

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, September 15, 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; 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

Guests: Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Jenny Morse, Chair, Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty; Steve Benoit, Vice Chair, Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty; Benjamin Withers, Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Absent: none

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

Chair Doe: We have a busy schedule today and will give you a synopsis of it in a minute, but want to head right into meeting and have us take a look at the minutes and go ahead and get them approved if we can.

October 6, 2020 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – October 6, 2020 – Microsoft Teams - 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Welcome new Vice Chair Ruth Hufbauer
2. Next Faculty Council Meeting – November 10, 2020 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm
3. Confirmation of Faculty Council Registered Parliamentarian ---
Lola Fehr
4. Confirmation of Faculty Council Executive Assistant – Amy Barkley

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting – September 1, 2020
2. Executive Committee Meeting – September 8, 2020

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Return to postponed discussion on Committee Annual Reports
 1. Faculty Council Standing Committee 2019-2020 Annual Reports
 - a. Faculty Council Report to the Board of Governors
 - b. Committee on Faculty Governance
 - c. Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
 - d. Committee on Libraries (**pending**)
 - e. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty
 - f. Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty
 - g. Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education
 - h. Committee on Scholastic Standards
 - i. Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning
 - j. Committee on Teaching and Learning
 - k. Committee on University Programs
 - l. University Curriculum Committee

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – August 28, 2020
2. UCC Minutes – September 4, 2020

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin: The Advisory System* – Committee on Research, Scholarship, and Graduate Education, Melinda Smith, Chair
2. Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Inter-University Graduate Programs* – Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education – Melinda Smith, Chair

F. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

- a. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen
- b. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe
- c. Board of Governors Report – Stephanie Clemons

G. DISCUSSION

H. FACULTY LIGHTNING ROUND PRESENTATIONS

SEPTEMBER 15, 2020 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes—September 8, 2020

B. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – September 1, 2020

Chair Doe: Asked: Are there any corrections to the minutes from the Executive Committee meeting of September 8th? What about the Faculty Council meeting minutes of September 1st? Are there any corrections to be made to those?

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent. Moved on to announcements.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Welcome new Vice Chair Ruth Hufbauer

Chair Doe: Was remiss and did not introduce our new Vice Chair, Ruth Hufbauer, to our ranks. Delighted to have her here. Ruth was elected in the special election we had on September 1st.

Ruth Hufbauer: Thanked Chair Doe.

2. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on September 22, 2020 on Microsoft Teams – 3:00pm.

Chair Doe: Want to announce that our next Executive Committee meeting will be next Tuesday, our usual time of 3:00 p.m. Steve Reising will be joining us to discuss the governance proposals they have had from the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty in front of the Committee of Faculty Governance since last December. We will be hearing from Steve Benoit and Jenny Morse today. They will talk to us a little bit about those proposals. Jenny has a commitment until 4:00 p.m., so Steve will be holding down the fort until Jenny can join us.

Chair Doe: Have placed in the chat all of the task forces that are up and running. Thanked those Executive Committee members that have been kind enough to step up and be involved in those task forces. There is one other task force that does not have an Executive Committee member on it is the IT task force. Am on that task force, and it's already become an almost unwieldy size, so think we are okay there. Encouraged members to take a look at those task forces and to let her know if any of them are of interest. Would be delighted to have you involved if you have the expertise or desire to be involved.

Chair Doe: We will be trying the Polly polling system for voting today. Has seen it used in other meetings, want to see if we can pull it off.

Chair Doe: Was on an Executive Leadership Team meeting yesterday, learned a couple things. Don't think either of them will be surprising. Colorado State University students are being amazingly compliant with requests being made of them regarding face coverings, social distancing, no parties. Watching the COVID dashboard, the cumulative total since May 21st is 189 cases, which includes faculty, staff, and students. Analysis over the recent data is that there is between one and eight new cases per day over the past week. Much lower than anyone predicted. Things going well. Enrollment holding pretty steady.

