

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, October 20, 2020**3:00pm – Microsoft Teams**

Present: **Sue Doe**, Chair; Ruth Hufbauer, Vice Chair; **Stephanie Clemons**, BOG Representative; **Timothy Gallagher**, Past Faculty Council Chair; **Amy Barkley**, Executive Assistant; **Sybil Sharvelle**, Engineering; **Carole Makela**, Health and Human Sciences; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts; **Linda Meyer**, Libraries; **David Koons**, Natural Resources; **Melinda Smith**, Natural Sciences; **Jennifer Peel**, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences; **Yolanda Sarason**, Business; **Sami Haddad**, Student Assistant

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Mary Pedersen**, Provost/Executive Vice President; **Donald Mykles**, Director of the Honors Program; **Jen Krafchick**, Associate Professor University Honors Program

Absent: none

Chair Doe called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Chair Doe: Began the meeting by requesting a slight change to the order of the items on the agenda. Would like to move the University Curriculum Committee discussion item to be right after the approval of their minutes. The reason for the change is because Brad Goetz is with is and has to leave early, and Donald Mykles may be a bit late. In the interest of making this work and allowing time for other discussion items, requested all of Brad's items to be moved up. Clarified that according to Robert's Rules of Order, this requires a 2/3 vote to change the agenda. Requested a motion to have the University Curriculum Committee discussion item moved up.

Yolanda Sarason: Moved.

Tim Gallagher: Noted in the chat that you can change the order of the agenda with a simple majority, and that it takes a 2/3 vote to add items to the agenda.

Executive Committee members agreed to change the order of the agenda.

October 20, 2020 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Faculty Council Minutes – October 6, 2020

B. Executive Committee Minutes – October 13, 2020

Chair Doe: Asked: Are there any corrections to be made to these minutes?

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Submitted corrections to the minutes prior to the meeting.

Chair Doe: Commented that the method that Antonio used to submit his corrections was preferable. Sent them by email so they are easy to see and make the changes.

Minutes accepted unanimously. Will be placed on the agenda for the November 3rd Faculty Council meeting with Antonio's corrections.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

Chair Doe: Have been participating in the CSU CARES initiative. Discussed the process for requests and what is involved. CANVAS has offered to refill the coffers for the CSU CARES account, so we can continue to give funds out to people who have needs at this time. Many people are in need right now. This is helpful for those who are struggling through lost income due to COVID, and now the recent fires. Lots of requests are coming in, they are capped at \$2,000.

Chair Doe: The Executive Leadership Team has been working on a strategic planning approach, and hope to have a planning framework in place by spring 2021. Efforts are underway, despite all the interruptions.

Chair Doe: Discussed the email sent out about the CSU-New Mexico football game being cancelled this Saturday due to a COVID outbreaks in New Mexico. Noted that it has not been rescheduled, just cancelled.

Chair Doe: Introduced Sami Haddad, the student helping us today. He is an Economics major. Reminded members that the Provost's Office and the Teaching Continuity Committee had put out a call to units who were interested in having student hourlies who could assist, particularly in classrooms, with the technological aspect. Reasoning for this is two-pronged: to provide assistance in the Teams and Zoom environment, and to provide additional income to those students who may need it. Sami will be helping us with a number of features in the Teams environment. Glad he is here with us.

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on October 27, 2020 on Microsoft Teams – 3:00pm.

2. Board of Governors Representative Visit at Faculty Council Meeting on December 1st, 2020 – Jane Rhodes

Chair Doe: Have only had one Board member respond so far, Jane Rhodes, who will be joining us at the December 1st Faculty Council meeting. Very excited to have her join us. The invitation has been issued, and we look forward to having some of them visit over the course of the year.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: We are in the midst of preparing communication for campus with guidelines for post-fall break. Announcement will be framing what the rest of fall semester will look like. Courses will be remote, campus will be open. All the same public health guidelines will be followed. There might be somewhat limited hours for library or other offices. Have collected many questions from around campus, will be answering those specifically.

Provost Pedersen: We are in our second week of saliva testing. Going really well. We had 900 tests on Monday, October 19. Our validation of that test with PCR is excellent. Still prioritizing testing wastewater areas. Prevalence on campus has been stabilizing between 2% and 3%. Things are looking really good.

