

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 14, 2020
3:00 p.m. – Microsoft Teams

Present: Tim Gallagher, Sue Doe, Susan James, Stephanie Clemons, Brad Goetz, Carole Makela, Jason Bruemmer, Melinda Smith, Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Dawn DeTienne, Rick Miranda, Bill Sanford, Steve Reising, Linda Meyer

Tim notes mistakes on the first page: March 31 minutes. Hearing no additional changes, approves by unanimous vote. Next EC meeting will be April 21 on Teams—correction to today’s agenda.

Action Items:

UCC meeting minutes from April 3. Brad invited to speak. He offers no comments. Tim invites changes and requests a motion to place the minutes on the consent agenda. Carole Makela moves, and Stephanie 2nds. Passes unanimously.

April 10 UCC minutes will be on the agenda next week.

Tim also received a new program motion from UCC and we will examine that motion next week.

Tim has us move ahead to the code change from the Committee on FG which they want to have on the May agenda. One week from today this will need to be sent to the FC since this is a code change requiring two weeks’ notice. Tim invites discussion of this item.

Linda asks about the effort underway to change all the wording about “regular” faculty. What about the language in this motion?

Tim agrees that changes to language will occur in two areas – faculty categories and gender inclusive language. Wonders if it is confusing to place something in front of FC that uses the old language. We agree to ask CoFG to change the language.

Rick: Asks about apportionment in the CoFG proposal: why is 45 equal to 1/3? The rationale says that about the same number of people would wind up on Faculty Council. Where are these elected people coming from?

Sue J: Steve needs to explain this so that there’s not massive confusion in Faculty Council.

Tim: We hope to have Steve R on the meeting soon so that we can get this cleared up. We move on with the intention to come back to this.

Linda: Speaks to there being a call out from Jenny Morse for improved representation to reflect proportional representation of NTTF. This idea may have died in committee. Wonders if there is going to be a strategy for NTTF to obtain greater representation.

Tim: the idea of NTTF representing their units is still alive, or at least not dead. Tim confirms that Jenny’s idea about representation came to him and that he sent the idea forward to CoFG and spoke with Steve Reising about the proposal and Tim was not aware of any particular problems or holdups with the idea’s consideration. Tim has not been told that they’ve (CoFG) put a definite no on this idea. Tim says that he or we can take this up with Steve R.

Tim moves us on to the Harry Rosenberg Award nomination. Tim explains that we as EC are charged with making the call on this.

Sue J: I don't recall how campus was made aware of the process.

Tim: The campus was made aware in two different ways. Tim announced the availability of the award via the entire academic distribution list. Additionally, he announced this to the Faculty Council members at the monthly meeting over the course of two months. Got the word out as broadly as we ever have.

Sue J states her support for the nomination. Linda Meyer also offers her support for the nomination.

Linda moves and Stephanie 2nds.

The motion passes and Jenny Morse will be the recipient of the Harry Rosenberg Award.

Tim moves us on to the Resolution on Race and Bias issues, which Carole revised for us.

Antonio, Sue D, Sue J and Stephanie all express their appreciation and support for the revision that Carole Makela revised.

Tim asks if we would like this to be on the May agenda. The committee votes and this resolution will occur at the May FC meeting.

Action Items—Code Change and Feedback on the President for the BoG. We will return to these at the end since Steve R has not arrived yet and Rick has to leave for the discussion about the President.

Rick gives his Provost's Report.

Rick points out that the President has turned our attention to the State Budget. Given the past month and the urgency around summer session, we are now just turning attention to the budget.

Antonio: Asks follow up on evaluation of the agreements. We should be receiving some kind of report from OEO regarding outsourcing to them but are not getting an accountability report annually.

Rick says that he doesn't think this would be a problem but says that we should suggest the set of metrics we are looking for. Do you want a narrative? Statistics?

Antonio: Suggests that the report be something like we get from Grievance.

Rick says that if we would write up a request or proposal for a report, it could be sent to Diana Prieto. We should circulate it among the EC membership.

Will Samford: Asks about the field course in summer that is part of the requirement of the major.

Rick states that the University is not sure what is going to happen. Explains that they have been planning for a later summer field experience but the virus is in control and so there's no way to know for sure.

Tim's Report: In the same category as the issue Antonio brought up regarding OEO summary stats, he reached out for summary information like the UGO provides from the Ombudsman Office. Contacted Kathy Rikard and Melissa Emerson for this information. So far he has not heard back.

Stephanie's Report. April 8 the BoG held a special meeting via ZOOM related to CSU-Pueblo being approached about a short-term lease as a health care facility for the State of Colorado. The decision was to move forward with this and are in negotiation in creating a contract Pueblo and the State. The contract hasn't been finalized yet. Objective: overflow hospital use.

Carole Makela: Is the upcoming meeting of the BoG going to be virtual?

Rick confirms that the meeting will be virtual.

Steve Reising We return to the Code change from the CoFG. First order of business relates to the last paragraph where you are not proposing any change to still refers to "regular" faculty and EC wonders if you would be willing to use strikeouts and underscores to bring that language into compliance with the new language standards. Linda Meyer pointed out in comments that "regular faculty" is also in need of change in the first paragraph.

Second order of business relates to questions and observations. We were not understanding the 1/3 and 45%. We need some wording of clarification to avoid the confusion on the floor of FC.

Steve: This is bringing the code into agreement with practice over the last several years. What the knockout means is that you take the # of representatives from the college and libraries and divide by 1/3. Keeps the same number of representatives across all colleges. The CoFG is responsible for this apportionment. 33-45% across the units evens out the differences. We don't want to propose anything that would double the size of FC or even to cut it by a large proportion. This strategy attempts to address the inequities as suggestive of differences across departments.

Linda seeks to clarify the objective. Likens the representation to the differences between the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives.

Steve R: Yes, exactly. If you just took the number of departments, 55, and had only representatives based on the number of faculty then we would have large representation from some and small from others. This approach addressing at-large members is an attempt to address these differences.

Carole: Is this going to change the number of representatives to be distributed among the colleges.

Steve: No.

Carole: Asks about the process because her college has no at-large representative.

Steve: Steve explains Carol's college (CHHS) has 117 faculty and 8 departments so if $117/8 = 14.6$ faculty per FC member. It turns out that is exactly where CHHS should be. With other departments the ratio works out differently and so this formula addresses the needs of those other college.

Dawn: How is it possible that changing from 1/3 to 45% doesn't change anything?

Steve: The Executive Assistant to EC has been figuring this out annually, and there will be no change in effect. We've been adding about 26 at-large members every year and this shift will make the process clearer, more consistent, and transparent.

Steve: 14-15 faculty per FC member. College at-large reps as percentage of number of dept and library reps. Shifting from 1/3 to 45% reduces the standard deviation substantially across departments. So this is a correction that has otherwise been done manually as a matter of practice rather than done in a manner that is defensible.

Carole: I think it would be helpful if you showed the current distribution and the new model so that people don't get the impression that something will change significantly here.

Antonio has new business. Brings up the vacancy in representation to the University Benefits Committee. Asks if there have been calls for nominations to fill this vacancy.

Steve: We have received the call and we are working on it. We will accelerate this process.

Antonio expresses his disappointment that we have not invited nominations to the University Benefits Committee. If we are waiting for people to jump in then this is counterproductive and we have been underrepresented on this committee for at least a year.

Tim assures that this committee actively pursues filling of vacancies and the vacancy is often hard to fill.

Antonio: If we are not being shown that there is a vacancy then how do we know that there's a need?

Tim: The CoFG manages these discussions.

Antonio: Is disappointed with the way this has been handled. The amount of money that the Benefits Committee is overseeing and the lack of a full slate of faculty representation to that committee means that there has not been an appropriate level of faculty representation.

Tim: Points out that John Elder and Tim Gallagher both attend those meetings. The committee does not get into the fiduciary responsibilities of the committee. The University Benefits committee works at more of a macro level. We are in the process of getting a third member to the committee.

Antonio: speaks further to the report of that committee last week when it was suggested that people are invited to that committee. To him this suggests that shared governance has not been properly utilized for representation to this committee.

Tim: To my knowledge, no one has been put on the University Benefits Committee without the election of the faculty.

Antonio: Points out that if he had not asked this question we might not have a rep to that committee for another two years.

Tim states his strong support for faculty representation to that committee.

We move into Executive Session and Tim moves on to the feedback to the BoG regarding President McConnell's performance in the year.

General notes without identifiers or specificity: Tim points out that feedback from faculty is typically quite low. Asks each EC member to speak to the feedback that they have gotten on the President from their constituencies and to speak to EC's feedback as well. Several EC members indicate that they received no feedback from constituents. Three colleges provided feedback. The EC decides to again solicit college-specific feedback about the President. One question that emerges is whether the feedback should reflect the calendar year or if we should include the whole year. Stephanie is asked to query the BoG when they would like the President's performance report. If we have more time, we can obtain more feedback from our constituents. Stephanie recommends that feedback is solicited through next Monday for discussion at next Tuesday's EC meeting. Tim clarifies that we solicit feedback from all faculty, not just from FC members. One example by way of process is that one college's Exec Committee rep will send the request to the Dean of Faculty who will distribute the request for feedback from all faculty.

Tim asks for EC members' individual feedback and due to low/no response recommends that we not only reach out to our constituencies but that we think more as individuals regarding the feedback we want to give about the

President's performance. Tim clarifies that typically the report is 80% EC member feedback and 20% general faculty feedback.

We adjourn at 4:40 PM