Executive Council Meeting
Nov 9, 2021, 8:45 – 10:45 am, via Zoom

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

Guests: Jose Rodriguez, Andrea Stone, Sharon Jones, Gowri Shankar, Clay Schwenn

Welcome, Check-in, and Adoption of Minutes
Oct 26 minutes approved

Unit Adjustment Follow Up
Jason Naranjo, GFO Chair and Shauna Carlisle, EC Chair and Keith Nitta, CCPB Chair

- After feedback gathered in GFO Autumn meeting, IR considering new formula for target salaries
- Working group (Nitta, Carlisle, Sinkler (IR), Dworkin (CAD), Camelia Bejan (Business) met and identified 2 alternate formulas. IR hasn’t modeled them yet
  - Using random sample of faculty, Bejan ran alternative formulas and original formula
    - Alternative formulas account for inflation, include annual raises, and reduce dependence on latest hire by having an average of recent hires
  - Technical changes in original formula led to less compression, 1/10th of the compression identified by original formula
  - IR working on incorporating formulas into report as well as including 2 new projections for different amounts of compression in the pool
    - VCAA originally asked IR to model a pool of 1% of total compensation, now asking to model 1.5% and 2% which will allow for more compression relief but, using original formula, still won’t address everyone’s compression
    - Using alternative formulas, level of compression dramatically reduces and can be completely eliminated even with just 1% funding pool
  - CCPB will discuss methodological choices of working group
  - CAD in parallel conversation about formulas and different levels of compensation pools

DISCUSSION

- Question may have more to do with value proposition rather than how many people get addressed and how much. What is the value proposition of inflation-based vs original formula?
  - Original IR model assumed 10% increase for promotions, 2% increase for merit and did not adjust for inflation so it modeled a target salary 2% above inflation every year, resulting in an over inflated target salary for people who have been here a long time
    - Results of modeling of salary and target salary of a hypothetical individual with 25 years of service:
      - IRs formula resulted in target salary of $300,000
• Alternative formulas resulted in target salary of $180,000 - $195,000
  ▪ Based on that difference, value proposition would be How much do we reward people who have been in service a long time?
  ▪ Alternative formulas do little to reward long service as they eliminate inflation that would have occurred over time.
  ▪ Alternative formulas cut everyone’s compression, especially faculty who have been here longest
• Valuing long-term service puts faculty of color at a disadvantage since inherent inequalities lead to faculty of color moving more, which also means they lose out on home equity
  ▪ Another disadvantage to faculty of color is the unlikelihood that they are in a position to get a competing offer in order to get a raise
• IR suggested a correlation between when someone was hired and their likelihood of being BIPOC (black, indigenous, people of color).
• IR suggested that since it was easier to collect wealth longer ago (especially buy a house), there wasn’t a need to compensate for years of service
  ▪ Not a quantitative argument but a normative argument
• Inflation considers the change in cost of living so the cost of buying a house today vs. previously was taken into account in new formulas
• Working group discussed divergence between Consumer Price Index and the Case-Shiller Housing Index
  ▪ Housing prices have not traced inflation but generally we do try to account for the differences in cost through the consumer price index
• Paradoxical that we are talking about rewarding faculty for long service but then telling them one of the only ways to get a raise it to look elsewhere. Not logical for hiring and retention
  ▪ Also functions as a loyalty penalty, especially to those who were part of institution-building as they don’t have as portable a set of credentials. Understates and ignores stage-ism and ageism
• Attempting to fix what is inherently broken by using the same ineffective methods will continue to perpetuate inequities. People shouldn’t have to go find another offer
• Would be helpful to have a 1-page brochure containing visualizations, formulas, approaches, outcomes and strategies to share with faculty. Create a google doc to gather feedback.
  ▪ Need to ensure BIPOC faculty are informed and their feedback gathered
  ▪ Hold listening session and reach out to ensure the issues are understood
• Institution is forcing faculty to make decisions without providing data. No matter what model is chosen, people will be left out, creating animosity and tension.
• Would releasing individual compression data to people reduce collective action?
• Suggest a collection action letter from BIPOC. Institution refuses to give data, activism is needed
• Chancellor is expecting feedback back on Nov 22, will IR have new models run soon?
  ▪ VCAA unsure of exact timeline but anticipates end of this week or early next
• Because of tight timeline, may consider conveying information in terms of value propositions:
  ▪ How much of the pool do we use (1%, 1.5%, 2%)?
  ▪ How do you distribute adjustment pool? (Most in need, as many as possible, combination)
  ▪ Are we recognizing experience and loyalty or accommodating for inflation?
• No matter what choice is made, some win and some lose, important to know where faculty stand on that, especially those populations most impacted
• Suggest waiting for report from IR before reaching out for feedback
• Suggest explaining philosophical differences and implications prior to faculty receiving their own individual data. Harder to have a conversation philosophically if everyone knows what they have to gain or lose individually
• EC’s suggested steps forward:
  o Circulate IR report with 1-page cover letter that interprets and highlights implications of formulas
  o Create opportunities for BIPOC faculty to provide feedback on formulas.
  o Push out to EFCs, CCPB, UWB Senators to gather feedback. Ensure all have a voice
  o Survey individual faculty (around Nov 15). Will be more complex than originally thought as there are now 3 funding levels, 3 formulas, and 3 distribution scenarios
• Carlisle and Marsh will begin reaching out to BIPOC faculty
• All feedback in all forms welcomed by GFO leadership and as much feedback as possible will be incorporated into GFO’s letter to Chancellor
• Suggest creating shared place where faculty can provide feedback and discuss
• Provost’s request for proposals for unit adjustment funding allows flexibility for unit to allow schools to determine how funds are distributed. Each school would decide how to use the funds within their school. This has to be identified in proposal. CAD will discuss and would like GFOs feedback
  ▪ Adds level of complexity and could lead to faculty at different schools being treated differently. CAD, EFCs, GFO need to think about pros and cons. This is not a CAD decision
• 5 EC members shared their individual disagreement with distributing funds to individual schools stating it would add tension and that a unified solution is better.
• EC needs an opportunity to process this option. Will wait to hear from CAD.
  o Choosing to see the campus as a unit or breaking it into schools/divisions makes a big difference and sometimes a disproportionate difference
• Important that faculty have voice on record stating that the good of the collective is the goal and, therefore, it is more equitable to view UWB as a unit

