

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, April 9, 2024

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106

Present: **Melinda Smith**, Chair; **Joseph DiVerdi**, Vice Chair; **Andrew Norton**, BOG Representative; **Sue Doe**, Immediate Past Chair; **Marion Underwood**, Provost/Executive Vice President; **Amy Barkley**, Executive Assistant; **Jennifer Martin**, Agricultural Sciences; **Rob Mitchell**, Business; **Sybil Sharvelle**, Engineering; **Sharon Anderson**, Health and Human Sciences; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts **Christine Pawliuk**, Libraries; **William Sanford**, Natural Resources; **Michael Antolin**, Natural Sciences; **Zaid Abdo**, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Susan James**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; **Richard Eykholt**, University Grievance Officer

Absent: none

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

April 9, 2024 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – March 26, 2024

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from March 26th.

Hearing none, Executive Committee minutes approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on April 16, 2024– Microsoft Teams/Administration 106 – 3:00 p.m.
2. The next Faculty Council Meet & Greet will be held on Thursday, April 18th from 3:30pm to 5:00pm in the Biology Building West Plaza (2nd floor)

Chair Smith: Encouraged Executive Committee members to attend the meet and greet on April 18th. This will be in an outdoor space if weather permits. There will also be snacks and conversation with the broader CSU community.

3. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on May 7, 2024 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Smith: So far, it looks like we have about twenty (20) people interested in attending the Faculty Council meeting in-person. We are looking into a venue for that and will keep everyone updated.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Provost Marion Underwood

Provost Marion Underwood: Was traveling last week to see daughter and had a chance to reflect about emerging priorities and what our team might do to advance CSU, as well as hopes for curricular innovation. Read “What do Universities Owe Democracy” by Ron Daniels while on the trip. Encouraged members to read this book.

Provost Underwood: Was working through annual reviews of direct reports and enjoyed reading self-assessments. You may wonder how someone new is handling the evaluation of twenty (20) or so people, and have relief heavily on self-evaluation, self-assessment, and Qualtrics input from faculty and staff in the various units. That was helpful for understanding how leaders are working within their roles.

Provost Underwood: In terms of generating and stewarding resources, have had a lot of time to think about that as well. Have been involved in the budget model redesign conversations and have continued almost constant communication with Vice President Brendan Hanlon over the specifics of the FY25 budget. We will be communicating those specifics to deans and vice presidents the week of April 22nd, and we will host a forum on April 30th. Am impressed with how Vice President Hanlon has been handling this. Vice President Hanlon is going through each proposal, communicating about choices on the academic side. Am feeling very happy to be at Colorado State University.

Vice Provost Susan James: We had a recent open forum for the budget model redesign. There was a question about faculty support and supporting faculty success, and whether that was a metric to be used. We responded that it was, but indirectly.

Andrew Norton: Question around that is when does a target become a metric. Think that is a discussion that the Steering Committee will need to have. There is the concept that metrics can maybe have unintended consequences.

Vice Provost James: The other topic that came up was the role of leaders in the whole process. Think it was maybe a question about unintended consequences around formula-driven things. We told them that in the end, it is the leaders making decisions, and if there are unintended things happening, leadership will step in to stop it and make changes.

Provost Underwood: Yes, you can count on that. Whatever the model turns out to be, it will need to be recalibrated periodically based on what is happening. Whatever model we begin with will constantly be tweaked to make sure that we are serving our students as best we can and that we are supporting our faculty and advancing our mission. There are many examples you can read

about other universities where a hybrid RCM model leads to behaviors that are less than desirable and that do not make sense at all. You have to adjust the model and step in to ensure everyone is being well served.

Rob Mitchell: It will get revisited. The other place to watch is to not have a single metric but multiple metrics. There is a tension in having more than one metric but not having so many and watching for those unintended consequences. This was brought up at the Executive Sponsor Committee meeting today as well.

Zaid Abdo: One question was also about how research-heavy departments will be impacted.

Jennifer Martin: A question was also asked at the forum about whether the metrics and the budget model would be utilized in promotion and tenure decisions, which was an easy question to answer. People don't know what they don't know. There may be an important conversation to be had from the Office of the Provost around what this will impact and what processes will remain unchanged, even though the model will be changing.

Chair Smith: We heard from Vice President Hanlon last week that it looks like it will be a 9% increase based on the long bill, and that amounts to only about \$1 million more in funds. Was asked today that if we are getting an increase in budget, why aren't we getting the increase in compensation. Think clarification around that would be helpful for faculty and others that are impacted by the compensation increase.

Provost Underwood: It sounded like \$1 million would not be enough to move the needle on compensation, although we wish it was, as thankful we are to have it.

