Executive Council Meeting
Feb 22, 2022, 8:45 – 10:45am, via Zoom

Present: Shauna Carlisle (Chair), Jason Naranjo, Keith Nitta, Sophie Leroy, Tyson Marsh, Julie Shayne, Santiago Lopez, Dan Bustillos, Shima Abadi

Guests: Becca Price, Sharon Jones,

Welcome and Adoption of Feb 8 Minutes
- Minutes Approved

Second Review of P&T Process and Next Steps
Rebecca Price, Chair, Campus Council on Promotion & Tenure

Carlisle summarized P&T conversation from previous EC meeting before turning the meeting over CCPT Chair, Price
- Confusion, concern, stress amongst faculty due to lack of understanding of P&T processes
  - Where do decisions reside? Provost? UWB?
  - Important that faculty understand benefits of the different layers of review at UWB
- Summary of P&T processes has been shared with VCAA, Deans, CCPT for review for feedback and all agreed it accurately reflects processes
  - Carlisle will add pieces suggested by Deans to help clarify what happens at each step (ensuring faculty understand they have advocacy at each step) and will share out again

Price summarized what CCPT does:
- Moving toward procedural and away from substantive review
- Reviewing cases from across schools provides unique perspective. Better able to catch if schools are evaluating candidates in different and unfair ways
- Observe and assess how faculty from different demographics are treated and report overarching trends of inequitable practices to VCA to be addressed
- See differences in how schools/divisions present data
  - Currently no systematic requirements or guidance on how to present strong teaching dossiers
    - Only teaching materials required for dossiers are peer reviews, student evaluations
    - Sample assignments and randomized selection of student work would be better
- Ask Deans/Chairs for additional data if questions arise
- Look for procedural mishaps
- Ensure external and committee review is appropriate, fair, and based on data

DISCUSSION:
- Sounds like CCPT is doing tremendous amount of work collecting data after the fact to ensure equity of future candidates rather than helping faculty get promoted. Any way to reduce that workload?
  - In Fall, CCPT is embedded in cases, in Winter & Spring is reflection period so they are part of process all along, not just after the fact
  - It is a large workload and CCPT has been an all-women council for several years
- UWT faculty governance considering doing away with APT (their CCPT equivalent) due to number of unsuccessful cases, concern that it is not a fair process
  - On agenda at tri-campus. Task force is addressing APT issues
- Process review is important to ensure case gets to Provost. There are things that UWB should be catching at school level. OEHR putting a checklist together for schools to use
- CCPT currently made up of people well-tuned to fairness issues and have fair practices, justice, equity as collective priorities. That could shift with different membership. If EC wants to protect this role of CCPT, need to make that explicit.
CCPT’s “data collection” is not systematic (due to candidate privacy), it is based on informed impressions.

Recusal process (members not reviewing cases from their own schools) causes extra workload on CCPT, especially for big schools. Wouldn't perspective from someone within school be helpful?

- To even out workload this year, CCPT changed process and created sub committees for each
- Can be advantageous to have those outside of school/unit review
  - If faculty know each other well, explanations are skipped over that could be helpful to an outside review. Being too familiar can lead to oversights
  - Another thing to consider is that the CCPT member from the school will not have seen the chair’s letter
- Dossiers are supposed to be written so that both those inside and outside field can understand. If CCPT members outside the field don’t understand something and have to go back to the Dean, that can lead to details being added that strengthen argument for case
  - Conversations with Deans can lead to Deans and committees writing better letters, better mentoring or candidates, ongoing capacity building. CCPT asks questions that aren’t captured by OE/HR.

CCPT’s advocacy is unique and important to UWB if we consider that we cannot rely on the institution to make changes when patterns of inequity are revealed, since many of those patterns have been patterns for a long time. Important to keep advocacy work going.

P&T process needs to be transparent so that faculty know where guardrails are, where to go if problems arise, how to access formal advocacy mechanisms if they feel they are treated poorly

- Outside support also critical
  - VCAA and Chancellor considering adding an Assistant Vice Chancellor role to support faculty success. Role would address patterns that CCPT recognizes, patterns in merit review, other
    - New position is not a guarantee. First step will be to submit request to Provost and, once approved, draft job description for review by Deans and GFO.
    - Goal of new positions would be to understand systemic issues, advocate, and develop (with faculty input), mechanisms that could support faculty

Being able to collect data is crucial to ensure the right people are reviewing the right files

- CCPT not being able to collect data is a big issue. Currently, data that is collected is:
  - OE/HR makes list of issues, documents questions from Provost about pieces
  - CCPT documents what they do and compiles questions from Deans
- If CCPT could collect demographic data, what would they do to analyze equity as it relates to promotion?
  - Make the data available to everyone and be able to calculate within schools, divisions, ranks, salaries to ensure we are moving toward a more just campus

EC needs to consider formally making justice, equity, and inclusion part of CCPT

Should CCPT review come before Dean, as was considered in previous EC meeting?

- CCPT assesses how faculty member has been treated so makes sense to have that come after the Dean. If there is a conflict between dean and faculty, want to detect that before it goes to higher administration.

Language in Faculty Code is confusing because the word “dean” in the code is actually referring to the Chancellor. So, should CCPT be writing letters to chancellor instead of VCAA?

- UWB Chancellor delegates that to VCAA but that can be confusing. One of the executive orders does clarify that.
- If UWT and UWB Deans were treated exactly like the Deans at Seattle, then the Chancellor would be bypassed. Big issue.

Carlisle summarized main takeaways:

1. Make public the list of file issues from OEHR
2. Bylaws or strategy for cementing justice, equity and inclusion in work of CCPT
3. Revise VCAA process to include Deans
a. What is the role of Deans? How do Deans see their role in the process?

4. System level issues. How do we systemize equity across campus?

5. Data issues: how do we bring demographic data into the P&T process

Next Steps:
1. Revise and recirculate P&T process documents to EC, CCPT, VCAA to ensure everyone agrees
2. Disseminate to faculty, through EFCs first
3. Conduct faculty survey, giving faculty an opportunity to identify places in the process where they have questions or concerns

Next Steps Demographic Data
Keith Nitta, Chair, CCPB and Jason Naranjo, Chair, GFO

Nitta shared draft of Class C legislation that requests demographic data and a faculty salary equity study. Nitta asked council to review document and provide edits/suggestions noting that the “be it resolved” section is clear but the “whereas” clauses need work. Draft not yet ready for wide dissemination but gathering feedback from particular individuals is ok. Eventually, will have EC stamp of approval, making all EC members co-authors of resolution. Nitta then opened the discussion to the group:

- GFO leadership new to writing something like this. Bringing work from Senate and EC together to leverage voice as a campus is new
- Resolution directly relates to data. Unless we have demographic data, we cannot do equity analysis
- Timeline of Class C legislation:
  - Adopted by a Faculty Council
    - EC has to request that the legislation become part of a particular council’s agenda (in this case, best options would be: Faculty Affairs, Race Equity and Justice, Tri-Campus Policy). If not adopted by one, try in another
    - Once adopted by a council, they clean up the language before sending it on to Faculty Senate
- Can take a long time to make it through Faculty Senate. May be asked to change language or break pieces apart but anticipate the spirit will be honored
- Point of this is to place pressure and awareness on UW president and provost. All GFO can do is advise to move forward in these areas. The more we can do that publicly and nosily, the better
- There are some indications of change in these areas addressed in the legislation but there are still a lot of protections around who can access data.

Nitta asked council to provide feedback directly to draft.

Unit Adjustment Update
Keith Nitta, Chair, CCPB

Nitta explained that CCPB subcommittee (Carlisle, Bejan, Li) volunteered time to help VCPA office review and reproduce calculations, individual salary adjustments and a few issues arose. Nitta turned meeting over to Carlisle to explain issues:

- Li and Bejan reviewed formulas and did not find any problems, however, in original data there was option to pick if individual arrived as assistant or associate professor and that is missing from this data. Only those who arrived as assistants are included in salary compression adjustment.
  - Strategy is to look at baseline, model impact of freeze, not including associates
    - Several people would be dropped if associates are taken out and that wasn’t what was reviewed by campus bodies and wasn’t part of proposal that went forward from chancellor’s office. Was not part of original proposal. Justification for why not to include them would be good
Will ensure no systematic impact on teaching faculty
  o Subcommittee will continue review. Calculations need to be done by March 1
  o At this point, no faculty have been contacted about adjustment

**Senate/GFO Partnership**
Shauna Carlisle, Chair, EC
  - Using feedback from EC and input from Senate Faculty reps, a checklist has been created that contains tasks that may help to strengthen relationship between GFO and Faculty Senate and council members.
    o Carlisle asked EC to review and provide feedback on checklist
  - A draft Faculty Senate website has been created. Working with VCAAs office to develop a video that would be informative for faculty.
  - Mike Townsend, Secretary of Faculty, helped develop language to include on ballots that recommends that Faculty Senators meet with GFO
  - Need to consider idea of members of GFO being the EFC reps for each school. EFC reps have their finger on the pulse of what faculty are thinking and feeling. What would the pros and cons of that be?

**School Updates**

  - FYPP: Co-coordinators terms are ending. FYPP considering having a part-time faculty member be the coordinator. Is GFO okay with have the FYPP coordinator be part-time faculty?
    o FYPP bylaw issue, no need for GFO review or approval FYPP bylaw issue

**Meeting Adjourned**

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