Provost Pedersen: Will be communicating to the campus details around strategic transformation. Had our third meeting with the leadership team, creating a framework that we will then be engaging groups all across campus, including faculty, staff, and students.

Carole Makela: Have had students ask what the availability is for testing for students who do not live on campus, but might be working essential jobs, so they don't have to go to outside testing facilities. Asked: Can we prioritize off-campus students in essential work and occupations?

Provost Pedersen: Requested clarification on what Carole meant by prioritizing.

Makela: Have announcements, availability of testings for them.

Provost Pedersen: The Teaching Continuity Committee is addressing all the specifics around testing. Can go to Kelly Long and ask her to bring this specific issue to the team.

Chair Doe: Had a question today from a faculty member about the saliva tests. The question was that if they were a member of a pool that tested positive and then they were needing the swab, the nasal swab that in the time between when they're pool-tested positive and when they got results from their individual swab that they would essentially need to be in quarantine. Asked: Is that accurate? Stated the concern was that it's not just about the individual who isn't infected who's part of a pool where somebody is, it's all of the relatives who are then affected.

Provost Pedersen: Discussed nature of pool testing. Eight samples are put together, each sample is part of another pool, so every sample is run in two independent pools. If the one positive will be identified because they're put into two different pools, it's actually only one saliva test that's run to verify the individual, so not all eight individuals are then deemed positive. If you get a

results that is presumed positive, there is roughly a 90% change that you are actually positive. Then you get the PCR test from a nasal swab. If it is negative, re-run on day three, because virus shows up in oral cavity earlier than in the nasal cavity.

David Koons: Commented in the chat that if it not already been considered, would like to suggest the idea of discussing with the school nurse the possibility of providing saliva-test access to our Little Rams at the Early Childhood Center. The nasal swab is painful on the wee little ones, but of course more accurate.

Provost Pedersen: Apologized for the tardiness to the meeting, goal is to be present at the first hour of all the meeting. Blocking calendar going forward. Really value this meeting time, want to know how to be engaged and work collaboratively with you.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – October 9, 2020

Chair Doe: Requested a motion to approve the minutes, then a discussion if needed.

Melinda Smith: Moved.

Stephanie Clemons: Second.

Chair Doe: Asked: Any questions from those University Curriculum Committee minutes from October 9th? Hearing none, requested votes in the chat.

Minutes approved. Will go on agenda for the November 3rd Faculty Council meeting.

2. Honors Thesis Committee Proposed Changes – Donald Mykles

Donald Mykles: Felt it was important for the Executive Committee to look at this proposal and provide advice. Noted that the Manual gives the Honors Council tremendous authority for running the Honors Program. Change is substantial enough, wanted to run it by the Executive Committee. About 20 years ago, tenure-track professors were deliberately put in as crucial to Honors theses. Would now like to include non-tenure track faculty with continuing appointments. Students can request a non-tenure track faculty member to serve, that goes through the department chair and then Don. Noted that they do an outstanding job. We have nearly 1800 students in the program, about 380 thesis proposals are completed each academic year. Have 350 students who have thesis advisors and committee members. Large number of people serving in these roles. Unique that we have a requirement for all our students to complete an Honors thesis. Other institutions rarely have that requirement, have a tough time finding enough people to serve as thesis advisors. Showed the current requirements. Modifications being proposed would change first requirement, would still be required to have a terminal degree in their discipline.

Makela: Noted in the chat that the Honors issue should go to the Committee on Faculty Governance in that it is a code change, that should be the action today.

Chair Doe: Responded to Carole in the chat. Asked: Where is this in the Code? Have looked and do not find the Honors Thesis Advising role there, appears to be in the Honors Handbook.

Chair Doe: Repeated Carole's comment about sending the issue to the Committee on Faculty Governance, noted that this was not present in the Manual. Had been a discussion of this at an earlier Executive Committee meeting, but does not appear to have made it into the Manual in any way. Decision today is to either have Don updated the Honors Handbook, or if we believe it is really a matter for Faculty Governance. As it stands right now, does not appear in the Manual. Manual is silent on who can serve as an Honors Thesis Advising Chair.

Jen Krafchick: Wanted to reiterate things that Don mentioned. Brought up that being able to provide this additional support to students by having a larger community who meet these qualifications. Already continuing faculty at the University, so it has been determined that they meet the requirements to be faculty.

Pedros-Gascon: Absolutely in favor of the idea of non-tenure track faculty taking the roles with those conditions, assuming they also have terminal degrees. Suggested in the future, would make sense to do it through the process that was being proposed of governance.

Makela: This does not appear in the code, and doesn't think it needs to be. Thinks it can be in the Honors Policies and Procedures, as long as wise exceptions are made now and then with the change and guidelines in regards to continuing faculty. Perfectly appropriate to do so.

Hufbauer: Asked Don: You approve tenure track folks that are going to oversee an Honors Thesis, right?

Mykles: Stated that tenure track faculty meet the qualifications and don't require approval. Just asking that it be moved to include the non-tenure track faculty in the qualification so students don't need to seek approval for those individuals. Thinks if we're going to really welcome non-tenure track faculty and the whole mission of the University, they deserve the opportunity to serve as thesis advisors and committee members as a regular faculty member does already.

Smith: Noted in the chat that this has been updated for graduate committees already.

Krafchick: Non-tenure track faculty are generally teaching more courses, in greater contact with undergraduate students. The students might be also more inclined to reach out to a faculty member who they already have a relationship with. Area of expertise aligns with what the students are interested in, so there is an additional layer of accessibility for students too.

Clemons: Had a question related to the comment about needing a terminal degree for a non-tenure track faculty member.

Mykles: Correct, that's the second qualification, that they must have a terminal degree, not changing that qualification. Students can still request these non-tenure track faculty members who do not have a terminal degree, just happening less frequently.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the Polly poll in the chat. Unanimous support from the Executive Committee members. Seems to be pretty wide support for this, if it is decided to something more with this, can take to Committee on Faculty Governance, can take it from there.

Mykles: Was really just looking for guidance about how this should go forward. If it should go through the regular review process, fine with that.

Chair Doe: Seems treating this the simplest way is maybe the best, and maintains local control over an issue that currently resides in the Honors Handbook, doesn't need to get into the weeds.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Task forces are underway. Intellectual Property Task Force met this past week with Provost Pedersen, have made some recommendations we are now able to pass along to the Committee on Responsibility and Standing of Academic Faculty, and the Committee on Teaching and Learning. Mostly have to do with CANVAS and ownership of instructional materials. Task force on shared governance has identified locations in the Manual where we can bolster shared governance and valuing of shared governance. Diversity and Inclusion Task Force has shared Section E revisions with Provost Pedersen. Will send all of these ideas to the Executive Committee, getting some ideas going and moving forward. The IT Task Force is happening next week, and Antonio will provide more information on the Presidential evaluation task force next week as well.

Chair Doe: Has been approached by one of the working groups with a proposal in response to concerns about faculty involvement, and lack thereof, in working groups. Was suggested that perhaps Executive Committee could form a team of chairs from key committees or interested parties would be interested in getting regular updates. Gave an example: Has been working with the Teaching Continuity Committee since July, something new comes out every time. If a few people could be brought in to represent faculty voices, that would be great. Asked members to send interest. Decisions are being made quickly, and acting quickly. More faculty voices, even just one faculty voice, would be helpful.

Makela: Asked in the chat: What is an example of a decision?

Chair Doe: Gave example of spring break decision being made currently, lack of faculty input on this matter. Having several voices in that moment to respond with what the implications are would be great. Topics range from seating charts, to methods of giving exams. Every day there are things that come up. Does not feel equipped or qualified to represent the faculty as a whole, would like more faculty involved in these decisions.

Jennifer Peel: Commented in the chat that it seems that each college should have faculty representation. Asked: The offer was only for one faculty member?

Hufbauer: Responded to Jennifer's question in the chat. Thought Chair Doe's comments meant that more than one faculty member would be good, but not necessarily one for each college.

Chair Doe: Took back recommendations to the Committee on Faculty Governance on our discussion about the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty proposal. Determined that the idea of shopping this around to each department wasn't the best way to receive feedback to campus. Waiting to hear back from the Committee on Faculty Governance with a request for a different strategy than going to all departments. Going to their meeting next Monday. Preferable to avoid the "nuclear option" of putting it in front of Faculty Council ourselves.

Chair Doe: Wanted to share that as a result of our Faculty Council meeting on October 6th and our Executive Committee meeting on October 13th, discussions about impact of football and our community have not gone away. Provost Pedersen met with Erica Suchman and Judy Heiderscheidt, had a good discussion about the concerns that remain. Had a good, long talk. Felt that Provost Pedersen heard us, specifically Erica and Judy, Felt emboldened after the meeting, sent forward a draft of recommendations:

- University should withdraw all requests for variance and agree that sports will be played without spectators. (Protects the entire Fort Collins community and beyond)
- Football and basketball players should live in a bubble and take classes strictly online, starting immediately. (Protects students, staff, and faculty)
- Student-athlete "consent" or opt-in form should be made available for review so that varied parties can analyze the degree to which the risks of opt-in were explained to student-athletes and their families. (Student well-being)
- University should agree to conduct cardiac MRI to rule out myocarditis in any and all student athletes who have tested positive and prior to resuming play. (Protects student-athletes and protects institution from liability). Recommendation document provided articles.

Chair Doe: Seemed to receive a fairly positive response. Asked: What do we do with this? Has not yet heard back from the President regarding these recommendations. Asked: Do we need to have a special Faculty Council meeting so that faculty can say more about these issues? Reminded members that a meeting could be called by a majority vote of the Executive Committee or can be petitioned by 25 members of the Faculty Council membership. Erica and Judy felt that the Faculty Council, and maybe the campus more generally, need to be involved in a broader discussion. The next game will be upon us and the question is what we should do.

Clemons: Stated in the chat appreciation for the recommendations and suggested a resolution.

Peel: Suggested in the chat that adding a timeframe for recommendations, such as the one for no spectators, as well as how the decision will be made when it is safe to remove any recommendations.

Pedros-Gascon: Believes we need a special Faculty Council meeting. Thinks it would be easy to get 25 members to call for it, widespread concern. Expressed concern that the NCAA had to cancel the football game, not us at CSU or New Mexico.

Peel: Asked in the chat: Why only football and basketball? And how is a bubble defined?

Makela: Asked in the chat: Is the bubble referring to practice and if so, should that be separate from online classes?

Chair Doe: Went back to Athletic Director Joe Parker's comments at the Executive Committee meeting about the pecking order that the NCAA determined, sports with high contact and most risk of contagion.

Sarason: Asked in the chat: Were any of these recommendations acceptable to administration that we could then take off the table?

Chair Doe: None of the recommendations have received any response. Have also not been contacted in any formal way in response to anything said at the Faculty Council and Executive Committee meetings, as well as these recommendations.

Pedros-Gascon: Noted in the chat that the President has refused to address how she intends to respond to the recommendations, not acknowledging its existence.

Peel: Questions about how to move forward. Feels that resolutions previously passed by Faculty Council have not had the impact that was desired. Asked what other options are available, about what the objective of a Town Hall would be. No guarantee anything would come of them. Noted in the chat that a meeting and broader faculty and community input would be a good thing.

Chair Doe: Idea of a fuller discussion and fuller hearing of where members of the campus land on this issue. Also potentially a media opportunity. A resolution might not lead to anything, but a public meeting requires attention, and could get the word out more generally. Local newspapers might be interested. Possibly not a solution or a good idea, why we are asking.

Pedros-Gascon: Believes it is always worth to have a discussion in which faculty can present their opinions to administration, even if administration doesn't listen to them.

Chair Doe: Asked: Would anyone care to entertain a motion, to call a special meeting?

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Gallagher: Second.

Chair Doe: Asked: Any further discussion?

Sarason: Asked in the chat: Is there any way to give the President a time to respond?

Hufbauer: Agreed with Yolanda's point, asked if there was a way to allow time for the President to respond. Personally appalled at the difference in protection of different groups on campus, would like this to change. Would like us to be able to work proactively with the President instead of against.

Chair Doe: Asked: Would it make sense to tell the President we have had this discussion, that we have voted, but want to give her an opportunity to respond? Possible to get her response prior to, or in lieu of, this meeting.

Pedros-Gascon: Agree the logical procedure is to give the President the possibility to respond. Feels that she has been given this chance and has not answered or addressed the question on several occasions.

