Executive Council Meeting  
Oct 26, 2021, 8:45 – 10:45am, via Zoom

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

Guests: Jody Early, Alex Musselman, Leslie Cornick, Grace Lasker Johnny Lin, Sharon A. Jones, Xiahua Anny Wei, Aanya Kathuria, Robin Angotti

Welcome, Check-in, and Adoption of Minutes  
Oct 12 minutes approved

Identify EC Reps to Meet with Enrollment Services Firm  
Lead: Jason Naranjo, GFO Chair
- Consultants from Ruffalo Noel Levitz coming to UWB to evaluate enrollment-related activities. Naranjo requested an EC rep be part of conversation around faculty’s role in enrollment management and program development in Dec 9, 10-11am meeting.
  - Tyson Marsh volunteered to attend
- Carlisle shared that there are 3 other leadership requisitions; Chancellor’s Advisory Council for Students, SUPER-G, Advisory Council on Campus Safety. Anyone who is interested can reach out to Carlisle or Naranjo.

Carlisle gave council opportunity to provide further feedback on GFO’s 2021-22 priorities (discussed in previous EC meeting) before turning meeting over to Naranjo to discuss council charge letters. Council offered no further feedback.

Council Charge Letter Reviews  
Lead: Jason Naranjo, GFO Chair
- Charge letter timeline; stock letters created based on campus and GFO priorities, circulated to council chairs, council chairs met with GFO Chair and VC to discuss last year’s work and plans for current year, then chairs finalized letters.
- Councils asked to align with faculty well-being as the focus of this year’s priorities. Councils that focus on academic pieces will continue to move those pieces forward as well.
- Working to streamline charge letter process so that letters are done earlier in the year.

Naranjo turned the meeting over to the council chairs to discuss their council’s charge letters.

- **Campus Council on Promotion and Tenure (CCPT)**
  Lead: Jody Early, CCPT member (presenting charge letter on behalf of Becca Price, CCPT Chair)
    - CCPT reviewing a record 31 promotion & tenure files this year.
    - Charges for 2021-22:
      - Clarify that CCPT’s goal in reviewing cases is to assess the fairness of the process used for each candidate. Ultimate goal is to avoid being a body that assesses substance.
• Share impressions with VCAA about how fairly faculty members who are being considered for promotion have been treated since either arriving at UWB or since their last promotion.
• Develop templates for Review Committee, Faculty Discussions, and Dean letters.
• Share templates of letters for Review Committees, Faculty Discussions, Dean, and CCPT letters with the faculty as a whole.
• Make recommendations about the promotion and tenure of 31 faculty members who collectively represent all of the schools at UWB.

DISCUSSION:
- When UWB started, there were not enough faculty at each school unit to review at school level so there was a need for a campus body to do substantive review. Now CCPT focuses on ensuring processes and procedures are followed

• Campus Council on Planning & Budget (CCPB)
  Lead: Keith Nitta, CCPB Chair
  Charges for 2021-22:
  - Coordinate faculty review and input into the proposed salary unit adjustment
  - Participate in the development of a UW faculty equity study
  - Annual review of GFO budget, including course releases

DISCUSSION:
- Naranjo recognized Nitta’s contributions in leading challenging conversations around how UWB works collectively toward defining and ensuring equity

• Campus Council on Academic Standards & Curriculum (CCASC)
  Lead: Grace Lasker, CCASC Chair
  Charges for 2021-22:
  - Support new and change course proposals and change program proposals through the UWB curriculum process into UWCC tri-campus system and approval.
  - Participate in FCAS meetings, when applicable, for tri-campus curriculum and programming input
  - Work with CCAL, Schools and other units at UW Bothell to adapt to anticipated revisions to Areas of Knowledge definitions, CEL, DIV, and any other tri-campus curricular initiatives

• Campus Council on Assessment & Learning (CCAL)
  Lead: Alex Musselman, CCAL Chair
  Charges for 2021-22:
  - Initial School Assessment on the Diversity Undergraduate Learning Goal
    - Next 1.5 years will focus on this assessment, working with newly hired Assessment Specialist
  - Inventory and Rubric Development on next ULG

