****

**Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes**

April 26, 2017 12:30-1:25pm CP 206 C

***Present:*** *Marcie Lazzari****,*** *Greg Rose, Mark Pendras, Lauren Montgomery, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee, Sushil Oswal, Charles Costarella, Leighann Chaffee, Katie Haerling, Julia Aguirre, Jim Gawel, Melissa Lavitt, Ellen Moore, Marion Eberly. Matt Kelley, Ji-Hyun Ahn, Marian Harris****,*** *Jutta Heller, Michelle Garner, Loly Alcaide Ramirez, Lauren Pressley, Nicole Blair.* ***Excused:*** *Mark Pagano, Marion Eberly. Jennifer Harris****,*** *Jeff Cohen.*

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission**

The agenda was approved with a note that the Salary Planning Exercise from Provost would be prioritized since it had been postponed from other meetings. Permission was given to record for the minutes.

1. **Approval of Minutes**

The March 31, 2017 and April 14, 2017 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved.

1. **Chair’s Report and Discussion Items**

* Professional Development – *Richard Wilkinson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Organizational Effectiveness &Development and Co-Interim Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration*

Richard Wilkinson presented a [Training & Development Manager Overview](https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/file/download/11b8cb7a85818d723b612913caada4ec753e65558f3068be35754b8e3b1e2b16?inline=1) PowerPoint. The Training & Development Manager will be working with Academic Affairs to support faculty professional development. This position will be a partial answer on how to move a more concerted effort forward for faculty development. Interviews have been conducted with several qualified candidates. In approximately a month, a person will be brought on board to fill this position (after a year of it being vacant.) Throughout the Strategic Planning process, enhancing professional development for faculty and staff was a top priority.

* UW Tacoma’s Training & Development Manager plans and promotes campus-wide learning as a pathway to organizational and individual success
* T&D Manager will report to AVC HR/OD and will be linked to Academic Affairs
* They will collaborate with Academic Affairs in planning and implementing professional development opportunities for faculty, partnering with deans and other academic leaders as needed, to design and facilitate campus-wide faculty development
* T&D Manager Initial Focus:
  + 1. Assess current learning landscape
  + 2. Identify priorities and approaches
  + 3. Gain leadership approval and faculty/staff buy-in
  + They will conduct an organizational readiness assessment looking at what we already do now, how well it is working, what we need to do (Charting Our Course, Leadership Interviews, Faculty/staff feedback, document review), as well as, obstacles and openings

1. What we offer today: management development; business skills; interpersonal effectiveness; career management
2. What we’ll offer tomorrow: Leadership development; faculty development

Recently published is a professional development website for faculty and staff, including: upcoming workshops, online modules, required training, faculty development series, KeyBank Professional Development Center; management and leadership development; teaching resources; UW Professional & organizational development

Q&A

**Q:** Could there be an addition of a budget for faculty to attend professional development off-campus?

**A:** Faculty have access to summer funds and -74 funds to craft an individual plan for off-campus professional development. There is vision for a campus-wide integrated plan to train the next generation of leaders and investing in moving the dial on campus goals, for instance, funds will be used for CORE Faculty Fellows professional development and for a potential Data Fellows group.

**Q:** How will Faculty Assembly be involved in development of this position and faculty professional development? There was a concern about approaching faculty development from an HR perspective since HR is often institutionally minded and/or managerial.

**A:** This is the beginning of working on professional development as a campus. Faculty Assembly and Executive Council will be involved in deciding how we do faculty professional development. Academic Affairs was involved in the design of the T&D Manager position. Turan Kayaoglu, the Vice Chancellor for Research and SIAS faculty member, and Justin Wadland, librarian and Head of Media and Digital Collections, were involved in interviews for this new position.

An EC member reminded Richard of a slide from a previous presentation that he gave. This slide contained a list of things that faculty would want training in. They asked that Richard share this slide with EC as well. FA Admin will follow up with Richard for said slide. Chair, Mark Pendras, directed EC to send him and Richard any further questions or discussion via email.

* FA Meeting De-brief *– item removed from agenda to prioritize Salary Planning Exercise from Provost*
* Salary Planning Exercise from Provost *Appendix A*

The Provost has tasked deans and chancellors with a salary planning exercise due to the budget crunch-time and slowed growth. This ask is also in conjunction with [Executive Order 64](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EO64.html), the Faculty Salary Policy. Provost Baldasty’s letter is in Appendix A. He wants units to use this process to plan for three+ years and look at salary equity, compression, and conversions. [Note: the UW Tacoma Chancellor is considered a dean within the UW governance structure, the EC is considered the elected faculty council, and UW Tacoma is considered a school.] Within the task of a salary audit, the following should be considered: regular merit, additional merit, promotion raises, unit adjustments, retention raises, etc. In regards to “peer institutions,” (similar demographics) UW Tacoma faculty salaries are decent.

FA leadership is working with the Chancellor and EVCAA to pull together data by categories (and for every academic unit.) The question is, “At what level do we look at this data?” EC could try to set priorities on how to address any gaps found in the data, i.e. what types of problems to address first? Most compressed for most amount of time? Or keeping up starting salaries? EC viewed a quadrants visual (Appendix A, slides link) in which, for example, Q4 represented most compressed for most amount of time.

EC members requested to have the data/salary audit information, and then pursue prioritization. They wanted the context first. Additionally, they wanted to see the data as it is now so that they can compare future data to it and know if the recommended changes were carried out. Some were concerned that if they view the data first, it may be even harder to prioritize. The data set had been shared as a hard copy with deans, directors, and program administrators earlier in the month. The data has been de-identified, broken down by unit, and is not disaggregated by gender, race, or ethnicity. UW Attorney General’s Office did a high-level analysis that did not include those factors. Chair, Mark Pendras, will contact Alison Hendricks in Academic HR for an excel version of the data set. UW employee salaries are public information and it is important to use this information to get at objective prioritization. Some EC members expressed that this cannot be a completely objective process because everyone has salaries and personal agendas. There are many, complex factors involved in this process.

At the unit-level, faculty should also be giving input. Unit’s need a plan moving forward that addresses the historical production of issues in order to avoid repeating those issues. The elected faculty council of each academic unit needs to be involved in this with their dean or director. Deans and Directors agreed to participate in this planning process with progress by June 2017. This is all a part of the same planning exercise issued by the Provost.

Once EC sets priorities, it is the task of the Administrative Leadership to hold deans and directors accountable to carry out the will of the faculty. EC will pursue a qualitative review, unit-level guiding principles, and campus-level principles. Chair, Mark Pendras, will include these pursuits in a letter to Provost Baldasty and that UW Tacoma will need more time for this task. EC members asked that his letter to the Provost asks why the gender, race, and ethnicity information was not allowed to be included in the data set from the Attorney General’s Office, for instance, if there was a legal reason, and to voice within the letter that these omissions of information felt demoralizing for UW Tacoma faculty.

This conversation will continue at a future meeting along with the prioritization exercise. The data will be circulated to EC members via email.

* UW Open Access Policy *– item removed from agenda to prioritize Salary Planning Exercise from Provost*

1. **Adjourn**

Appendix A: [Salary Planning Exercise Slides – EC 4.26.17](https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/conversation/assembly/997044)

February 15, 2017

Members of the Board of Deans and Chancellors

Dear colleagues:

I am following up on our conversations on faculty salary policy and, particularly, on Executive Order 64. As we’ve discussed, the revision of EO 64 came about because of a collaboration among the leadership of the Faculty Senate, Board of Deans and Chancellors, and the Provost’s Office. We have made significant progress in the past six months or so and are in a good position to tackle some of the salary issues the faculty have said they believe need to be addressed.

I’m asking each of you to create a three-year plan, **in collaboration with your Elected Faculty Council, your department chairs, and your leadership team**, with a view to making good use of the various components of the revised EO 64. The tools provided there are:

* Regular Merit
* Additional Merit
* Promotion Raises
* Unit Adjustments
* Retention Raises

Please use this process to *plan* for the next three (or more, if you wish) years, thinking proactively about salary equity, compression, and inversion. I’m asking that you give me your preliminary thoughts by May 1. We will spend time in May and early June (and beyond) learning from one another in the BODC.

I realize that any modeling you do will necessarily be an estimate — an estimate that will depend on many things we cannot predict (e.g., undergraduate and graduate tuition increases, legislative allocations). Given the range of variation possible in these areas, I suggest you think of two or three scenarios.

You will know best how to proceed. I have no greater ability than any of you to predict the future, but I think it would be useful to think about tuition increases at approximately 2 percent per year, both undergraduate and graduate (note I am assuming either a tuition increase or a backfill). As provost, I will continue to try to provide you with some central funds for compensation, too.

I ask that you focus a good deal of attention to merit (both regular and additional) and to unit adjustments. The unit adjustment is now configured to provide you with a great deal of flexibility in addressing issues of compression, inversion, and to proactively deal with issues around retention. Some of you have been inundated with retention raises. If so, you might want to think about alternative ways to consider them, perhaps more proactively leveraging the unit adjustment tool rather than reactively through the retention tool.

As I noted above, you know best how to proceed in this work.  I am providing additional information, however, thinking that it may well be useful to you.

First, as the Faculty Salary Policy document we discussed (and revised) together notes, we are looking not just at salary, but at broader issues of human capital needs that require funding and thus impact the size of any salary pool. Specifically, the way we work (number of FTEs, size of curriculum, and broad work load issues) all affect the amount of money we need to do our work. In many ways, the modeling that needs to be done is about (a) making explicit the costs related to our activities, (b) deciding how to prioritize those activities in a way that really serves our mission and addresses our needs and interests, and (c) being strategic about how we distribute funds.

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting will separately transmit to you materials developed by them that can be used to quantitatively model your salary system. The materials illustrate the impact of the four critical input variables (FTE, total salary funds pool, entry point salary, and rate at which all-faculty off-campus peer salaries are rising) that largely determine the shape of your average salary vs. years of service curve. These models should help you determine what new investment is needed every year to keep pace with off campus-peers, and what continuing faculty raise can be funded with these new funds combined with the “overage” released by retirees. The models teach, among other things, the lesson that average faculty salaries rise with years of service if, and only if, the continuing faculty raise exceeds the rate the entry point salary is rising.

We will continue to discuss this work at our BODC meetings this winter and spring so that we can learn from one another.

I know that this requires a good deal of time and thought, although I know that many of you have already begun this work. I want to emphasize that I believe this is a great opportunity for extensive and deep collaboration between faculty and administration in each school and college. I see the elected faculty councils, department chairs, and leadership teams as a necessary part of this work, both in terms of ideas and advice, and also as a way to create a sophisticated university environment in which we understand the intellectual as well as the financial implications of what we do.

I look forward to our continued conversations on these issues.

Jerry

**Faculty salary policy**

*Note: This is meant as a framing document, with a goal of starting a robust conversation across the UW about compensation and related issues. Each school, college, and campus may well differ in how the conversation unfolds. The key thing is to get the conversation going.*

Ultimately, the discussions and solutions are not just about salary. They are about the quality of the faculty, meritorious work, and market pressures. These issues also concern human capital needs. Program/curriculum design, faculty workload, staffing mix, and salary policy goals/objectives are all inextricably linked together to create a dynamic system. Sustaining long term institutional success requires us to thoughtfully manage them all and appreciate better the dynamic linkages between many contributing factors.

**Assumptions:**

* No new major internal funds available from Provost to address your needs/goals
* State dollars essentially flat
* Modest tuition increases (~2% per year)
* Necessary to collaborate between administration (deans, chancellors) and elected faculty councils, department chairs, and leadership teams

**There are six key questions:**

1. **What are your goals, in terms of salary averages by rank?**
2. **What is your current salary pool?**
3. **What is your goal, in terms of a salary pool?**
4. **How many faculty FTEs do you have? (what is the mix? Rank, etc.)**
5. **What is a reasonable time line to address salary policy broadly, considering that your faculty profile naturally changes over time (from retirements, resignations, etc.)?**
6. **What do you need to do in order to be competitive in your discipline in the next 2-3 decades?**

**Things to consider:**

1. **Needs/Costs assessment**
   1. What is the cost of your curriculum?
      1. Program offerings (how many degrees? Certificates? Undergrad, grad?)
      2. Program curriculum design (how many courses?)
      3. Delivery modes (Face to face? Other formats?)
      4. Enrollments (total number of majors, minors, SCH)
      5. Class size (small classes, large? A mix?).
      6. Teaching loads (how many classes do faculty teach? Mix of faculty teaching loads, contributions of lecturers)
   2. Current Staffing mix in your unit (TT/NTT/Teaching assistants/clinical staff, etc.)
2. **Resources assessment**
   1. What resources are available to your unit to fund the work done in the unit (teaching, research, etc.)?
      1. Current state $$
      2. Program tuition (current? Flexibility to adjust?)
      3. Enrollments (current, anticipated demand, trends?)
      4. Buyouts
      5. ICR
      6. Endowments
      7. Other
3. **Constraints on your funds**
   1. Compliance, risk
   2. Regulatory and legal requirements
   3. Accreditation standards and requirements (e.g., accreditation rules about class size, curriculum, use of full–time faculty, library staffing and access, etc.)
   4. Curriculum
   5. Space
   6. Current tuition levels vs peers/regional competitors
   7. Etc.
4. **Gap Analysis**
   1. What is the best mix of faculty to enhance your ability to achieve your unit’s goals and objectives for teaching, research/scholarship, and service?
   2. What’s your current mix of faculty?
   3. What gaps exist, and how do they need to be closed in order to better align mix of faculty with ability to achieve your goals and objectives?
   4. Given your mission, who are your market peers (may differ by programs/departments within unit)?
   5. Salary needs to sustain ability to recruit and retain high quality faculty in desired mix to support mission related activities, goals and objectives?
   6. What things can you quit doing? Are there things in your program that are not key to your unit’s mission and that can be eliminated?
5. **Need/goal prioritization**
   1. Revisit unit strategic plan
   2. Prioritize, rank gaps
   3. Create a timeline for and develop a plan to address gaps
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