Chair Smith: Curious about why the increase is only amounting to \$1 million.

Vice Provost James: That is all universities.

Chair Smith: It might be worth messaging it that way.

Norton: It is probably 1% after you take out the mandatory increases such as bonds, utilities, and financial aid. It ought to be in the budget spreadsheet so you can interpret between the percentages.

Vice Provost James: The other thing is that a 1% raise for all employees amounts to \$5 million.

Chair Smith: Have been asked by people why, with this much bigger increase from state allocation, is it not showing up the way we might think.

Vice Provost James: The other positive news is the roughly \$50 million for the Veterinary Teaching Hospital coming from the state, which will help our overall long-term budget picture.

Sue Doe: Would like to go back to the question about 9% being \$1 million. Would like to understand, because if we got the desired 11%, that would be somewhere around \$1.2 million.

Trying to figure out what kind of numbers you have to get for this to move the needle. Would have thought this would make a greater impact. Am not making an argument for compensation per se, but about impact.

Chair Smith: Think that is the question people have. Think that is something we could ask Vice President Hanlon to speak to.

Martin: Recently in Faculty Council, we passed an update to the administrative leave policy, which we hope to see on the Board of Governors agenda in May. We have, in repeated ways, reached out to the Office of General Counsel, and we are struggling to get any sort of structured engagement with them. This lends to the fear that in the eleventh hour, something will get pulled from the Board of Governors agenda. Requested to see what we can do, because we continue to struggle with communications from General Counsel. It continues to be a big barrier and it is not for lack of effort on behalf of this group.

Provost Underwood: Thanked Martin. Had communicated with Jannine Mohr about these changes last week, and we both agreed that we are supportive. Will follow back up to express support and see what we can do to move this forward.

Chair Smith: Thanked Provost Underwood.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Would like to switch topics and transmit a concern. Have been talking with people since the last Faculty Council meeting, and there is a feeling that the decision to move the graduation ceremony to the stadium has been poorly planned and thought out. It seems extremely premature and rushed that we have decided to move in this direction without first considering impacts. There were questions like whether the national anthem would be sung, and if so, who would be paying for that. Would like if the Office of the Provost could provide clearer guidelines of what is being expected and how much of the bill is going to be covered. This is a financial constraint for a lot of units being told that this is what we are doing. There is a feeling that this is rushed. Feel it would be good to get ahead of the discourse and address this.

Provost Underwood: There is a very involved committee structure and communications plan for the details of the new format for commencement. The hope is that the stadium ceremony will be a joyful University-wide event where the national anthem will be played, and regalia worn. It will be fun and festive and be a community celebration. Our vision for the department celebrations is that there is flexibility there for them to be very special and have every student's name called, the diploma covers are given out. The arrangements and celebration do not have to be elaborate. We are envisioning nice events where students get their names called and faculty can be there to meet students and families. If departments need assistance for these modest events, there will be a pool of funds they can apply for. We are aware that there are differences in sizes of units, so we are open to some flexibility for how units want to organize their ceremonies.

Provost Underwood: There is an organized committee structure for input that will have Faculty Council representation on different levels of committees, as well as student representation. As the new format comes to life, there will be many chances for input on the details. The unit

recognition ceremonies will also be centrally scheduled to coordinate space. There will be much more communication coming out about this and many more chances for input.

Sybil Sharvelle: Expressed concern with respect to taking away the December graduation, in particular. We have a lot of students that graduate at non-traditional times, and this is an important milestone for them to be able to celebrate. It was mentioned that they could go through an earlier commencement, but it does not feel very celebratory when you have not finished yet. Think we are taking away some important experiences for the students that recognize this milestone. There are also equity issues, which Pedros-Gascon has raised previously as well.

Provost Underwood: Expressed appreciation for sharing this concern. CSU is more flexible than other universities as to when students participate in commencements. There is a desire to be flexible and to give students a few chances to participate if they want to. There is an effort to consider large groups of international students who graduate and then go home. These are mostly at the graduate level, so we are encouraged Dean Colleen Webb to consider having a ceremony in December for international graduates or graduate students, since they don't always have the option to come back.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions or comments, thanked Provost Underwood.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – March 22 & 29, 2024

Chair Smith: Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything to be called to the attention of Executive Committee in the University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Brad Goetz: Nothing of note. This is an ordinary set of minutes.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote to place the University Curriculum Committee minutes on the Faculty Council agenda.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for May 7th.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: The Faculty Council website is getting close to being done and is in the final stages. When it is approved, we will come to Executive Committee to have everyone look at it.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: Have worked with Rachel Baschnagel to put together a page on the new Faculty Council website that has financial page excerpts from the Board books going back to 2021. Once the site goes live, those will be available for everyone.