B. Old Business

C. Action Items

1. Review of "Prioritization of Courses and Action in Case of Covid Spike" – Teaching Continuity Committee. **The Teaching Continuity Committee requests the Executive Committee's prompt review of this time sensitive document which they are working on but may not be distributed until just prior to the Executive Committee meeting.**
2. Teaching Continuity Information for Executive Committee Review

Chair Doe: Dean Withers is bringing a document which was shared from the Teaching Continuity Committee. The Committee has determined this document requires some narration and is being presented in front of a few groups, including us. Invited Dean Withers to speak to this document.

Dean Ben Withers: Thanked everyone for the opportunity. Glad to be here, important that we share these kinds of documents with this group and others across campus so that people are broadly informed and we get the input that we need.

Dean Withers: To provide some context, the Teaching and Learning Community Task Force has been in existence since back in April and was put together by the President and then-Provost Rick Miranda. Was charged with getting the classroom environment ready for the fall. Joined the committee with my fellow deans Jan Nerger from Natural Sciences and Lise Youngblade from Health and Human Sciences. Recently have added Beth Walker from Business. Have had Sue Doe join us over the process of summer, been great to have her and her perspective. Now looking towards spring.

Dean Withers: The document we are looking at was put together by the Teaching Continuity Committee at the request of the Pandemic Planning Team, which is the President's overarching task force. Was at their request so that the campus could be prepared in various scenarios if we were to see spikes across campus. Have been fortunate with a relatively compliant student body. Thinks our students have been much more community minded than what we have seen in other campuses. Incidents of transmission have been relatively low. Have not seen any transmission cases from classrooms. Faculty doing great job of maintaining protocols. Isolated incidents of

people not wearing masks, but have complied once being asked. Everyone is doing their job. This document we put together is a guideline, a recommendation, that will go to the President should we see a sudden spike campus-wide in transmission. Document outlines a couple options to make sure we are prepared on the academic side so we maintain academic excellence and the mission standards of the University.

Dean Withers: There are three options outlined:

- 1) If relatively modest spike, keep lab and studio courses on campus—courses that are difficult or impossible to conduct in an online environment.
- 2) If it is a moderate spike, everything online for 14 days—essentially quarantine everyone on campus.
- 3) What would happen if we needed to go completely online.

Will not go through rest of the document, feels it is relatively self-explanatory. Would love to have feedback to take back to the Committee and share with the President and Provost.

Jennifer Peel: Expressed appreciation for this document and all the effort that went into it. Had a couple of questions in terms if the public health team at CSU was involved in creating this. Also wondered if there were definitions in mind in terms of mild, moderate, and severe spikes to clearly define what those mean.

Dean Withers: To answer first part, yes, the public health folks have been involved in our discussions. They are part of the 4:00 p.m. meeting that the President convenes every day. Kelly Long and I are members, represent the academic side. Have tried to avoid any algorithmic approach due to so many different variables, haven't looked at a certain number. Considering other types of conditions that are involved, particularly with the community. Low percentage of cases in Larimer county are coming from CSU compared to CU in Boulder county. Looking at impact in terms of community and what would be the impact of making certain decisions based on that broader view. Does that help you?

Peel: Hard to look at this not taking in the context of the community. We do not live separately from the community and the students don't either. Thinks this is all great. Being in public health, ecstatic to see our numbers, but would caution that everything is inching up right now. Looking at the longer-term trends. Thinks this is wonderful to have in place because it may come into play soon.

Dean Withers: We want to obviously hope for the best and make sure we are doing everything that we can to tamp down transmission, to do the health protocols in the classrooms, to do the testing, but we also need to be prepared for worst case scenarios or middle case scenarios. Will take document to the President and communicate that based on what we are hearing from public health professionals, here are options short of taking everything remote. Allows for teaching continuity.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Asked: What is the protocol for communicating to faculty and students? Will we receive a Central Administration or will it be transmitted by Dean's and/or chairs?

Dean Withers: Those would come directly from the President and from the Provost, but it would be incumbent on them to share that message across campus just like we did in March.

Chair Doe: Want to probe this group a little but to see if they can look at the levels of phasing and just to see if they have any responses. If we start at bottom, phase 4 and everything is closed. Then phase 3, all undergraduate and graduate courses go remote. Then phase 2, all undergraduate courses go remote, but graduate courses remain on campus. Want to ponder this for a moment. Asked: Does that concern you at all? Does that seem as if some faculty would be exposed and others wouldn't? Can you imagine a scenario in which this could create greater concern among some groups rather than others? Just trying to probe a little bit to see if that was thought through. And then phase one, some degree of outbreak, in-person undergraduate courses are going remote except for first year seminars, 100 level courses, and graduate courses. Asked: Does anything about that concern you, or do you think it should concern us?

