those who have been here longer and have had a chance to buy housing, etc.
- Large portion of faculty guaranteed to not be impacted by adjustments. Is presence of those faculty in data set distorting decision-making process?
 - Doing separate analysis by disciplinary category could help alleviate that
- An Assistant making more than an Associate or Associate making more than a Full is a problem, regardless of when they arrive
- Unit adjustment is equity lever, separate from meritorious pay
- Allocating funds by dividing by 5 and giving each unit same amount is inequitable
 - Suggesting allocating by groups of faculty with similar salary inequity issues across disciplines, not by unit
 - Need to focus on how equitable salaries are amongst UWB faculty, regardless of what is going on nationally
- Multi-prong approach seems best. Suggest livable wage approach and analysis per discipline approach
 - Using disciplinary categories will reinforce culture/national system of valuing certain types of labor over others
 - Multi-prong approach good but most concerned about those most impacted
 - If equity is principle from which CCPB is making recommendation, then communicate to VCAA that those furthest away from equity should get the most
 - Living wage conversation is critical in that piece
 - need to determine assumptions willing to make if using that matrix since we don't have data such as number of children, etc.
- Footnote: salaries of faculty on sabbatical look lower
- Principles CCPB will present and expect administration to deliver on:
 - Care for UWB faculty who most need the help (e.g., in relation to living wage); those the furthest away for equity should get the most
 - Address as many people as possible
- How a unit adjustment works: unit requests permission from provost to spend their own money. This year, 10 of the 16 UW units had money to ask for, UWB was one such unit
 - Provost needs to see that it makes sense as a big picture

Socha summarized that CCPB's recommendation regarding unit adjustment will highlight equity principles and suggest livable wage be strongest focus. Socha will provide recommendation to VCAA, Deans, Chancellor to help inform request to provost.

Review of 2020/21 and Items for Next Year

- Items from CCPB charge letter:
 - Facilitate development of new School-level Fiscal Operation Guidelines within the modified RCM budgeting model.
 - School EFCs were well engaged in this, so CCPB decided to not do additional work here.

- Improve campus-wide reporting on faculty compensation, including by race, gender, etc.
 - Worked all year with VCAA, VCPA, IR, UW Senate and others to find ways to do this. Effort is strongly supported across our entire campus.
 - Could not get access to any faculty demographic data from UW OE/HR.
 - Goals
 - Enable this analysis
 - Ideally done by UW
 - Also have UWB data available at UWB for further analyses
 - Strengthen data sharing agreements between UWB's IR and UW central units that control the data.
 - Current status
 - Initial analysis will be of faculty compensation by unit (e.g., school, division, discipline category), track, rank, and years at rank. No demographic data.
 - This week Adrian Sinkler and GFO leadership met to complete answers to a set of questions about the analysis to guide IR work over the summer. We expect agreement on the answers before end of June.
 - We hear that the Provost will be open to a unit (UWB) adjustment in the 2021-22 AY. We expect the faculty compensation analysis to inform any request UWB makes.
 - This work will continue next year (and likely for several years).
- We would like quarterly updates regarding each of the focus areas in the form of a short memorandum and visit to EC.
 - Did not do.

Additional items:

- Shared governance
 - Repeatedly had CCPB members seek feedback from their school EFCs.
 - Discussed ways to help strengthen connections between GFO and school EFCs and FYYP AOC.
 - Keith asked Chancellor for increased GFO budget in order to provide each school EFC chair and the FYYP AOC chair with a 0.5 course release to do this work.
 - Decided to not increase course release amount (VCAA is increasing it from \$6K + benefits to \$10K + benefits).
 - Expect to continue to work with school EFCs to ensure that at least one member of their EFC is also a member of either EC or CCPB.
- GFO budget request
 - Asked Chancellor for a budget increase to accommodate
 - Schools actually taking their GFO course releases
 - 0.5 course release to fund increased articulation between GFO and School EFC and FYYP AOC
 - 1 course release per AY for unexpected needs
- GFO course release policy
 - Requesting EC approval of two recommendations from CCPB:
 - Updates to GFO Course Release Policy to accommodate unexpected requests
 - Course release for PK Sen's Role on Financial Transformation Team; see the charge letter from CCPB

- Will be suggesting updates about when / how review GFO course release commitments
- Presentations & discussions
 - UW Financial Transformation - Kendra Yoshimoto, Director, UWB Fiscal and Audit Services
 - UWB Husky Village - Tim Wilson, Dean of Student Life
 - Space Planning for Post-Pandemic - Amy Van Dyke and Gowri Shankar
- Possible items for CCPB to work on next year?
 - Improve campus-wide reporting on faculty compensation, including by race, gender, etc. - continue this work

Adjourn

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri

Meeting ended at 12:30pm

The next CCPB meeting will be Oct 13, 11-12:30