Executive Council Meeting
Jan 11, 2022, 8:45 – 10:45am, via Zoom

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

Guests: Alanna Pawlak, Cinnamon Hillyard, Sharon Jones, Alka Kurian, Jin-Kyu Jung, Johnny Lin, Jesse Zaneveld, Becca Price

Welcome and Adoption of Minutes
- Dec 7 EC Minutes Approved
- Carlisle introduced and welcomed Dan Bustillos (sub SNHS rep) and Julie Shayne (returning FYPP rep)

Set Agenda for Jan 27 GFO Winter Meeting
- Council approved GFO Winter meeting agenda items:
  - Ongoing response and issues related to Covid-19
  - Unit adjustment and implementation

Unit Adjustment Proposal Q&A
Keith Nitta, Chair, Campus Council on Planning & Budget
- Chancellor followed plurality opinions expressed in faculty survey. Since chosen formula for calculating target salary was fairly conservative, no need to go beyond less than half a percent of total compensation for unit adjustment
- Distribution will cut fairly evenly between teaching-track and tenure-track faculty (14 teaching track, 13 tenure track). None of those identified have been notified since final decisions have not been made
  - Timeline: Senate council will make determination in January, Provost will consider and make decision by the end of February, and implementation should be complete around April 1
  - Might be retroactive for the year, but that is still unclear
- Someone from GFO leadership and Chancellor Esterberg will meet with UW Planning & Budget on Jan 24 for 15 min to bring forth any questions
- CCPB will continue to work to operationalize processes and timing in order to have policy template in place for next unit adjustment. Need to maximize opportunities to work together through shared governance
- VCAA stated that timeline for future unit adjustments is standard, as part of the executive order indicating that unit adjustments are one of the ways that salaries can be adjusted
  - Separate issue within the unit adjustment that impacts only full professors (both teaching and tenure track) and that falls into a different timeline. VCAA is part of committee implementing that
    - In 2020, Provost started a work group to look at how full professors could be evaluated
      - Tenure-track full professors have no review process other than merit review
      - Working group looking at ways to encourage continued excellence and productivity in full (and maybe assoc.) profs with a more intentional process
      - Group created rubric, matrix, evaluation criteria but indicated that it is useless if there is not a reward tied to it
        - UW reviewed whether this could be supported financially and determined that it could be an extra 1%
        - 1/3 of full professors would have the opportunity to get this funding every 3 years, only based on merit
    - UWU and UWT were consulted at the time and opted not to participate. Provost is now revisiting and asking UWU and UWT chancellors if they would like to participate
      - Chancellors are awaiting financial analysis from UWS Planning & Budget
      - VCAA and UWT counterpart are on committee that will work on consultation (faculty groups, deans) and implementation, if chancellors opt to participate
This would be part of unit adjustment. Unit adjustments can happen for portions of faculty based on competitiveness, reputational issues
In conversations with Faculty Senate to ensure this aligned with Faculty Code
Nothing has been decided and this would occur on a different cycle, probably in autumn
Teaching go off of appointment review

DISCUSSION:
- Is this a one-time merit review?
  - No. One third of the faculty would be evaluated for this special funding every 3 years
- 1% of pool mentioned is in addition to what is consider for merit raises already
- Senate Executive Committee raised question as to whether this would be after tenure review and the answer is no
- Effort is to address salary equity in higher ranks across institution. People’s salaries top out and there is no good way to reward them for achievements
  - More about incentivizing and providing opportunity to recognize continued excellence rather than rewarding longevity
- IAS doesn’t do extra meritorious anymore so who is this evaluation by? Is it the same pool for teaching and tenure? Is this a non-mandatory thing?
  - VCAA recognized that several schools do not do extra meritorious and that a plan will need to be identified if UWB opts to participate.
  - VCAA will connect with EC when the decision is made as to whether UWB will be participating

Review Data Science Minor Proposal
Johnny Lin, Assoc. Prof., STEM-CSS
- Updates since EC first reviewed proposal in November:
  - Cover sheet routed and signed, two issues raised during that process:
    1. IT and Library asked what the plan is if enrollment numbers reach a point at which additional support staff is needed
      - Current funds resources can support planned cohort. Will revisit if demand grows
    2. AOC approved request to have IAS faculty member on AOC, effective after proposal is approved. Caleb Trujillo agreed to serve in that role.

Review Data Analytics Minor Proposal
Jin-Kyu Jung, Assoc. Prof., IAS and Jesse Zaneveld, Asst. Prof., STEM – Bio
- Began work on minor 3 years ago; conducted research, surveyed to determine interest, had conversations around offering two minors (data science and data analytics) and what makes Data Analytics different:
  - Managed by Office of Student Academic Success
  - First cross-disciplinary minor on campus
  - Students exposed to coding and scripting but focus on using existing method analysis
  - Social implications
  - 3 required courses (one shared with data science)
  - Plan is to scale up, first offer twice a year and then eventually offer every quarter

DISCUSSION:
- VCAA commended faculty for intentionally designing a minor that is accessible to multiple majors and recognized the extra challenge that came with developing the minor during a pandemic
- How are students supported in choosing between Data Analytics and Data Science minors?
  - Both minors include B DATA 100-level core course in which the differences between minors is communicated so students can make an informed decision between the two
    - While both minors are applicational, the Data Science has a more low-level programming component than Data Analytics
• Faculty members who teach B DATA 100 can tweak it to their interest or expertise.
  o Suggest paring down (possible combining some of) the 11 learning objectives and make them more explicit and active so they are clearer for students.
  o Some reading objectives read more like what students will be doing in class rather than what they will be learning.
• Will B DATA course be required? If so, there will be a lot of overlap between Data Science and Data Analytics requirements.
  o B DATA course was not finished/set when work began on Data Analytics Minor so it was not included as a requirement. Unsure if it will be included as requirement or pre-requisite.
• What is current capacity of the one shared class across minors (BIS 232 Data Visualization)? Are we sure we can offer it?
  o It is offered 4 times a year now and is often full.
    ▪ May need to add more, IAS is prepared to do that if necessary.
• Proposal says $32,000 might be needed to support this with part-time lecturer hires. Is that investment already there to cover this? And with projected growth between 50-100 students, what are your expectations for the next 5-10 years? Data to support the future vision would be useful.
  o Currently do not have specific number projections. Will be an ongoing conversation, will adjust as needed.
• Suggest reaching out to UW’s eScience Institute. UWB courses could be part of their program or their courses accepted at UWB?
  o Abadi will introduce Lin to eScience Director.
  o Jung noted that the Data Science minor was created with a different purpose than the eScience Institute but he is willing to connect to explore potential opportunities.
• Anticipate minor will be popular and scale beyond estimates. RCM model includes two ways in which a minor allows schools to receive more funding:
  1. FTE (in terms of teaching) contributes to the allocation of funding for the following year.
  2. Small portion of formula accounts for Majors granted and Minor granted. As minor grows and, depending on where it is hosted, that is possible RCM revenue.
    ▪ Data Science minor is completely within School STEM while Data Analytics minor is within the Office of Student Academic Success (OSAS) which is not a school so does not receive RCM funding according to formula.
      ▪ Director of OSAS should work with Data Analytics AOC and an FTE team to prepare a 5-year analysis on revenue to give school Deans and EFCs an idea of the implications for schools and for OSAS.
    ▪ Data Analytics minor is an example of a cross-campus academic initiative that aligns with the strategic plan which allows for two opportunities for funding:
      1. Chancellor investment fund round in Spring, an opportunity to account for development (more faculty will be teaching courses). Also opportunity to provide bridge funding because of the lag before RCM catches up.
      2. Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs funding available to support cross-campus initiatives. Requires team to come together to submit proposal.

Carlisle asked Jung to revise the learning objectives of the Data Analytics minor and resubmit proposal to EC for review and vote in future meeting.

Questions from Campus Council on Promotion & Tenure
Rebecca Price, Chair, Campus Council on Planning & Budget (CCPT)
• Price asked council to consider the following questions regarding the composition of CCPT and whether that composition best suites the needs of the campus:
  o Is GFO willing to add an at-large member to CCPT to reduce workload as # of cases increases?
Currently no requirements of membership associated with rank. Sometimes full professors are recused from cases of someone applying for full professor, leaving Assoc. Profs to make recommendations on Full Professor applications. In those cases, CCPT submits a recommendation but does not vote and the letter to VCAA is not signed

Is it possible to add teaching track faculty to CCPT to help in the review of teaching track faculty?

1. Once CCPT completes reviews for the year, they meet with VCAA and CAD to give their impressions on process (are expectations clear enough for candidate? How can process be more transparent?). Right now, only tenure track faculty provide that feedback

How can council members express interest in continuing their appointments? How can other faculty members express their desire to serve on the council?

1. CCPT has been all women for past few years and heavily skewed toward women in years prior. Helpful if there were ways to communicate to campus who is interested in the work. If we don’t see who is interested, the same people will continue to be chosen

Should CCPT bylaws be changed to consider School of STEM divisions?

1. As the bylaws are now, STEM CCPT members are recused from ALL STEM cases, rather than just those within their division. Need to reconsider.

**DISCUSSION:**

1. CCPT bylaw change to include teaching track faculty on council could move through GFO quickly

2. Gender issue is also bound up with complex issues connected to how we value and reward those who serve

   - Different kind of comradery and focus on injustices when a council is all women. People don’t understand the decisions being made or impact

3. If teaching track faculty are added, what happens if there are no teaching track cases to review?

   - Teaching track members would be involved in policy discussions and can sit in on VCAA/CAD meetings. While faculty code does not allow for teaching track faculty to vote on tenure track cases, CCPT opens discussion of each case to all members

   - Need to have a conversation around if it is possible to interpret the code differently, should teaching track faculty vote on tenure-track faculty

   - It can be confusing for each to review the other’s due to the differences

4. Leadership and work of CCPT is tremendous and highly valued by VCAA and CAD

5. Consider consulting with Mike Townsend, UW Faculty Senate, regarding the Faculty Code around voting because adding teaching track will change things

6. It is also difficult to find external reviewers to review teaching track faculty, especially full professors

7. While teaching track faculty desire to be involved in forums, there are often structural barriers at several levels. Is there equity across universities in this capacity?

   - Identifying peer institutions will be crucial to this and other issues

   - To change Faculty Code would require a lot of process in senate, then faculty vote, and recommendation to president.

8. If GFO changes bylaws, should all CCPT changes be done at once?

   - Suggest lumping non-controversial (easy) changes together and put those through while working separately on other pieces

9. In regard to teaching-track and tenure-track and rank and voting, there are a lot of complex layers to these conversations, we need to have a plan to take on these issues.

   - Having conversations and learning how to listen is crucial

   - CCPT chair expressed that her own research interests have shifted toward faculty equity since serving on CCPT

   - Need to find ways to make the work of CCPT more transparent so faculty understand the important issues discussed and uncovered in that council while also understanding that the composition of the CCPT changes
Carlisle concluded by asking Price to return to a future EC meeting to move forward on adding a teaching track faculty to the CCPT. Carlisle will continue to work with Price via email to move that forward.

Faculty Response to President Letter about Covid-19 Letter:

- Frustrating that faculty were expected to make important decisions in only a few hours.
- Administration attempting to appear flexible but they are forcing faculty to make decisions that could have a big impact on teaching evaluations
- Faculty expected to provide in-person and online teaching but are not given resources to do that
- SNHS was prepared to do January online because they were aware of the impacts of the Omicron variants but other schools were not
- Faculty were first told that they had to teach in person and had to pass that message on to students (many of whom were scared to return) without flexibility and then this last-minute decision changed all that. Would have been better if original messaging wasn’t so inflexible, room to shift.
- Message to faculty very unclear as to what is permitted and what isn’t, very anxiety-inducing
- Overwhelming concern raised by faculty in feedback gathered by GFO is that if faculty had been looped in early and had a voice early, much frustration could’ve been avoided
- Needs to be flexibility. VCAA and/or Dean need to be able to make decision around faculty teaching in-person or online
- Students have nowhere to go on campus to zoom, it puts them in an awful situation
  o There are places for students to join classes remotely but students don’t know that. Getting the message out and clear is hard to do
- One of the main concerns through all of this is that faculty voice is not being collected. GFO working on better aligning with Faculty Senate
- If VCAA and/or Deans make decisions on a case-by-case basis in regard to faculty teaching online or in-person, that could lead to a lot of problems for students (to include perceived inequities) and scheduling problems. A lack of standardization might be problematic.
- Faculty Senate leadership has been in conversations with Provost about how the message went out and how they can think about future messaging.
  o Bigger issues have also surfaced, like the fact that the UW system is well behind when it comes to online learning.
- If consider decentralizing decision making regarding being hybrid, remote, etc. schools have to work on consistency. Microlevel conversations to create consistency, help mitigate back lash.
- Student counseling sessions are booked 3 weeks out. All of this changing back and forth and seeing surveys from students in fall, they want connection and they want to feel safe
- IAS Dean sent email to faculty assuring them that they would be decided in whatever they chose to do and that was very helpful
- Administration should consult with its own experts in epidemiology and UW School of Public Health before making policy

GFO Leadership will draft recommendations and share with EC

Motion by Carlisle to Approve Data Science Minor Proposal
Seconded by Naranjo
Passed without Dissent

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:45am
Next EC meeting will be Jan 25 @ 8:45am