Pedros-Gascon: Does not have an issue with this, feels faculty will speak out if they feel they are taking unnecessary risks. Understanding also that people may have specific needs, will depend on very personal things that people may decide to engage in one way or another.

David Koons: Thanked Dean Withers for this document. Appreciative of the efforts to limit the disturbance in the planning for both student and faculty members. Encouraged everyone to look again at option 2, quarantine and then back to classes. Concerned that switching back and forth between off-campus and on-campus among courses might cause a bigger disruption and could lead to a lower quality. Want to think about this in the context beyond a single course.

Dean Withers: The intention there is that all courses in that option would go remote if we were to see a widespread outbreak. There would be no exceptions to the quarantine period, so that is the intention on this document.

Chair Doe: Asked: Jennifer, did you have another question?

Peel: Yes. Wondered why all undergraduate courses were lumped together, and why graduate courses remain in person even as undergraduate goes remote.

Dean Withers: Graduate students tend to be older and more mature academically. Received feedback in the spring that graduate students should be able to meet with small classes and mentors. Other universities are doing this similarly, as there's so little evidence of classroom transmission. Felt we could rely on professional and academic maturity of graduate students to keep cases down. Some degree of confidence that they are doing the correct things in the classroom, including those in small lab environments.

Chair Doe: Asked: Across the country, isn't it right that a lot of graduate programs have determined they will stay open while their undergraduates go remote?

Dean Withers: Yes, that is correct. University of North Carolina Chapel Hill is a good example of that. Got a lot of press for starting in a face to face hybrid modality. After the first two days of

classes, took all undergraduate courses remote, but kept their graduate and professional programs with the ability to meet face to face.

Peel: Can see how you would want to leave the option for programs or courses to make that case. Will also point out that many schools of public health are online, as are their graduate programs.

Dean Withers: Can adjust wording a little bit on that to make it clear what we're doing is that we're telling the University to give folks that option. Would not want to have it done on just the individual level, needs to be in consultation with Department chairs and we need to think about the needs of the student. Basically saying that the University is willing to see graduate programs continue in that environment as opposed to just making the blanket statement that everyone goes.

Peel: Yes, could be something along the lines that you have to show you have a plan and justification for doing so.

Dean Withers: Again, this document provides that scaffolding, there are going to be a lot of things that would have to be followed up on. This document doesn't go into those details, it just provides the scaffolding for decision-making, and then we would have to get to work to put all those details into place.

Chair Doe: Asked: Any other questions? Thanked Dean Withers for bringing the document, hoped this was helpful feedback for the committee. Asked: Any further questions?

Dean Withers: Stephanie raised her hand.

Stephanie Clemons: Thanked Dean Withers for the presentation and for being interested in hearing feedback from us. Was wondering whether it having some type of polling device with Faculty Council members where a question like this could go out where there might be comments from certain departments that could give you additional information related to these levels. Would be hesitant to put a "yes" when not aware of impact on specific departments. Might be too much feedback or too granular, but possible one or two issues that are brought forward that may change when they consider "moderate" to.

Dean Withers: Welcome to input, plan is to share this broadly. Discussing this with graduate students, any time we can get useful input. Our goal is to present this to the President and hope they find it helpful. We can filter for more information. Will leave it up to this committee how best to poll Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Thanked Dean Withers. Welcomed him to stay if he wanted.

3. UCC Minutes – September 4, 2020

Chair Doe: Next up we have our University Curriculum Committee minutes. Asked: Can we make a motion to move on this?

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Clemons: Second.

Chair Doe: We are going to use Polly. Asked: Any comments on these minutes while we wait for Amy to get that set up?

Brad Goetz: No, these ones are pretty straightforward. Do have a special action item coming to you for next week.

Minutes approved unanimously.

4. Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin*: The Advisory System – Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education – Melinda Smith, Chair

Chair Doe: We will move to Melinda Smith to discuss this action item, changes to the Graduate Professional Bulletin regarding the Advisory System. Asked: Melinda, would you like to speak to this?