Curriculum Proposal Review – MS in Community Health and Social Justice
Grace Lasker, Andrea Stone, Clay Schween – School of Nursing and Health Studies (SNHS)

• Program originated from student desire to stay on campus to get next level of practice around values and missions of SNHS which is grounded in community health and social justice
• Started process in 2016, took time to capture the needs of students, mission and values of SNHS, greater campus, and community partners and gathered feedback.
• Program seen as a regional need
• Worked on proposal for a year being cognizant of needs and needed changes within the public health systems.
• Program not only grounded in theory of community health and social justice but also in practice and application, providing tools to make systems-level changes on behalf of population that are fragile due to systems that have evolved to keep them in a fragile medical access state
DISCUSSION

- Particularly good that students can receive professional certification
- SNHS is leveraging years of growth in curriculum into this master's program
- A lot of feedback gathered from other programs about partnering. Electives are available and are tri-campus access
- Timely and important program. See room for overlap with Critical Change Leadership
- Created curriculum with assumption that people will come in from different backgrounds. Intro to Epi not a requirement but working on building Epi course specifically for such students
- Hybrid format resulted from student surveys showing overwhelming preference for hybrid and because other SNHS programs are hybrid. International students cannot be involved in hybrid courses. If demand from international students increases, will reconsider.
- Is the plan to shift faculty and staff effort from other areas?
  - Currently hiring 2 Assistant Professors to support growth of programs.
  - In regard to staff, currently have a grad advisor and hired a recruiter in anticipation of this new program

MOTION by Naranjo: Motion to Approve SNHS Curricular Proposal
SECONDED by Marsh
PASSED WITHOUT DISSENT

GFO/Senate Collaboration Update
Shauna Carlisle, EC Chair

- Next steps in aligning GFO and UW Faculty Senate:
  - Create Senate webpage on UWB page to highlight key issues at Senate level that intersect with UWB
  - Develop educational video for new faculty
  - Identify ways to get involved in the conversations (who to contact, what roles there are)
- UWB Faculty Senators have given positive feedback on working with GFO
- One pressing issue to discuss on UWB Senate page is the unit adjustment. Senate and GFO are both working on it, how does that work intersect?

DISCUSSION:
- Would be helpful to figure out the shared goals and alignment between GFO and Senate and get involved in work on key committees and continue to push for greater tri-campus efforts
- Good idea for UWB Senators to meet amongst themselves and with EC
- It's been a chronic challenge for UWB Senators to be representatives. They go to meetings but aren't the most effective advocates because they don't meet with constituents.
- Suggest a blog space where senators can post without website modifications having to be made

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP) Updates
Shauna Carlisle, EC Chair

- Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Process
P&T process approved as 21/22 GFO agenda item because faculty at large have concerns
- Messaging from administration to faculty (and faculty council) has historically been that P&T decisions rest solely on the Provost.
  - Keith Nitta raised issue in Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP) years ago and received same response that P&T decisions rest with the Provost.
  - Carlisle raised issue in FCTCP last month
    - Tacoma EC also shared similar concerns
    - VCAA provided detailed overview of process of Campus Council on Promotion & Tenure (CCPT) at UWB
      - Vice Chancellor (VC) and Deans have substantial input as to whether a faculty member receives tenure
      - Provost only has final say in situations where issues cannot be resolved by VC and Dean
      - VCAA acknowledged that the Chancellor's office needs to work on making P&T process more transparent to faculty
    - EC acknowledged that making P&T process transparent may move conversation away from vesting tenure at UWB but that is for faculty to decide.

Should UWB be final stop for decisions on UWB PT files vs. Provost?
- Need to narrow down what our ask is to our Chancellor and VC

**DISCUSSION**
- Provost's office wants to control P&T and there are questions as to how much UWB and UWT want to push back. Some dissatisfaction expressed by some faculty but not sure if it is enough to justify pushing to change authority. How much do we want to organize around changing this structure?
- When UWB and UWT were vested, code was sloppy and used the terms "dean" and "chancellor" interchangeably so it is difficult to see who actually has the authority.
- At UWS, Dean has direct line of communication with Provost, at UWB there are 7 different layers of review and the code is unclear
- Disagreement as to the role of UWB CCPT. Should they do substantive review? Procedural review? Both?
- How do we position faculty to be successful when 7 sets of eyes will be doing substantive review?
- Faculty employment contract states that tenure is vested by UWB, that is the clearest reason to have P&T decisions made at UWB
- Need to organize and find out how much of an appetite faculty have to engage in this kind of campaign.
- Since the Provost review/approval requires nothing different from faculty, not sure why we would push to change it.

**P&T Review Process at UWB:**
- Dean gets feedback from within school and submits to CCPT
- CCPT reviews and submits recommendation to VCAA to do independent review
- VCAA recommendation goes to Chancellor
- Chancellor concurs with VCAA and writes letter to Provost's office
- Teams in Provost's Office review files closely, contacting Chancellor or VCAA if they have questions
  - Rare that questions would go all the way back to dean or faculty member
  - Most recommendations are signed off on
Provost’s team provides recommendations once all questions are answered and everyone is on the same page and Provost reaches out to Chancellor and VC for conversation (that is not written in code, just practice)

- Provost rarely disagrees with decision but, if they do, UWB Chancellor and VC will agree with Provost

- Beyond the framework of power and control, could also frame this as an efficiency issue. Could some of the layers by avoided for the sake of efficiency?
- What problem are we trying to solve? At other universities, these decisions are made at the Provost level. There is a need for consistency across our campuses and faculty aren’t required to take any extra steps in order for the Provost to review/approve so what are we trying to solve?
- 3 things to look at as we consider moving P&T process to UWB:
  - Is the process of P&T clear on UWB campus?
  - Is the process fair?
  - What are the pros and cons of moving P&T process to UWB?
- There don’t seem to be any cons to UWB P&T decisions being made at UWB. Pros are that UWB faculty would be judged by UWB standards.
- Helpful to get numbers and data and look at other models
- Concern is that we separate ourselves from UW Seattle too much. Could lose benefits of being seen as part of the UW whole.
- In the next EC meeting, council will talk about ways to gather more information and make the process clearer. Will work with VCAA to write description of P&T process and think about next steps.

Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Program Overview

- Initiative around risk management that UW is venturing into. Process already started and asked to share the slides with EC and EFC is departments. Info only. Key tasks identified in slides

10:35- 10:45am: School Individual Updates

10:45: Adjourn

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:45am
Next EC meeting will be Nov 23 @ 8:45am