Gallagher: Agreed with Antonio. Have presented very big items to the President with no response. Feels this has become the norm. Items have been passed from the Provost to the President, and then no response. Feels the Faculty Council should speak out and give its view.

Hufbauer: Agreed with everyone, feels it is important to meet. Given the date we are going to meet, possibly will be responsive before then.

Chair Doe: Asked: Any further discussion before we call the vote?

Peel: Suggested thinking about the format of this meeting, set up to be successful and get the answers we need. Has not been productive in the past. Possible moderator, clarifying questions in advance to make sure we are getting to the issues.

Chair Doe: Discussed how current meetings aren't good platforms for this discussion, have constraints that a special meeting may not have. Will have to be very carefully set up and arranged. Will need help with this, asked members to be in contact. Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion for a Special Faculty Council meeting passed. Will be planned in a fairly timely manner.

2. Board of Governors Report – Stephanie Clemons

Clemons: Have a couple of things to report from the Board of Governors. Will also be providing a written report to the Faculty Council. Had a faculty member from CSU Fort Collins who received the Board of Governors Teaching Award, Karan in Engineering.

Clemons: Already heard the budget schedule from the President. Main concern that they told us is that the system and the three universities in the system may have a negative 30% coming from the state. Four scenarios they have come up with for the budget are some that they are taking seriously. President McConnell discussed enrollment, concerned about Spring 2021. Have hired a consultant to help with target audience to make sure they are bringing in their market as much as possible, as many students, both resident and non-resident.

Clemons: Heard from Provost Pedersen that they are moving forward with strategic planning. Three different strategic planning sessions are still planned this fall, and will report more in December.

Clemons: President McConnell reported that CSU Fort Collins is one of 10 universities in the world working on COVID research. Only two universities were asked to report to Vice President Pence, so CSU presented with Notre Dame related to COVID research.

Clemons: Dean James Pritchett gave a report that they are conducting metrics and how they can predict how much money in scholarships they need to give to a student to be able to have them come to CSU. Have predicted that about \$1200 in scholarships is the tipping point.

Clemons: Yolanda Bevill, Vice President of Communications, was talking to the Board of Governors about brand management. Stated that CU Boulder has more “top of mind” awareness than CSU Fort Collins. Doing another survey to find out why CSU isn’t “top of mind”, competing with community colleges more than ever before. CSU should be a house of brands, rather than a brand house. Had surveyed alumni, only 20% were recommending CSU.

Clemons: From CSU Pueblo, athletics have increased contributions. Their courses are being re-designed from online, lots of commonality between our institutions. From CSU Global, seeing a dip in fall enrollment. Parents with children at home aren’t necessarily registering for classes, also a slight decrease in employer reimbursements. Karen Ferguson, the Provost of CSU Global, stepped down, and they are searching for a replacement.

Clemons: Board of Governors has an announcement for the Hughes Stadium project, 160 acres of property. Available on the Board of Governors website for more information on that project.

F. Discussion Items

1. University Curriculum Committee Discussion Item – University Curriculum Committee – Brad Goetz, Chair

Chair Doe: Had taken a look at this last week, deferred the discussion until today. Asked Brad if he would like to speak to this discussion and remind members what they are looking at here and what he would like to get from the Executive Committee.

Brad Goetz: Recounted some history of the proposal. In September of last year, the Executive Committee and Provost Miranda asked the University Curriculum Committee to give some consideration to blanket approval of online availability of all courses previously approved going into the future. The request was to streamline the process and to create a little more agility in terms of the way units were offering courses. COVID hit in March, and the University Curriculum Committee put forward an item in our minutes in April, basically to approve courses to be taught in an online format through the spring of 2021. At a point now where that particular Faculty Council special action is going to come to an end next semester. Will probably be getting guidance from a number of places as to whether or not courses can continue to be offered online, even if they’re not approved online. Wondering if the Executive Committee would like the

University Curriculum Committee to consider that item again, possible new action item. Fairly simple, basically says that approved courses may be offered in any mode of delivery, any instructional format. Hoping to get some feedback on this from Executive Committee, whether we should consider it and move forward again. Same topic has come up within other committees, more urgency in some groups than the University Curriculum Committee at this point.