Melinda Smith: Can give you a little bit of background. Just updating language so that because of the change in titles that have occurred for faculty, both tenure track and non-tenure track. Much more inclusive now, which is great. Asked: Can I make a motion? Move that Executive Committee approves this for consideration for Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Clarified that we were just looking at the first one of the two. Asked: Is there any discussion?

Pedros-Gascon: Believe it's more inclusive and like the fact that it relies on departments to make that kind of decision. Thinks it is a very good decision.

Chair Doe: Thank you. Asked: Amy, do you want to put a Polly poll up there? Is everyone seeing it? We have votes occurring.

Clemons: That's for only the first one, correct?

Chair Doe: Correct.

Clemons: Okay, so we may just want to make those Polly polls a bit more specific.

Approved unanimously. Will be placed on agenda for Faculty Council meeting on October 6th, 2020.

5. Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin*: Inter-University Graduate Programs – Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education – Melinda Smith, Chair

Chair Doe: Asked: Melinda, would you like to speak to the second one?

Smith: Reported that CU backed out of the agreement, so it no longer makes sense to have this in the Bulletin. Unfortunately, now students will have to pay to take courses from CU.

Chair Doe: Had one question about this. Asked: Does this whole section just go away? Is that the way I am reading it?

Smith: Yes, because it's pretty much null and void.

Clemons: Asked: Melinda, how long has this been in place for? I mean, when has this gone away? Basically five years ago, ten years ago, or just last year?

Smith: Last year. Talked to Dean Stromberger during our discussions, was pretty clear that this was really under subscribed. Not many students actually do this, but now if they want to, they're going to have to pay tuition rather than having these courses available for free.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked: Would they have to pay full tuition or the equivalent in credits would be paid by CSU?

Smith: No, they would have to pay whatever tuition CU would charge.

Pedros-Gascon: Thank you, that was my understanding.

Smith: So it would be arguably discouraging for students to do that.

Smith: Motion to have this approved by Executive Committee for review by Faculty Council.

Koons: Second.

Chair Doe: Asked: Are we ready for a vote? We are looking at the second one, the Inter-University Graduate Programs.

Linda Meyer: While we are voting, have a question about the Polly. Asked: Is there a chance we could try out the anonymous version today too so that when we have a vote we don't want everybody to see how we voted?

Chair Doe: Yes, and that is an interesting question. For this group, it's really not an issue, but interesting piece of this when we get the big Faculty Council going. We have a lot of guests. Doesn't think people are knowingly voting when they shouldn't, just sometimes people don't know whether they should be voting or not. Can try the anonymous way out today. Need to give this a little bit of thought, different when we get a big group going.

Meyer: Wonders if there is an option where the folks who are conducting the election can see who the people are that are voting but that everyone else can't necessarily see how people voted.

Barkley: Did not see a way to make it completely anonymous, but will do more research to figure out how this works. Will try the anonymous function on any further motions or votes we do today.

Pedros-Gascon: Liked the way we voted for Vice Chair. Took a little time but worked fine. Identities were protected. Had to be careful that only those given voting rights were able to cast votes.

Tim Gallagher: Noted in the chat that Polly has an option under results settings to not share with audience.

Approved unanimously. Will go on agenda for Faculty Council meeting on October 6th, 2020.

D. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Chair Doe: Asked: Sue James, will you be giving a report since Mary is not here?

Vice Provost Susan James: Was not provided a report by Provost Pedersen, but do have some comments.

Vice Provost James: Clarified the tenure extension for untenured faculty. This holds not just for people going up this year, but for anyone pre-tenure, including new hires. There was a bit of confusion in the Council of Deans of who this applied to. Reason to bring it up here was that the tenure process is under the purview of the Faculty Council and Manual, but this kind of situation is just not addressed in the manual. Wanted to make sure Executive Committee was aware of this and if there are any concerns or suggestions, we want to hear about it.

Gallagher: Wanted to speak to this. Manual has some specific language related to this as Sue James pointed out. The Provost office has occasionally made some changes to the way that's done, but always in a way that's more permissive for the faculty member. So long as there's no harm to the faculty member, this has come to be accepted as something that is not in conflict at all with faculty interests or with the policies in the Manual.