3. Budget Model Update – Rob Mitchell & Jennifer Martin

Mitchell: Thanked everyone for the engagement at the most recent forum. We had about two hundred (200) people there, so a lot of engagement.

Chair Smith: Stated that Martin indicated in the chat that the recording of the forum would be posted soon. We could link that on the budget resource page on the new Faculty Council website.

Mitchell: We had more questions in the chat at the forum that we had time to get to. We captured those questions and the subcommittee for communications of the Steering Committee will respond to those individually and make sure they get a response.

F. Discussion Items

Vice Provost James: Faculty Success is holding a promotion and tenure forum on Thursday, April 18th from 9:00am to 10:30am. This is a virtual event, so it will be recorded and posted. Will be a panelist along with Provost Underwood. This will be focused on early career faculty. It is open to everyone, and we hope deans, chairs, and promotion and tenure committee members attend, but the idea is to provide information and answer questions for early career faculty who are planning for promotion. Think we should have a Faculty Council member as part of the panel. Asked members to reach out if they are interested in being on the panel.

Vice Provost James: We are allowing people to submit questions ahead of the forum. The most popular question we get is about early tenure promotion because there are no guidelines in the Manual about that. One of the discussions we have had previously in this group is limiting early to be one (1) year. Provost Underwood has shared that at past institutions, there have been no timelines for promotion and tenure, particularly promotion, so the concept of “early” does not exist. Think this is something that Faculty Council should consider addressing next year in their sessions, even if we do not change the Manual.

Provost Underwood: Expressed appreciation to Vice Provost James for bringing this up. It is important that if there is an expectation that people who go up early are above the bar that we write this down somewhere so that everyone can understand it. There are deans facing pressure from people wanting to go up early, which does not work out well if we are not clear. Echoed desire for Faculty Council to address this. Am open to whatever Faculty Council thinks is best. It just needs to be clear so that everyone can see it and so that it is equitable.

Pedros-Gascon: It is important to have this be equitable. Know there are situations in some units where materials are published before the hire has been accepted and in others, materials are only posted after the contract is signed. This gives an enormous advantage to people who may already have ten (10) years of publications in. Another consideration, in addition to considering early promotion, is whether we should consider, for example, early promotion of people who are

receiving credit for working outside, because we might end up with an expedited tenure line for someone with only one (1) year of service. We should have a clear understanding of what is acceptable or what is considered extremely exceptional, because right now there is not that kind of framing. Think that enables units to extremely different approaches depending on the nature of chairs, qualities, etc.

Norton: There used to be a memo on the Provost's website, and it went away.

Vice Provost James: As a department head, found this memo problematic because it was not created through a shared governance process and was not in the Manual.

Provost Underwood: Would prefer to work with you all on something that we can all agree on and that is written down. Was impressed with the candidates' promotion files but am uncomfortable with the fact that the process is different in different parts of this university, and that is not equitable. Parts of the process are not written down. Would like to work together to write them down.

Norton: Think we shy away from this because it is a tough topic, but we need to do it because there are enough examples of inequities arising from not having written documentation around the process. Would encourage Faculty Council or the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty to take this on.

Provost Underwood: Would be happy to work with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. Would like us all to work together to get procedures that work similarly across this University so that everyone understands them. Understand criteria must be different in every unit, but the process should not differ depending on what college or department you are in.

Vice Provost James: To Pedros-Gascon's point about service credit, there is a place in the Manual where it states that you need to be employed at CSU for two (2) years before you get tenure, as long as you did not have tenure at another institution. If you did not have tenure at another institution, you need an exception from the Office of the Provost if you have not been here for two (2) years. Most people are not aware of this.

Vice Provost James: Thinking back to discussion we had at Faculty Council around the code and faculty annual evaluation, which went well. Looking forward to continuing that discussion at the Faculty Council meeting in May.

Vice Provost James: There have been so many changes to the Manual. Know there will be a report coming from Faculty Council and SOURCE stories, but wondering if we need a cheat sheet or checklist of the changes so that the members have this information and can go back to their units to talk about it.

Mitchell: Department is working on revising our code to be consistent with the Manual. It was started by the chair and has been working well. The chair tasked a group in the department. Would focus on department chairs because there is a little bit more stability there.

Vice Provost James: Would like to see us move toward a code template and make it easier for departments to stay up to date and actually follow their own code.

Chair Smith: Thanked everyone for the discussion.

G. Executive Session – UGO Survey Results

Joseph DiVerdi: Moved to go into Executive Session.

Norton: Seconded.

Executive Committee adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Executive Session concluded at 4:49 p.m.

Melinda Smith, Chair
Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair
Andrew Norton, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant