Campus Council on Planning and Budget Meeting  
Mar 10, 2021, 11am – 12:30pm, via Zoom

Present: David Socha (chair), Keith Nitta, Jason Naranjo, Shauna Carlisle, Peter Brooks, P.K. Sen, Nora Kenworthy, Jennifer McLoud-Mann, Gowri Shankar, Sharon A. Jones

Guests: Leslie Cornick (Dean, STEM), Amy Van Dyke (Director, Physical Planning and Space Management)

Call to Order, Approve Minutes
- Minutes approved after following correction was made:
  - Added bullet stating “Conversations around space in new Husky Village for a medical clinic and licensed clinical social worker will continue.”

General Updates/Questions:
- Husky Village:
  - Mental and sexual health services need to be on future CCPB agendas
  - How often will CCPB be briefed on progress?
    - Currently no system of update in place specifically for CCPB
  - Housing for REU students in summer is crucial for REU programs

Process for Awarding GFO Course Releases
Socha explained that VCAA is increasing course releases from $6,000 + benefits to $10,000 + benefits and opened discussion to council asking how/if GFO should increase amount or number of course releases in order to strengthen shared governance between EFCs and GFO councils with the goal of closing communication gaps and ensure information is accessible.

Discussion:
- An offset of compensation would help incentivize service, especially in smaller units
- Reasonable to offer EFC chairs course release as they have the demanding job of deflecting requests for administrative work. EFC chair is key connection to unit
  - GFO asking for additional labor (attending CCPB meeting) in exchange for release, EFC chairs may not be best choice since already overburdened
- Some positions would have to change from elected to appointed
- An appointed person from EFC (other than chair) to serve on CCPB could work
- Concerns about concentration of representation if one person in multiple roles
- SNHS designed EFC to include rep from all faculty ranks. CCPB open to do the same?
  - Part-time lecturers aren’t voting members and aren’t compensated for service, so that is hard
- Business currently revising bylaws to state that CCPB Business rep is permanently invited to EFC meetings. Should be different person from those already on EFC.
May need to be addressed at school level with bylaw change with guidance from CCPB and EC around what is needed for shared governance.

GFO bylaws can be changed to accommodate articulation around connections between schools and GFO.

When is biennial budget created? Deadline for request increase in GFO budget?
- Questionnaire will go out late March asking for projected needs. Extra funds in GFO budget a quirk, there may be adjustments made

**Chair Summary:** CCPB reps talk with EFCs (for ideas, not proposals) about improving shared governance, share out in Apr CCPB meeting. Strong need exists for CCPB and EC to have this connection; do schools want connections to other councils? Look broadly across GFO, consider where salient decisions are being made, consider matters of efficiency. GFO has no recommendation, only desire for improved shared governance. CCPB will defer wording of draft policy until hearing back from reps on EFCs thoughts.

**Equity Analysis of Faculty Compensation**
Socha reported that the Dean of STEM created work group to analyze faculty compensation. Only salary data currently available, no demographic data. Analysis proceeding well, group dedicated to principled methodical work and comparing to external data/sources. Goal to have data to Dean before unit level adjustment requests are due. Until STEM has agreement on what to share, data will not be shared with CCPB. STEM analysis could inform how to do campus-wide analysis. Socha then opened discussion to council:

**Discussion:**
- Other schools that UWB benchmarks against have done this work, found inequities, and taken steps to address. UWB needs to work with partners in shared governance to push this forward. This type of analysis needs to be done on regular basis.
- Current Faculty Senate leadership and GFO leadership (next 3 years of leadership) care deeply and are a united front on this issue. Faculty Senate has reasonable plan to push this forward at tri-campus level, optimistic about getting traction. Work at UWB may shape how this moves forward at tri-campus level.
- Gratitude to STEM taking the lead on this important work
- Expect some analysis data will be available to share in next CCPB meeting
- Median salaries and range of salaries being analyzed. Do not have data on gender or any demographics. Only salary information
  - What about start date of employment, titles, starting salary?
    - If VCAA requests it. All data requests must go through VCAA
    - In order to access data prior to the Workday system being used, OE/HR staff effort would have to be directed to accessing old systems. Needs to be further conversation around that.
  - STEM began analysis planning prior to tri-campus effort. STEM’s goal is to establish base line information and a template that might be useful for campus. After that, STEM will defer to larger efforts happening.
STEMs efforts are potential pathway to look at this issue across schools, even if demographic data can’t be obtained, STEM’s process could offer another way of answering those questions. 

Assumption is that STEM’s analysis will identify outliers and those outliers will be looked at, despite demographics.

One challenge is how equity is defined? In this conversation, is equity looked at differences only by rank?

- STEM is not trying to sub define equity, rather, standing by broader definition of equity in STEM. Not at a place to get at deeper questions due to limited data. Hope tri-campus effort will move forward. This will be an iterative and slow-moving process
- Future conversations should include issues of race, ethnicity, and how non-white people see definition of equity.

STEM working group will identify outliers and put that information in the hands of those who DO have more information.

One example of STEM methodology: looked at time in particular ranks, looked to see if there were differences there and why

- STEM hasn’t looked at measuring earning over longer periods of time, working group will consider doing so

**Chair Summary:** Discussion will continue for the foreseeable future as work advances.

**Space Planning for Post-Pandemic**
Amy Van Dyke and Gowri Shankar

Socha introduced Amy Van Dyke and Gowri Shankar to discuss constraints of facilities on campus, how they have changed over the past year, and what schools may want to think about in post pandemic.

Shankar explained that the SUPER-G committee (student, staff, faculty reps) works strategically to evaluate space utilization and make space allocation recommendations to Chancellor and that the pandemic has added further complexities to previously planned changes/projects. He then turned the presentation over to Van Dyke.

Van Dyke presented further background and context on current state of space planning at UWB

- Changes coming in 2023 and 2024
  - Addition of STEM 4 (construction begins summer 2021, opens autumn 2023). 50/50 share between UWB and Cascadia, shows co-location nature of campus.
  - Husky Village redevelopment. Phased demolition to create new housing develop to accommodate 1,000 (vs <300) and dining hall. Leased space at ground floor levels for relocating offices.
  - Culmination of projects will mark end of leases at UWBB and UWBX.
- Analysis done to determine how UWB space is currently being used.
• 35% office space (offices, meeting rooms, copy rooms) – biggest use of space
• 27% instructional space
• 15.7% library space
• 15% research space

• Office of Financial Management (reports to Governor) analyzed all WA public institutions to see how campuses are using space. Looked at campuses relative to FTE and determined certain amount of square feet of space needed based on that FTE.
• Impacts of adding new buildings and subtracting leased spaces.
• Adding new buildings and subtracting leased spaces will result in minimal space gain.
  o Biggest space needs (instructional space and “non-residential” space: assembly space, lounge, food services, etc.) will remain a challenge
• Looking at data and looking ahead to ensure space is used efficiently and identifying opportunities to adjust
• Post-pandemic considerations play into space planning decisions
  o Spectrum of possibilities: “Everybody goes back to 100%” to “Nobody comes back, everyone stays remote, continue operating as we are now”
  o Reality will probably be somewhere in the middle but that middle has not yet been defined.
  o Challenging to determine how to use space well but remain flexible while considering post-pandemic possibilities and anticipating changes (STEM 4, Husky Village, leases ending)

Van Dyke opened discussion to council, encouraging members to share any anticipated issues, constraints, opportunities related space planning.

Discussion:
• Pandemic posed barriers but also offered opportunities to bridge gaps (i.e. offering classes very late or early). Requiring students to come back to campus may place constraints back on. Also, the need for instructional space could be less if we continue to offer more online options.
• So many differing opinions and preferences regarding how things will look after pandemic, will people be engaged broadly, via survey, about this topic?
  o VCAA delayed putting surveys out because faculty, staff, students are overworked and exhausted but now 3 sub-committees have been formed to create surveys:
    ▪ Survey to all instructional staff (goal: out 2nd week of Spring)
    ▪ Students survey (goal: out 2nd week of Spring)
    ▪ After results of those two surveys are gathered, survey will be developed for student-facing staff
    ▪ Surveys aren’t about work/life balance issues but, rather will offer feedback on lessons learned from different instructional modes.
    ▪ Also hope to get sense of support that will be needed in post-pandemic world.
    ▪ Will report out by 8th week of Spring.
• For autumn 2021, UWB has been instructed to plan for full in-person quarter. Plan is to back off of that once public health information is out in May/June.
  o Will faculty be asked their preference for remote working?
    • 3 listening sessions with OE/HR were offered. Primarily attended by staff and faculty.
    • GFO EC will have OE/HR attend meeting listening session
    • Those rules are set at tri-campus level.
    • Will consider what surveys say.
    • Taking a student-centric approach to this.

Shankar and Van Dyke concluded discussion stating that nothing is needed from the CCPB at this time and that they will come back to CCPB when more data/information is known.

Action Items:
  o CCPB reps please gather input from your faculty on the following topics:
    • Ways faculty could articulate with the curricular and extracurricular opportunities that the new Husky Village will afford.
    • Ways for GFO and school EFCs to create better ways to work together in support of continually improving our shared governance, such as having certain faculty be on both one of the GFO councils and on a school EFC (though doing that might reduce the number of faculty involved in governance).

Adjournment

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting ended at 12:30pm
The next CCPB meeting will be Apr 14, 11-12:30