

AGENDA
Executive Committee
Tuesday, October 27, 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: President Joyce McConnell; Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee; Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Andrew Norton, Agricultural Sciences

Absent: None

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

Chair Doe: We have much on our agenda. Discussed the email sent prior to the meeting about President McConnell’s visit to the meeting. Should help with planning regarding the Special Faculty Council meeting.

October 27, 2020 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – October 20, 2020

Chair Doe: Asked: Do we have any corrections? Did send in some corrections prior to the meeting.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Submitted corrections via email.

Doe: Asked Antonio to state corrections so Executive Committee is aware of what they were.

Pedros-Gascon: On page 12, statement says “hear them” when it should say “listen to them”.

Chair Doe: Thanked Antonio. Asked: Any other corrections? Believes that the November 3rd Faculty Council agenda does not need to be included in the October 20th meeting minutes since they are already in the packet. Asked Tim to clarify on this point.

Tim Gallagher: Agree with that, thinks that is correct.

Chair Doe: Will make that correction. Discussed the other corrections sent in. Correction on page 7, question came from a faculty member, not a family. On page 15, should say “through Spring 2021” instead of “to Spring 2021”. This is where we are talking about how long the approval for any delivery system for courses was allowable, will further discuss this today. Important we get this wording changed as part of our discussion today. Also noted that a sentence in the Libraries report appeared incomplete. Upon further examination, was determined that it was complete, and no corrections were needed.

Hearing no further corrections, minutes unanimously approved.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on November 10, 2020 on Microsoft Teams – 3:00pm.

Chair Doe: Next Executive Committee meeting will be in two weeks on November 10th, at regular time, 3:00 p.m. Faculty Council meeting next week, November 3rd from 4:00pm to 6:00pm. We are hoping to get the agenda out tonight.

2. CSU Cares and ComPsych Benefits

Chair Doe: Talked about CSU Cares a little bit at the last Executive Committee meeting. Have probably read about this in SOURCE and other locations. CSU Cares is receiving an unprecedented number of requests for assistance from employees, multiple a day. Requests are capped at \$2,000. Canvas Credit Union made a gift of \$50,000 to further support CSU Cares, and at a recent meeting of the state classified personnel an additional \$11,000 or \$12,000 was donated by folks in that employee group. Asked members if there was any objection to hearing from the CSU Cares people at our Faculty Council meeting next week. Given stress our community is under, might be good to hear from them.

Melinda Smith: Stated in the chat that it would be good to know if they are taking donations from anyone.

Carole Makela: Stated in the chat that hearing from Cares is important.

Chair Doe: Sounds like we are in support. Would not be a long presentation. Feel we need to hear these things, this body could be supportive, same as state classified group. Stated that the ComPsych Benefits, which provides psychological services to employees, have been extended to GTAs. Having an impact, may want to share with graduate students who are teaching assistants. Probably applies to GAs and GRAs. Important extension of their services.

Chair Doe: Final announcement is to say hello and welcome to Andrew Norton, who will be joining us officially as part of the Executive Committee after the next Faculty Council meeting.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: We are here in week 10, which is phenomenal. Extended thanks for hard work in supporting students, staff, and faculty for making it this far into the quarter.

Provost Pedersen: Wanted to re-emphasize the plans for after Fall Break, have some clarity about operations. As of now, all classes will go remote, but operations on campus will remain open. Planning on flexibility so areas on campus so those that have the flexibility to work remotely will have that option, in conjunction with Deans and Department Heads working that out. Deans and Department Heads and Chairs want to make sure that students will still have access to the computer labs and other areas on campus. Anticipating 500-600 students to remain in the residence halls, which is about 10% of what we have now. Facilities will be open to support them. Anticipating those students that live in the community to still be visiting campus to access services. Library will be open, but likely with reduced hours. Questions have come up about what will be open, what will be closed. Deans will be meeting with the Pandemic Team to let them know what the colleges need so they can be supported by facilities operation. This is, of course, subject to change based on community COVID rating. Hospitals are nearing capacity.