Chair Doe: Can provide bit of rationale for the sense of urgency. Has become clear, while working with the Teaching Continuity Committee, that the registrar's office is facing a bit of deadline. Need to start putting all the summer courses into the system really soon. Ideally would already have this done, but haven't moved ahead with this. Believe there will be a continuing need to allow classes to be taken online that haven't previously been offered online. The limit placed on this blanket approval will not help with next summer. Feel the registrar's office will be deeply constrained if they don't have an answer prior to the December Faculty Council meeting. Reminded members that we are not deciding on the issue, Brad is just trying to find out where everybody is on this and what the concerns are.

Makela: Generally in favor of this. Have a concern that the students are sufficiently aware so they can plan their lives. Considering leases, affects on costs of insurance, long list of implications for students that need to be considered. Need to provide timely information for them.

Chair Doe: Thanked Carole. Might even be an argument for urgency around clarity regardless of where the Faculty Council falls on this.

Peel: Commented in the chat, thinks this issue is ready for discussion at Faculty Council, ready to be an agenda item for the full Faculty Council.

Sarason: Thought we had discussed this and said we approved this for one more year.

Chair Doe: Had extended through spring 2021. Had discussed this possibility last week, but did not make a determination. Asked: Would that be your preference to just extend another year?

Sarason: Yes. Like others, concerned as we move more and more to online format if that will become the norm, and that we'll lose some of the rigor provided in in-person classes.

Pedros-Gascon: Agreed with Carole and Yolanda. Believes it merits being discussed by the whole body of the Faculty Council. Personally feels more comfortable extending one year, not sure of being convinced of the need to approve blanket approval, but that's a very personal situation. Don't know how much that may be a situation that also happens with colleagues.

Chair Doe: Thanked Antonio. Would guess concerns would be shared. Believes Ruth may have mentioned this maybe a week ago.

Ruth Hufbauer: Thinks students are struggling to focus in their online classes, have concerns about them just not coming back if things are going to be online.

Chair Doe: Current plan for the spring is to mirror very similar percentages for face-to-face that have occurred in the fall. Does seem to still be a commitment to face-to-face.

Peel: Wrote in the chat that being approved as an online format does not mean that classes need to be offered online. These issues about what format to use are broader than what can be decided by the University Curriculum Committee. Thinks it is ready for discussion and would support it being placed as an agenda item. Doesn't believe those decisions should be made by the University Curriculum Committee. Just gives people in courses and the department flexibility to be able to move online quickly if needed.

Smith: Commented in the chat that if we extend another year, we are just kicking the can down the road. The University and faculty can benefit from both a strong in-class and online presence. The proposal provides that flexibility for any course without getting further approval.

Hufbauer: Noted in the chat that with a careful description of what this gets us, it could get approved by Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Asked: Brad, have you gotten the feedback you need to continue with this?

Goetz: Hard to say, thinks that at Faculty Council, with so many folks in the room, number of issues become conflated in the discussion. Action is just a procedural action and it gets conflated with a lot of other items that are simply not affected by this. Already receiving course proposals that are including online for the indefinite future. Gave impression last time that they would be forced to teach online, which is not the intent. It is simply to be nimble, more agile, to be able to move within a unit and do what you need to do. Suspect that the Higher Learning Commission will tell us what to do, but this would be a longer-term solution too, all the intricacies of getting a face-to-face course approved and then having to go back a semester later and go through the process to get an online approved. Showed and discussed the form used to propose courses.

Makela: Fully realize this is procedural, and the University Curriculum committee has the prerogative to change that form and get the information they need. Still need to be able to indicate someplace what the students can expect, and they can plan their year, not semester by semester. Asked: Is that a responsibility departments, colleges, and the registrar's office are going to take on so both faculty and students can better plan their life?

Chair Doe: Hopefully the academic support advisors would be on top of this. Help guide students through what their options were and the more timely the information, the better.

Clemons: Thinks faculty are in a different place than they were last April, something to keep in mind as we move forward. Expressed appreciation for Carole's thoughts of the students, believes faculty also need to plan their lives so this would be helpful to them as well. Suggested offering a presentation before the discussion is opened so they can contemplate the issues.

Makela: Doesn't think this should have to be a special action item on the floor of Faculty Council. Setting up a situation that every time the University Curriculum Committee wants to

make a change to the form, they would have to come to the Faculty Council. Thinks it should be part of their consent agenda. Question related to both faculty and students needs to be answered.