Vice Provost James: That makes a lot of sense, Tim. Asked: Anybody else have comments on that?

Pedros-Gascon: Thinking more about also the impact that this may have on sabbaticals and research. Hope there can be some kind of leniency, approving of those who may even decide to postpone.

Vice Provost James: Yes, this question came up for those who have had to postpone their sabbatical. Will likely have a permissive approach to this, if someone was not able to take a sabbatical due to the pandemic, will not have to wait another seven years to apply. Will make sure we communicate out to campus about that.

Chair Doe: It looks like both Jennifer Peel and Stephanie Clemons have questions. Asked: Jennifer, you want to go first?

Peel: Just would like to say I think it's important to keep this in place. Think it's very important for junior faculty to have this option as long as it continues to be an option that they don't have to take it. Important to include new hires, definitely support it.

Chair Doe: Sounds like it is all in the messaging. Can't imagine how terrifying this moment would be if I was newly hired. Messaging seems to be really important and needs to be broadly distributed.

Vice Provost James: The Provost will be sending out a letter on behalf of the Committee of Gender Equity on the needs of equity and flexibility during this time of COVID. We know this is not normal times.

Chair Doe: I think Stephanie had a question.

Clemons: More of a comment of support, going back to the tenure clock extension. When we think of the first year of someone coming to a new culture and campus, it is a real struggle sometimes. Many different reasons to support this.

Chair Doe: Even given the strange teaching circumstances that teachers are under, having some messaging out to chairs and TMP committees about humane ways of doing observations, how they are helping people with their annual evaluations that will be contributing to their progress towards tenure.

Vice Provost James: Some folks are doing some really heavy lifting right now and they need to get credit for that. Need to get folks to recognize those sorts of things.

Pedros-Gascon: One area of concern is that there is a reduction of funding for any research for new tenure tracks, in addition to the fact that traveling is limited. Concerned about impact of 10%, 5% reductions are having specifically on those funding when it comes to colleagues on the tenure track. Hope down the line the Provost office can think of something to remedy.

Vice Provost James: One suggestion I might recommend to them is to think about a fund aimed specifically at junior faculty.

Pedros-Gascon: Problem is those are not usually very well extended. Make sure we are making those sources known so people can apply.

Vice Provost James: Thank you.

2. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Still doing Laps and Chats on Thursday afternoons. Good fortune to share time with baby William, as Amy Barkley has been joining us. We have had three or four faculty members join us so far. Basically a way to have office hours in this current moment.

Chair Doe: Continuing to work with the Teaching Continuity Committee. Also attending Executive Leadership Team and Council of Deans meetings. All working very hard. The Teaching Continuity Committee was meeting daily during the summer, is now meeting twice a week, and has now determined that they need four meetings a week. Fully into spring scheduling. We are being asked to have spring schedules ready by September 24th. A lot happening to make all of that work, will be affected by temporary work adjustments, what Poudre decides about their classes. Lot of things won't be resolved by the end of September, but we must plan. Still planning on the typical start date. No determination yet on whether or not we will have a spring break. Many other institutions are not taking spring break.

Chair Doe: Visiting all the standing committees. Have been to four or five already, scheduled for the rest of them. Also been talking consistently with the other councils, feels we have a particularly good collaboration at the moment.

3. Board of Governors Report – Stephanie Clemons

Clemons: No report at this time. The next Board of Governors meeting on October 8-9, 2020. Slated to be at CSU-Fort Collins, likely over Zoom.

Chair Doe: Thanked Stephanie. Before we go into discussion item, have lined up two faculty members for our October 6th Faculty Council meeting. Ruth Hufbauer has agreed, and D.L. Stewart from the School of Education. Trying to get a nice cross-section.

Pedros-Gascon: Had a question for Stephanie. Asked: When we will receive information about the CSU system budget? Know they had announced a 10% reduction on expenses, but would like to know how those numbers compared to the number of new hires that CSU system has hired.

Clemons: Had a question from Carole Makela about enrollment numbers for CSU Online, if the 10,000 new students were half time or full time students and they were about 50% each. Had responded to Carole directly about that, but will let everyone on Executive Committee know that. Still getting information about the system budget as well. Wanted to bring up that last year we were giving Tim different ideas for discussions and presentations, had Joe Parker of Athletics at our last Board of Governors meeting, might be interesting to invite into Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Doe: Asked: Is there a mechanism by which we could invite the Board of Governors to come to our Faculty Council meeting? Something we have discussed quite a bit.

Clemons: Thinks personal invitations via email would be best.

Chair Doe: Great, thank you so much. Will follow up with you.

E. Discussion Items

1. Return to discussion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty in shared governance

Chair Doe: Welcomed Jenny Morse and Steve Benoit. They have been kind enough to come here today to talk about the proposals they have had in front of the Committee on Faculty Governance since last fall. The Committee on Faculty Governance will join us next week, and then the Executive Committee will decide how to proceed for September 29th. Will turn it over to Jenny and Steve. Thank you for being here.

Benoit: Thankful for the committee being willing to have this discussion. Have a slideshow.

Benoit: It is all in Section C.2.1.3.1 and there are two changes that we submitted in our proposal. The first paragraph describes the people who are counted in figuring out the number of at-large representatives that each Department would get. Our proposal is that when we make that change, we make a change to include contract and continuing faculty. The second change is the second paragraph which describes who can actually serve on Faculty Council, and we have proposed making the same change there to permit contract and continuing appointment type to hold elected positions on Faculty Council, either departmental positions or at-large. Not considering adjunct in this category.

Benoit: The rationale was submitted to the Committee on Faculty Governance. The rationale for having non-tenure track faculty counted toward apportionment is that the Faculty Council is a representation body for all faculty, and that is described in a section of the code here. It makes sense that a representative body of all faculty should include those that it claims to represent. Right now we have 785 non-tenure track faculty who are being represented in Faculty Council only through their colleges and members on the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. Much lower representation that the typical faculty member has in Faculty Council.

Benoit: The rationale for the second change is that all faculty members are protected by academic freedom. Have heard arguments against stating that non-tenure track faculty are vulnerable to pressure to vote or behave a certain way. If there is an issue of pressure, bullying, or intimidation, that should be addressed directly.

Benoit: These proposals were submitted to Faculty Governance in December of 2019. Met with them in March of 2020 to discuss the proposals, Don Estep was still present. In response to his opinions at that meeting, we have submitted revisions to the motions to clarify some of the rationale and justifications and those were submitted in April. Thought we would discuss this in early fall, and then when Joseph DiVerdi self-nominated and had it called out of order due to him being ineligible, raised it as another potential discussion topic.

Benoit: Discussed potential positive impacts of the proposal being passed. Would normalize non-tenure track faculty, help move us to a “one faculty” view. Would broaden the pool of where faculty members can be chosen from, provides service opportunities, takes load off tenure track faculty colleagues. See a lot of benefits with broader representation. Discussed how at-large representatives are allocated, and his estimates for representation. Predicts 13 to 22 non-tenure

track member if this is passed based on university employee roster and how at-large are distributed right now. Most are full or associate, and if that trend continues, then probably closer to 13 members. If non-tenure track are voted in proportionally, closer to 22 members.

Benoit: Showed graph showing faculty participation trends. In 1984, “special faculty” was redefined and the number of non-tenure track and temporary faculty members has exploded. Would like to combat the sense or impression that the way things are now is normal, and what the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty is proposing is a radical change, but really they see it as a return to normal.

Jenny Morse: Appreciated visual of participation change. Thanked Steve.

Pedros-Gascon: Coming from Liberal Arts, one of the key departments, am aware of the situation and back this idea. Devil is in the details, but can be discussed. Foresee a potential problem in that the loss of at-large reps by some colleges and to Liberal Arts may take some persuasion. Another issue is the systemic situation, there might not be a lot of representation of non-tenure track faculty in colleges outside of the College of Liberal Arts. We want to create something that is transformational for the whole institution and it might end up being limited to one or two colleges.

Morse: Bring up a good point. We can decide what the limits are for that representation, for example, no more than 1/3 could be non-tenure track. Clarified that we are not advocating for adjunct faculty to be serving in these roles, but do want to count them in their numbers.

Pedros-Gascon: If my department serves as an example, non-tenure track voting has improved cordiality.

Peel: On the slide where you indicated the net change in the at-large representatives, you didn't indicate CBMVS which is the college I'm from, so was just curious does that mean no net change to the number if it was not indicated?

Benoit: Yes, if there was no change, I left it off the list.

Ruth Hufbauer: Want to second Antonio, am really in support of us moving forward with this. Think it is important to recognize that at-large folks and departmental representatives are representing non-tenure track faculty right now, just like you are proposing, adjunct should be represented. Wondering about counting of adjunct, seems odd if they are fairly temporary in the system. Like the idea of doing it proportionally, can convince folks of one faculty that that would be okay. Reluctant to not count non-tenure track folks as full faculty members and defining a 1/3 non-tenure track maximum, would rather just count. Everybody's counted the same, but that adjunct appointments aren't quite the same kind of appointment as continuing or contract. Would love your thoughts on those things.

Morse: Clarified that adjunct do not have the same service requirements, but the manual was changed so continuing and contract appointments do. Wouldn't make sense for us to impose, but

should be counted. We wouldn't ask them to serve because that's not part of their job at the University.

Benoit: Going back to Antonio's point, we need to frame it as we're not moving them to the College of Liberal Arts, we're correcting the distribution to match the actual distribution of the faculty. It's making representation for people that haven't been represented, not stealing representation away.

Tim Gallagher: Executive Committee's job is to bring things to the Faculty Council when it is ready. Don Estep kept things from moving forward last year, but now there is new membership, that might change. It is such a fundamental issue that the full faculty should decide it and discuss it.

Hufbauer: There were lots of discussions about this on Faculty Governance. What Sue has proposed is much more expedited. Vote at a later time, but discuss first.

Clemons: Asked: Steve, are you willing to share with us your slides? Would like to study the slides in the context of CSU hiring more non-tenure track. Sounds like the main argument relates to the fact that non-tenure track are more vulnerable. The part of the manual that states that Faculty Council represents all faculty is the most compelling. If Faculty Council doesn't agree with these changes, they should change that manual wording.

Benoit: Happy to share the slides. Asked: Should I send them to Sue?

Chair Doe: Yes, happy to distribute them. Carole Makela is next.

Carole Makela: Appreciated you showed the trends and the implications on the slides. Wants us to be alert to the fact that every department doesn't describe the term adjunct or use adjunct the same ways. May not be used consistently across campus. Just need to be clear.

Chair Doe: Believes when they are using the term adjunct, they are referring to the description described in the Manual.

Makela: We need to be clear then that that's the case in our discussion.

Morse: We are referring to the definition of the appointment as described in the Faculty Manual.

Chair Doe: Might be a potential point of confusion, might be hard for some people to wrap their head around.

Pedros-Gascon: Dissonance is needed. We can't always have the same ideas. Better to have real vote allocation. Recognition of dignity and many other things.

Morse: Completely agree. Forgot to add one thing, this change would also allow for non-tenure track faculty to serve as members of standing committees. The Committee on Teaching and Learning really wants non-tenure track members.

Chair Doe: Asked: Anything else?

Yolanda Sarason: New to this conversation and this discussion. Would be helpful in the argument to know what other universities are doing.

Chair Doe: In the 2016 CoNTTF proposal that was put together, they listed the best practices of 10 different institutions. Report can probably be shared with this committee. If Jenny or Steve can share it, would be happy to send it.

Pedros-Gascon: Hope after the vote you also get pay raises. Voting rights are long overdue, but down the line I hope we get more salary equity. If salaries are more competitive, then the institution would have a reason to hire more tenure track.

Clemons: Would predict that Faculty Council will be supportive, just depends on how they operationalize it.

Chair Doe: Asked: Any final comments, Steve and Jenny?

Benoit: Thanked Chair Doe for the opportunity.

Chair Doe: Thanked them both. What we are ultimately doing is determine whether or not something is ready to stand debate. Getting ideas out in front of people so they are educated about them before they come to a vote. Will talk with the Committee on Faculty Governance next time. Will discuss best ways forward. Thanked them for their contribution.

F. Faculty Presentations

Chair Doe: Asked: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Sarason: Second.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

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