Provost Pedersen: Working very hard on spring semester plans. Will still start on the original start date, and are still deciding about Spring Break. Final decisions will be made this week.

Chair Doe: Asked: Has there been any discussion around the budget conversation at the state level, or are they in a holding pattern? Have not seen anything in the news, possibly delayed due to election or other issues.

Provost Pedersen: Have not heard anything either. Currently discussing 4 models, a 10% or 20% reduction both with and without a 3% tuition increase. Only change is that we may need to consider a 30% cut.

Chair Doe: Asked: Those models that are being discussed, have they been discussed to the Recovery Advisory Committee?

Provost Pedersen: These are just initial projections. Done before we our year-end numbers from last year, very preliminary. Will likely have opportunity to start work and dig a little deeper after the next Board of Governors meeting.

Stephanie Clemons: Stated that the Board of Governors said that state reserves are somewhat depleted, and that a number of things on the ballot will affect the budget. We may hear more after the election.

Makela: Typically in Colorado, the governor brings out new budget information in November, doesn't seem like we are running late.

Chair Doe: Budget is a source of anxiety. As it begins to materialize, will be all ears. See what is happening around the country, news stories around measures that universities and colleges are having to take around budget constraints. Asked: Any other questions?

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – October 16, 2020

Chair Doe: We have UCC Minutes from October 16th in the packet. Asked: Do we have a motion to approve these minutes, and then can have any discussion or questions?

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

David Koons & Smith: Second.

Chair Doe: Asked: Any discussion of these minutes? Hearing none, asked Sami Haddad to utilize new polling mechanism. Discussed the new mechanism and the issues that we have run into with Polly. Requested a vote using Microsoft Forms.

Motion passed. UCC Minutes from October 16, 2020 will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for November 3, 2020.

Executive Committee agreed to vote on UCC Minutes from October 23 and October 30 by email after UCC Meeting on October 30, 2020. Pedros-Gascon moved, Koons second. Minutes approved by majority by email. Placed on revised agenda for November 3 Faculty Council meeting.

2. University Curriculum Committee Proposal – [tentative]

Chair Doe: We have another University Curriculum Committee item, bit more complex. We return to the University Curriculum Committee proposal regarding instructional delivery methods. There is some urgency around this matter. Had approved additional instructional formats for courses through Spring 2021. Now we look at extending this further. The question is do we simply extend this for another year, or do we think about doing this forever and ever. Consider likely concerns about this. What we are deciding is whether or not this should appear on the Faculty Council agenda for November 3rd to allow the Faculty Council to decide. University Curriculum Committee wants to be as prepared as possible. Courses next summer already at some risk if they have not been approved for online delivery. Planning already happening for Fall 2021, under some pressure to do something as soon as possible.

Brad Goetz: Two items that Executive Committee should consider today. One of them is a miscellaneous request from the University Curriculum Committee from April of last year. Was brought before Faculty Council, and then changed to accommodate for online approval through the Spring of 2021. Anticipating that there will be a similar miscellaneous request in our minutes on Friday. Talked with Carole, Executive Committee settled on the idea of this being accompanied by a resolution of Faculty Council. University Curriculum Committee wouldn't put forward this resolution, the Faculty Council would. Hopeful that the Executive Committee could

craft what that needed to look like to address the concerns of the Executive Committee and more broadly, the Faculty Council, so that the resolution could go in sequence with this. Made an attempt at crafting a resolution, hopeful that Executive Committee can revise and refine that to accommodate concerns of committee. Number of things that would then have to happen rapidly. Will have to vote on this at the University Curriculum Committee's meeting on Friday, would then electronically approve the minutes to pass on, and they would need to be placed on the Faculty Council agenda. Resolution would also need to be placed on agenda. Someone would need to volunteer to separate the miscellaneous request so we can discuss it separate from the minutes.

Chair Doe: Discussed the miscellaneous request that was provided by the University Curriculum Committee last April. Had pulled it out for separate approval. Would probably want to do the same thing again, so the minutes are not dependent on the approval of the specific request.

Smith: Stated in chat in favor of separating it out.

Goetz: Not sure what the resolution will contain. Discussed the number of concerns about the quality of courses in the online format, discussed Carole's concerns last week about whether students would be aware of the format. Hoping a resolution could resolve these concerns. Really is a request to administrative units to review their courses for quality, for frequency of delivery, probably in all formats. Have never written a resolution, unsure about the language. Hoping Executive Committee can provide their thoughts and craft this into something useful.

Chair Doe: Reason we are showing these things side by side are due to conversations from last week and last March and April. Attempting to address concerns here.

Makela: Think a resolution is important. Make a point to departments that they need to share this information with students and faculty in their planning. Need to have to have a document we can widely distribute to make it clear to departments and units of what their responsibility is in offering courses and fulfilling students' needs to be informed in completing their courses and planning.

Chair Doe: Think through how we could address some of the underlying challenges and concerns that accompany a blanket approval. Possibly some of the same concerns that happened last spring will also happen this November. What Brad and Carole have attempted to do is to provide some degree of responsibility to place this somewhere, since it doesn't belong to the University Curriculum Committee to ensure the quality of the course offering, nor is it their responsibility to ensure students are informed. These issues have concrete implications for students. Wisdom around some strategy of calling departments and units to handle these issues.

Clemons: Wanted to clarify some of what was being discussed. At last Executive Committee meeting, had discussed course offerings and delivery formats, including online, and making a blanket vote moving forward, and saying all courses could be available in any of those formats, and departments could decide how to teach those classes with faculty input. Hearing now about discussing when courses are offered and assessing quality. Wondering if we want to separate the multiple pieces that are being discussed.

Chair Doe: Yet another option was offered up, to approve for another year, extend approval from Spring of 2021 through Spring of 2022. Now question is what do we make of this. Asked members if they think this is ready to be seen on the floor of the Faculty Council, keeping in mind the urgency around this.

Makela: Think we need to look at this special action item and really think if we need to have it as broad as all courses. Departments, because of accreditation and other requirements, may not want their courses labeled with an option of online. Unsure of exact wording, but need to be careful of using the word “all”.

Chair Doe: The University Curriculum Committee proposed different language from last year, that all approved courses **may** be offered in any mode of delivery.

Makela: Need to recognize that the format designation on a course proposal informs the banner system, which indicates then in the schedule that these formats would be there, and also indicates in the catalog that the course may be offered online, face-to-face, and hybrid. May suggest that the department still has the option in the decision to indicate how narrowly or broadly in how many of the formats they make available.

Smith: Think that these are two separate things. Main thing with Brad and the miscellaneous item would be helpful to Faculty Council and the discussion, laying out some of the issues. Unending stream of course changes as people change from face-to-face as an online option. Laying out parameters of what University Curriculum Committee does, not saying you have to teach a course that way, just that it may be taught that way. Clearly laying that out prior to discussion could be helpful. Thinks resolution is more about a philosophical issue, recognize that going online is not the same as face-to-face.

Antonio: Concerned with the impact about the comment on when classes have to be taught, a clear planning of classes. Concern for departments who have financial constraints, mandate to teach classes at a specific time can have a financial impact. Feel concerned that we are more willing to have very clear expectations from departments and faculty than we are to have a clear commitment on the side of administration. Constantly having to approve course substitutions. Would like a stronger financial commitment from administration to facilitate those classes.

Gallagher: The University Curriculum Committee wanted to give departments and faculty leeway to do things they way they wanted. When departments think it's not appropriate to offer something online, then they don't need to do that. University Curriculum Committee is asking for approval from Faculty Council from a curriculum perspective.

Chair Doe: Use of the word “may” in the new proposal has made this more palatable. Does not obligate faculty or departments in any way. Units determine format that is appropriate. Additional questions around these larger philosophical questions.

Gallagher: Noted in the chat that “may” applies to the department, not the student.

Makela: Spoke to the resolution. Understand Antonio's concerns, but also need to recognize that we do an annual budget, not semester by semester. May need to add to the resolution reference to the role and responsibility of the administration.

Yolanda Sarason: Expressed concerns about the financial pressures leading to more online teaching, even if we think courses are higher quality when in person. Moving more and more online whether we want to or not.

Chair Doe: Believes that concern was brought up at the April Faculty Council meeting. Lots of effort going into making sure we are clear this time around. The moment necessitated it, then there was worry about becoming a fully online institution. Timing was really a factor.

Makela: There are two funding streams. Resident Instruction students may have online classes in their program, but still registering for Resident Instruction and paying for it through tuition. Then there's the line through the division of Continuing Education, where that is a separate funding stream, and have programs totally offered through that, and registering through that system.

Chair Doe: Clarified that Resident Instruction students remain Resident Instruction students, just have the option to take online classes.

Makela: Departments can take some courses and offer them through Department of Continuing Education and tap into that funding stream, but are not to do that for Resident Instruction students. Students can make the choice, but they do not have to. Need to protect integrity of their enrollment to complete their program.

Andrew Norton: Asked: Are we offering a motion that would extend this another year or permanently?

Chair Doe: Proposal as it stand states "courses may be offered in any mode of delivery". Asked: Should there be an end to that sentence? This question may come up.

Goetz: Answer to that is forever.

Norton: Stated in the chat that can see the reasons for doing this "forever" but thinks this would require a much longer discussion with Faculty Council to have a chance for approval.

Sarason: Stated in the chat in agreement that the University Curriculum Committee should not have to approve each course. Not thinking intentionality, but unintended consequences.

Provost Pedersen: Typically with accreditation is that a school cannot choose to move all classes to go online without getting accreditation approval. Would be considered a substantial change. Usually not allowed from accreditation standards. Guidelines from the Higher Learning Commission will really dictate what we can and cannot do.

Chair Doe: Asked: Is this something we need to worry about as a result of this proposal? Also noted that accreditation is a constraint on going too far with online instruction. See it as a natural constraint for any inclination to move 100% online.

Provost Pedersen: Would be considered a structural change, would require a review and approval.

Clemons: Looked at the Higher Learning Commission website, says that prior Higher Learning Commission approval must be required for the initiation or expansion of an institutions distance or correspondence program. From a programmatic perspective, is part of an accredited program. Accredited based on student output, not faculty input. If we shifted online, would have to have a separate accreditation process and pay additional fees.

Chair Doe: Stated in the chat that accreditation is a natural constraint on unbridled instruction. Believe this is what Provost Pedersen was pointing out.

Goetz: All items are true and should be discussed. Laura Jensen has already been asked about what percentage of the courses that can be offered online, believe we are in the clear. Also part of an accredited program. Went back to the “may” statement in the proposal, many courses in program would not be offered online. Many programs this would apply to. Would give units the flexibility to do what is necessary and helpful, rather than a requirement.

Makela: Rather than putting a time period, could we put “consistent with Higher Learning Commission standards”, and as long as its “may”, the specialized accreditations would be up to the departments and units.

Chair Doe: Asked: What if we say “all approved courses may be offered in any mode of delivery consistent with Higher Learning Commission standards and unit priorities”?

Antonio: Not sure why we are working this as a resolution. History of resolutions in this institution is limited. Has been used on limited occasions, and has a very clear call to action. Not sure if in favor of going this route.

Chair Doe: Two different issues. We have the proposal that has been brought to us, and also the resolution. Anticipated to respond to concerns. Can separate these completely. The proposal is what we need to decide on. Asked Brad if he feels it is ready for Faculty Council.

Clemons: In favor of the Higher Learning Commission addition to the statement, also possibly a statement that refers to a renewal. Puts a bracket around it, some intentionality moving forward.

Goetz: Creates a difficult dilemma. Quarter of courses are already approved for online forever, but to put a timeframe on for review could really mix this up. Could see courses coming through and add online approval, and then they’d be outside of review. Question now is five years down the road about which courses are up for review.

Norton: Thinks there is a lot of fear around moving online for instructors. Understands what the University Curriculum Committee is doing and why this is appropriate to do, but could be a big ask for the Faculty Council to approve this into perpetuity.

Ruth Hufbauer: Asked in the chat about Stephanie's suggestion and Brad's points. Asked: In 5 years, wouldn't we leave the courses approved as is, and just decide whether to continue the policy?

Chair Doe: Have prepared for that possible discussion on the floor of Faculty Council. Just have to decide if it is ready to go to the floor.

Clemons: Trying to think about how to help the Faculty Council work through this issue. Suggested an FAQ, might be helpful. Thinks Andrew's point about fear is valid, but also a lack of education and training around how to do classes online.

Chair: Think we have two different things here. Asked: Can we have a motion to separate out the University Curriculum Committee's proposal on instructional delivery from the University Curriculum Committee minutes?

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Gallagher: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote using Microsoft Forms. Received a majority. Next piece of this has to do with the language. Asked Brad to read the language as we have it.

Goetz: It will be "may be offered consistent Higher Learning Commission standards and unit priorities".

Chair Doe: Re-read entire statement. Asked: Do we have a motion for that item?

Ruth Hufbauer: Moved.

Clemons: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat. Looks like we think this is ready to appear on the November 3rd Faculty Council agenda.

Goetz: Dependent on approval of University Curriculum Committee, will get sent as soon as it is approved.

Chair Doe: Will send this out for electronic approval over the weekend. Asked members how they feel about the resolution. Feels the resolution could follow in December if not ready.

Makela: Feels the December meeting would allow enough time. Would strongly encourage having a resolution. Antonio commented that they haven't been effective in the past, doesn't

mean we can't make an effort to make them effective as we go forward. New faces in the administration, address it to particular people and units.

Chair Doe: Figure out how resolutions are best deployed, how they become impactful and important. Can refer back to resolutions easier than the minutes of a previous meeting. More opportunity for usage and value than we have seen to date.

Goetz: Wondered if we could have a time limit during Faculty Council, so Faculty Council could actually draft the resolution at the meeting. Chance to discuss the important elements of this.

Chair Doe: Thinks this could be possible. Give a chance to concrete ideas and concerns into a resolution.

3. Committee on Libraries Annual Report 2019-2020

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Will submit report in writing in the interest of time. Will be sent after the meeting.

i. Update on Special Faculty Council Meeting

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell for coming to the meeting. Aware of conversations that were happening, lots of faculty felt there wasn't enough time at the Faculty Council meeting, voices weren't heard. Desire of this group as a result of conversation last week is to have a Special Faculty Council meeting to address these issues and to provide some concrete manifestations of the ideas that have been formulating, such as the four recommendations. Wanted to make sure these are seriously considered by the University. Hope to come up with a time and mechanism for the Special Faculty Council meeting.

President Joyce McConnell: Thanked Chair Doe. Many people want to be involved in the presentation to Faculty Council, including people from athletics, academic support for student athletes, and some student athletes themselves. In addition, because much there are so many questions about the work that was done between the Pandemic Team and the medical team in athletics, as well as the county, other possibility is hearing from someone on the Pandemic Team.

Chair Doe: Have questions coming from the faculty, even faculty with expertise on the topic, not convinced those issues are being addressed. Part of the issue is faculty feel they haven't been heard in their own concerns.

President McConnell: Know that Provost Pedersen met with Erica Suchman and Judy Heiderscheidt last week. Meeting went well. Have a couple observations. Different experts can have different opinions. We are following the advice from three different entities, looking at CDC, state, and county guidelines. Also listening to medical experts with the state and county. There continues to be dispute about things at this point in time. In the end, have to follow the

orders of the county and state. Complicated structure in terms of medical advisors. We have a medical team, and the county, state, and Mountain West Conference all have their own individual medical teams, including epidemiologists. Lots of medical voices. Being able to answer questions doesn't necessarily mean we all come to agreement.

Chair Doe: Asked if it would be helpful to have this conversation with the faculty generally. Consider what this would contain, and how important would it be to hear from those many parties that would like to speak to the issue that President McConnell mentioned.

Pedros-Gascon: In favor of any sort of follow-up, feels it is extremely important. Would discourage too many people on the platform. Suggested a moderator from Faculty Council.

Makela: Asked: Do we want to be listened to, or do we want to hear from them?

Chair Doe: Thinks there are many faculty voices that haven't been heard. Faculty members are varied, hearing from more could be helpful, even if there is some repetition.

Sarason: Noted in the chat that faculty want to be heard, not sure a special meeting will do this.

Chair Doe: Asked Yolanda to elaborate on her comments in the chat.

Ssarason: New to Executive Committee, viewing from a newbie's perspective. Would have a lot of questions if a new meeting was called. Feel we are inundated with information. Maybe just addressing the four recommendations, what can or can't be done, discuss the concerns trying to be addressed by the recommendations.

President McConnell: Hard to find exactly the right forum. Virtual format is not as easy as showing up in person. One of the things that is really difficult during this pandemic and our response, even separate from athletics, is that things can change in 24 hours. Discussed option of having a report at every meeting. When things are changing so quickly, having five minutes on each agenda would be helpful as we go forward into the next semester.

Chair Doe: Accepted President McConnell's offer to give a report at each meeting, actually on agenda for next week. Noted that the large meetings happen only once a month, but feels it would still be valuable.

Vice Provost Susan James: Commented in the chat that a special meeting of Faculty Council would allow faculty to be heard. Would recommend wide advertising of the special meeting to all faculty and why it is being called so suddenly, because of the football game on November 5th. Could ask President McConnell and team to start with succinct, direct answers to the four recommendations posed by Chair Doe, distilled from the meeting with Erica and Judy, and then open it up to questions from the faculty.

Chair Doe: Expanded on Vice Provost James' comments in the chat. Moments of value in just hearing. We are interested in what all of the stakeholders feel in this moment, everyone is very committed. Part of the issue is a willingness to hear what faculty are concerned about. Feels that

if faculty are heard and valued, it is so important. Would like to also hear comments on the recommendations, but also open it up to questions and concerns of faculty.

Pedros-Gascon: Commented in the chat that is both about being heard, but also feeling that the questions are being presented are responded and addressed clearly.

Sybil Sharvelle: Suggested in the chat that we may want to consider limiting time for asking a question to one minute, so that questions are succinct.

President McConnell: Suggested having members from athletics attend so faculty can hear from them directly.

Sarason: Asked in the chat: What about being moderated by a mediator?

President McConnell: Suggested Martine Carcassonne as a moderator.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concerns about this, because sometimes mediators don't want to transmit challenging questions.

President McConnell: Asked: Would Chair Doe be able to moderate?

Chair Doe: Could be possible, may not be the best person for that. If it needs to be from Faculty Council, can go in that direction.

Vice Provost James: Noted in the chat that Chair Doe would be a great moderator, but understands hesitation. Suggested Tim Gallagher.

Makela: Suggested in the chat that it could be co-moderators.

Jennifer Peel: Asked in the chat: Should we check in with Erica and Judy about the time/day?

Sarason: Asked in the chat: Maybe questions can be submitted ahead of time?

Chair Doe: Stated in the chat that the special meeting will tentatively be on Monday, November 2nd from 4:00pm to 6:00pm. Questions submitted ahead of time. Stated that they will check with Erica and Judy on the time.

2. Board of Governors Report – Stephanie Clemons

Clemons: Gave report last week. Nothing has changed. Only note is that the Board of Governors will be meeting only one day in December, on December 3rd, over Zoom.

F. Discussion Items

G. Faculty Presentations

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

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