Naranjo thanked council chairs and recognized that this year is going to be a hard year and that chairs are asked to only take on what their councils can handle and not feel compelled to say yes to everything.
Unit Adjustments
Leads: Jason Naranjo, GFO Chair and Keith Nitta, CCPB Chair

- GFO leadership sent letter to UWB Chancellor and Vice Chancellors calling on them to:
  - Increase unit adjustment to cover compression, knowing that faculty have been working exceptionally hard and the initial amount earmarked is not sufficient
  - Provide individualized salary reports to faculty so they are aware of where they stand compared to their comparative group
  - Work with Seattle to gain access to demographic data so that a faculty salary equity can be properly assessed
- Faculty will have a say in which model is used for distributing funding. Models will be discussed in Oct 28 GFO meeting.
- Nitta shared summary of feedback collected from EC and CCPB and CCPB’s collection of feedback from schools. Conclusion points identified from those conversations:
  - 3 possible scenarios for distributing the limited funds to address compression; A. distribute it to those in most need, B. distribute it to as many people as possible, C. Combination of A & B (50% to those in most need and 50% given to as many of the rest as possible).
    - Currently no consensus on preference of method from faculty and there is confusion around the options
  - Faculty want to know amounts of individual compression as it will help to inform which distribution scenario is preferable
  - Faculty have concerns around methodology that IR used to calculate target salaries.
    - IR’s report lacking information about the formula and method used to calculate target salary.
    - Objections to formula:
      - Lacks demographic data
      - Does not account for inflation
      - Does not account for time in rank at previous institutions
      - Does not account for cost of living or wealth
      - Does not compound interest over time
      - STEM & Business concerned over small comparison groups
    - Concerns mostly coming from CCPB and are significant enough that many members don’t want to move this forward with the formula IR introduced to identify individual amounts of compression
      - Significant objections as it will stop any discussion on distributing funds and turn focus on methodology and formula used
    - Some faculty want to see campus wide comparisons of faculty salaries
    - Several faculty dissatisfied with using the unit adjustment to deal with salary equity

Discussion:
- Feedback from STEM: Funding dedicated to addressing inequities in salary should prioritize discriminatory pay disparities above compression
- Working on a tight timeline, risk derailing unit adjustment if we engage in debate over which imperfect formula to use.
  - Short and long term game. Short term, use imperfect model to ensure we don’t lose unit adjustment funds this time. Long term, continue pushing for demographic data to be able to truly address faculty salary equity issues
• Submitting FOIA requests or asking faculty to self-report are a few options for getting demographic data.
  • FOIA requests take a long time and there is a good chance it will be denied, since the data is self-disclosed
    o Senate and Provost Office need UWB unit adjustment decision by Nov 22
    o UW pushes faculty to use data to make decisions but refuses to provide the data needed to make this decision. Need to push back on that.
    o UW uses data to claim "diversity" but won't release that data
    o Both/And approach seems best. Work simultaneously to take part in unit adjustment while also working to make improvements systemically.
      ▪ Don’t want to lose opportunity for unit adjustment to help faculty who need it most
    o University is not giving what is actually needed, leaving faculty to fight over crumbs
    o Other institutions have done salary equity analysis and included demographic data. UW claiming that they can’t do it seems disingenuous.
    o Can there be a dialogue/vote about different formulas?
      ▪ Once we reveal data based on a formula, we are committed to that formula
      ▪ To what extent are we amplifying inequities by using this flawed formula?
    o Not being able to get demographic data is unethical. Need to take strong action steps to show that this unit adjustment isn’t an answer but a brief pause in a larger conversation around equity
      ▪ Unethical that faculty have to chose who gets raises with this unit adjustment
    o Faculty need to understand the formulas used and that demographic data wasn’t made available and the politics around that so that they know that they are being asked to make decisions on behalf of the institution without data.
    o This is a 2-phase process: Phase 1: faculty need to make a decision regarding access to unit adjustment funds while recognizing the limitations a lack of data is placing on those decisions. Phase 2: Propose plan for address lack of information to demographic data and vow to revisit the formulas and construct more equitable adjustments in the future
      ▪ Need to clearly state that what the school is doing is problematic

Nitta summarized that he will redraft the memo summarizing faculty’s feedback to be stronger on DEIJ issue and stronger on what faculty feel about being expected to make decisions without proper data. He will also address all of the inadequacies brought up around the current formulas used by IR and then summarize the 3 distribution scenarios. Nitta will continue to work on this with CCPB

**Curriculum Proposal Review – New Data Science Minor**
Lead: Johnny Lin, Assoc. Teaching Professor & Director of Undergraduate Computing Education

• Summary of impacts of new Data Science Minor:
  o Enrollment: 45 students initially
  o Faculty load and hires:
    ▪ PT expansion cost for BIS 232
    ▪ PT expansion cost for CSS 211/BISSTS 307
    ▪ PT replacement cost for CSS/CSSSKL 123
  o Space on campus: No extra space needed
  o Staff support: No extra support needed
  o Enrollment plan: Initially 45 students, increase with demand
DISCUSSION:
  o Project 45 students will take advantage directly of minor. What will that look like 3 years from now? Will be a popular minor, may want to add positive budget impact statement.
    ▪ Student interest survey resulted in a substantial amount of interest. To get to the 45, a conservative assumption was made based on survey results of students. Precise amount is difficult to ascertain but it is promising.
  o Under RCM, completed minors are considered as part of the formula for allocating funding to schools.
  o Regarding administration and oversight, there is an IAS course listed as a requirement that looks like it will require an extra session of course. Don't see IAS faculty/staff. Request that there be a rep from IAS for oversight of administration of minor.
    ▪ Lin agreed that IAS rep on AOC makes sense, cannot make pledge to have that rep in place but will strongly recommend and support
    ▪ EC Chair supports inclusion of IAS rep

MOTION by WATTS: Move to Approve Data Science Minor
SECONDED by MARSH
PASSED WITHOUT DISSENT

GFO Representation on Senate
Robin Angotti, Chair, SCPB
  • Ways in which UWB GFO and Faculty Senate can better align:
    o Quarterly meeting with EC Chair and Faculty Senators
    o Quarterly meeting with UWB senate council reps and GFO leadership
      ▪ Legislation is drafted in these councils
    o Establish regular communication with Joey Burgess to identify openings
    o Both EC chair and GFO chair attend faculty senate meetings

DISCUSSION:
  o How might we take up the issue of faculty salary equity across tri-campus system and leverage the voice at UWB to call on the institution as a whole, via the Senate, to engage in substantive work around understanding salary equity for the tri-campus system?
    ▪ Angotti stated that 4 faculty groups (1 Tacoma, 1 Bothell, 2 Seattle) all interested in salary equity, took the issue to President and Provost but gained no traction.
    ▪ Angotti stressed that the correct place to bring this issue is the Senate. In terms of demographic data, start with new committee on IT security, Information, Technology & Security and also FCTCP and Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      ▪ Raising this issue through councils is the way to go
  o Further conversation needed around:
    ▪ Meaningful difference between having seated members on senate councils vs. having campus reps.
    ▪ Norming consolation with constituents.
    ▪ When is dual nature of GFO and Senate synergistic and when is it duplicative. Identify where most agile and effective advocacy lies. Propose UWB have targeted discussion on how to optimize participation at UWB and tri-campus level.
Angotti stressed that while the Senate votes on what comes out of councils, faculty governance really happens in the councils.

- In terms of campus reps vs. individual faculty, the only one encoded is FTCTP, the rest are whoever wants to be a part of it.
  - If you want to change how those reps are selected, faculty code would need to be changed.
- Important that UWB faculty are aware of potential opportunities for council positions.
- Quarterly meetings between GFO and council reps will go a long way toward UWB and Senate aligning

Carlisle will continue to summarize work and notes and come back to issue

10:45: Adjourn

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:45am
Next EC meeting will be Nov 9 @ 8:45am