Executive Council Meeting
Dec 7, 2021, 8:45 – 10:45am, via Zoom

Present: Shauna Carlisle (chair), Jason Naranjo, Keith Nitta, Jason Daniel-Ulloa, Linda Watts, Tyson Marsh, Santiago Lopez, Sophie Leroy

Guests: David Socha, Sharon Jones

Welcome and Adoption of Nov 23 EC Meeting Minutes
- Minutes approved

Hybrid Institutional Infrastructure Update
Sharon Jones, VCAA
- VCAA Jones shared slideshow describing past hybrid/blended learning efforts/outcomes and updates on hybrid/blended learning at UW Bothell
  - Jan 2015, eLearning Coordinating Committee formed and produced final report and recommendations in July 2015
  - Jun 2017, eLearning Steering Committee formed and produced 2-year plan, resource video, school-level conversations, participation in eLearning Symposium, recommended questions for online and hybrid course evaluations.
  - 2019/20, IT was looking at ways to move forward, gathered feedback from 20-30 stakeholders and then the pandemic hit at which point, planned next steps were halted
  - Despite efforts, moving digital pedagogy forward has been difficult due partly to tensions with UWB and tri-campus
  - 2017, resources were dedicated to hiring staff to help and IT took over leadership of Digital Learning at that point
  - Efforts of schools to move eLearning forward have been scattered with the exception of SNHS which designs all programs for distance learning
  - Spring 2021, VCAA’s office surveyed faculty and students and results showed obvious benefits of eLearning and great interest in accelerating and improving hybrid learning
  - During and post pandemic, things have been hectic for faculty and students and people are exhausted
    - Considering bringing in consulting firm Online Learning Consortium, a non-profit organization recommended by UW
      - VCAA has received a proposal from the firm but is not wedded to the idea, but rather using it as a conversation starter.

Jones stated that VCAA’s office has carryover funding and requested the council’s feedback on how best to use resources to move hybrid institutional infrastructure forward at UWB:

DISCUSSION:
- High quality consulting is valuable but bulk of funding and resources should be invested in faculty and infrastructure,
  - VCAA explained that the consulting firm recommended 2 prong approach:
    - Facilitate conversations with individuals doing this work previously at UWB about what infrastructure we need
      - Individuals who participate should be compensated for efforts
      - Survey faculty to gather their infrastructure concerns
      - Don’t necessarily need to hire consulting firm to do this
Faculty cohort-based approach. Core groups of faculty work with consultants over a 2-4 year time period to learn how to teach high quality hybrid courses
  - Faculty in cohorts would receive $5,000 stipend for effort which would be a 4-week course customized to each cohort
  - Students may prefer hybrid model but may not have resources (equipment, space) to be successful. Infrastructure not in place at UWB. How can we provide students with what they need?
  - Burden will fall heavily on lower paid faculty and while a stipend is great, this process is ongoing
  - Funds should be made available so that burden isn’t put on students who don’t have access to or experience with technology. A course, training, or interaction with students who need that support.
    - As more people gain access to technology, it becomes more of a burden on those who don’t have those skills or resources
  - Center for Digital Learning and Innovation at Seattle University does a good job of supporting faculty who are moving courses online. Luke Ware, Assoc. Dir., is a UWB Cultural Studies grad
  - School of Business surveyed students and faculty
    - 250 undergraduate students surveyed and overwhelmingly indicated desire for online formats. They want some convenience but may not think about their own access
      - Gap exists between what students say they want & challenges that may arise later
    - Graduate students value in-person more but do want online synchronous options
    - Faculty also want online options but also value in-person
  - UWB has a diverse student body with diverse needs so we need to offer diverse pathways
  - What critical needs should funding go to at UWB?
    - Infrastructure
    - Faculty training with technology
    - Compensating faculty for thinking and strategic time spent
    - Free-up faculty to do due diligence to figure out what will work best for students
    - If consultant has experience across universities and can recommend best practices, that could be useful too
    - Aspects around equity and inclusions should be closely considered when considering how a hybrid model could work
    - Having data that looks beyond campus needs to student context and faculty context will be critical to this work
      - Student participation in this process will be key
    - "Hybrid Learning Days" could be one method
    - Faculty offices are not set up for teaching remotely and policies in place for taking equipment home make it nearly impossible to teach from home.
      - Getting resources to be able to do asynchronous or synchronous teaching will require policy change. Current processes to get equipment are patronizing
    - As we transition to permanent model of hybrid teaching, need to think of ways to engage students who are struggling. In-class provides in-person interaction some students need
    - Pilot model may be more effective. Determine what an intervention would look like for a particular group rather than trying to find a universal solution
      - Could hire an evaluation team to track progress and assess if process is working, gather measures of equity, accessibility, pedagogy

Chair thanked VCAA Jones for coming and invited her back to EC for future conversations on the topic

Unit Adjustment Debrief and Next Steps
Jason Naranjo, GFO Chair and Shauna Carlisle, EC Chair and Keith Nitta, CCPB Chair
Carlisle thanked everyone for their hard work, discussed next steps for this unit adjustment and indicated that conversations will be happening soon regarding future unit adjustments.

- **Next Steps:**
  - Ensure everyone has all information. Disclose all reports along with a cover letter
  - Ensure everyone has a chance to get their questions answered
  - Consider what role GFO wants to have in re-analyzing data and different models considered

Nitta reported that everything was formally submitted to the chancellor and reviewed some findings of faculty survey.

- Several faculty members had concerns about methodology (including one faculty member not being able to replicate calculations IR came up with). EC needs to think through if/how to participate in ensuring faculty are satisfied and comfortable with the calculations

- Responses were split as to whether unit adjustment should happen at the school or campus level.
  - Overall, campus was for a campus-level process but there was divergence inside of schools.
  - Should inform us on what we might want to prepare for

**DISCUSSION:**

- UWB needs to establish list of peer institutions. Being able to clarify where we are and where we seek to be will be helped if we connect to a network of institutions facing similar challenges
  - This is a maturation step and faculty are integral to making these determinations
  - As a campus, we have different opinions about our identity but, collectively, we need to know who we are as a campus for these sort of big decisions

- VCAA Jones reported that the Chancellors received and reviewed feedback from GFO and Deans and, after some discussion, the following changes are being made to the methods:
  - **Methods 1, 2, 3:** Instead of anchoring to most junior faculty member in each group, these methods will be recalculated based on the median of the lowest rank within each group. This aligns with how STEM conducted analysis last year
  - **Method 1:** Will be recalculated based on a compounding method which will change results from $1.1 million to $1.8 million.
    - IR didn’t use compounding method originally because it was assumed that calculations would be done as they have been for previous unit adjustment
  - **Method 3:** Will be recalculated based on compounding method, will increase to $400,000
    - This is because method was just modified last Friday to a compounding method
  - VCAA moving to a range of 2%-10%

- What are EC’s thoughts on how EC and GFO should be involved moving forward?
  - Would be helpful if Chancellors provided final decision in writing that includes:
    - Specification of model that was chosen based on feedback
    - Any errors detected and remedies put in place
    - Size of the pool that will be requested
  - VCAA doesn’t consider what was detected/changed to be errors in models but rather different understandings of the models

- Process unjustly fell to one individual in IR and a lot of decisions were made based on that individual’s decisions and assumptions. They did the best they could but other professions can/should also give feedback on these processes in the future
  - In the future, providing stipends to a group of faculty to work with IR, VCs, GFO during the summer would be a good idea
    - IR, VCPA, and VCAA had much time to work on this but faculty were on hiatus and faculty council memberships were changing.
    - Consider providing compensation for faculty working during calendar year as well
  - Need to build on idea of working group to work with IR. Need to have more eyes on data

- Important to distinguish between working groups vs. reps in decision-making or advising groups. When faculty are off contract, they cannot consult constituents and, therefore, should not be voting.
Could calculations/code be made public? There may be faculty interest in researching this, could enable some creativity, rigor. Could create a test data set that could be used to play with.

If EC wants follow-up group to play part in recalculations for this unit adjustment (re-check Model 1, review calculations themselves) that group will need access to data set and then identify who will be doing what with the data. We need to have a plan and proposal to do this work.

A more formal group would be implemented for future unit adjustments

Summary of Unit Adjustment Process:
- GFO and CAD recommendation went to chancellors
- Chancellors are deliberations
- Chancellor will submit proposal to Provost by Dec 15 and UW senate will also be involved
  - Proposal will on be 3 pages
  - If approved by Provost, it will then go through detailed analysis
    - Faculty who received retention offers or were deemed non-meritorious will be removed
    - Will check with OE/HR and possibly Deans to see if there are specific reasons for certain phenomenon/patterns.
- After decisions from UW Senate and Provost, UWB will move forward with implementation

VCAA addressed concerns stemming from a faculty member being unable to replicate IRs calculations:
- Understanding is that IRs calculations were based on the most recent faculty hire in each group. In some groups, the most recent faculty hire was 5 years ago or isn’t an Asst. Prof. or Asst. Teach Prof. anymore. When the faculty member tried to analyze the data, they left those who were left out. That accounts for why that faculty member couldn’t replicate IR’s results. Not due to an error but rather due to choices made and understandings
- Doesn’t sound like there is much space for GFO to be involved in process
  - Once it is known what has been decided, a limited group could have access to data. Would need a data sharing agreement
  - Small group could convene and be tasked with partnering with Chancellors in understanding final calculations and could provide input around implementation

Chair asked EC for soft agreement on short term (to take place after Winter break) & long term next steps:
- 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 Jones will forward updated models
  - 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
DISCUSSION:
- VCAA stated that the chancellor cares deeply about not being able to include demographic data in this process and is in conversations with President and Provost. Unsure when to expect revised decision
  - VCAA was asked if UW tri-campus was considering producing demography report similar to the UW Staff Demographics report produced within the last few years that included demographic and exit interview data
    - VCAA Jones unaware of staff report
    - VCAA does have access to dashboard that shows faculty demography but does not have access to the raw data behind it that would allow for analysis
    - Deans are supposed to suggest to faculty leaving who are part of underrepresented demographic categories to take part in an exit interview with the UW Faculty Advancement office before leaving so that, over time, they can gather enough feedback to report out
    - EEO report provided each year that talks about a static view of where we are
- Suggestion from VCAA that GFO analysis group that replicates revised models could also recommend which model should be used moving forward to avoid having to go through this process every time
  - GFO leadership has discussed the importance of establishing alignment between the philosophical orientation and principles that lead to the selection of methodology and the processes for implementation through shared governance.
    - CCPB working on this and intend to have something ready by end of academic year
- In regard to identifying peer institutions for salary comparison and market data, what do we do when a peer institution doesn’t have similar schools? Different schools may need to rely on different institutions
  - Would caution against sub-units picking their own set of comparative institutions or UWB cherry-picking peer groups based on different purposes. If we choose judiciously and together, we can commit to a faceted view that, in aggregate, is useful for comparisons. The list can be reviewed as we and our peers change but picking and committing is important.
- In regard to identifying peer institutions for future calculations, would like to see effort put into a value/theory-based comparison group. (What are our values? What do we want our salary equity to look like?) and create comparisons based on that
- Need to discuss language used when discussing market comparison and market data because they are rooted in concepts and ideas that do not align with UWB’s stated values around social justice. You can’t have a market justice system that says we are committed to social justice.

Nitta summarized that EC will continue work on peer institutions and broader issues around how to get access to demographic data from Academic HR. CCPB will focus on unit adjustment and things related to it directly. He then asked EC if there were any concerns or questions as the councils split off and thanked all for the transparent and participatory involvement in the unit adjustment process.
- Council didn’t have any concerns

10:35-10:45am: Unit Updates
- No school reports

10:45am: Adjourn

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:45am
Next EC meeting will be Jan 11 @ 8:45am