Goetz: At last Faculty Council meeting, someone determined it was illegal for us to pass this as a University Curriculum Committee consent agenda. Anticipated this and that is why it was pulled out. Asked to communicate with Carole to put together a statement as part of this item to ensure there is some acknowledgement of the student need.

Makela: Willing to work with Brad. Somebody has to provide some assurance that this isn't totally open-ended and the students won't be required to live totally different lives from spring semester into fall semester.

Goetz: Will touch base with Carole over the next week. Talks to Kelly Long each week, can be notified if there is a different kind of urgency. Sense is that would rather have it well prepared so the Faculty Council is more inclined to approve it. Saw in the chat the notion of just "kicking it down the road" and that's the reality, if we just get another year extension, that's really all we're doing, and putting a lot of people through the effort of actual course proposals.

Clemons: Had a question for Carole. Heard from faculty in April that they wanted to have a discussion about this topic. Asked: If we put it in the consent agenda and it's not pulled out in some way to have a discussion, how do you feel the Faculty Council members will react? Want to keep things as open and transparent as possible, but kind of help manage some of their information so they know ahead of time what is happening.

Makela: Think in making the motion for the consent agenda, we can point that out and indicate the narrowness that this is, as far as the procedural change, but you know the breadth of implications that it has. Asking for and suggesting that administrators, especially at the department level, would have to do planning and make information known so that both faculty and students have a tentative, year-long offering plan.

Chair Doe: Reminded members how this worked in the spring. Believe that the reason we had this as a separate item and not as part of the consent agenda was because we were afraid it was going to get bogged down and then hold up the consent agenda. Other questions is what kind of authority or power would we have to make recommendations to departments about what they should be doing. Fundamental problem, we can make recommendations and suggest best practices, but can't tell a department what to do. Suggested discussing this further during the week, work with the University Curriculum Committee and Carole, and then formulate next steps in the planning for this. Reminded members that Kelly Long feels this is quite urgent, mainly because of registrar's office.

Pedros-Gascon: Thinks the vote this time may be positive, especially if there is some kind of explanation that we provide to faculty that can be more reassuring about the impacts. Thinks that was a big missing part of the discussion that didn't really convince the people on the fence. Would discourage the idea of having this as a consent agenda, would rather have it as a discussion. Believes it merits discussion, feel people will be more comfortable approving this as a discussion rather than consent agenda.

Goetz: Discussed how the major completion maps that every program has put together indicated all the benchmark courses and indicates some level of comfort with those courses being offered. Had been misunderstood over the years in the form and in the course approval process is that when a course is approved to be offered, some units haven't understood that as an obligation. What has happened in these tight budgetary times is that they haven't actually offered the courses. Making issue worse by allowing units to say "as needed", leaving students in kind of a bind. Might be part of the form that we could address with this topic, Carole's suggestion of having this be more of an administrative approach is a solid one.

Makela: Could put together a resolution from Faculty Council that addresses department offerings and messaging students based on the department responsibilities and the responsibilities of deans. Have this be considered by Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Thanked Carole, will keep this option in mind.

Pedros-Gascon: Aware of the financial constraints. Constantly approving exceptions to situations, also have counselors who are already explaining to students, but have limited resources. Sometimes cannot honor a class with only two students, deans office may not approve the class.

Chair Doe: Will ask Brad to take it from here, call in some folks who have offered to be helpful and will return to this.

G. Faculty Presentations

Chair Doe: Asked: Any additional concerns before we adjourn?

Hufbauer: Asked in the chat when the next home game was.

Amy Barkley: Believe it is Wyoming on November 5th.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concerns regarding the keynote speaker for the Diversity Symposium. Feels it was poorly handled, would like a better understanding of what happened there. Feels either Vice Provost Susan James or Provost Mary Pedersen can address this next week. Feels it merits some kind of discussion.

Hufbauer: Asked if we could invite Mary Ontiveros or Ria Vigil to the next meeting if we are going to discuss this.

Chair Doe: Yes, can invite them. Feels unfortunate that there has been a campaign against Abdullah, but doesn't answer the question of whether or not she is associated with the Nation of Islam. Lots of open questions.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

Sue Doe, Chair

Ruth Hufbauer, Vice Chair
Stephanie Clemons, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant