

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, September 22, 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: Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Steve Reising, Chair Committee on Faculty Governance; Leo Vijayasarathy, Committee on Faculty Governance; Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee

Absent: none

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

Chair Doe: Welcomed everyone to the meeting. We will head right into the announcements.

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 – 3:00pm
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 22, 2020 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – September 15, 2020

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on September 29, 2020 on Microsoft Teams – 3:00pm.

Chair Doe: The next Executive Committee meeting will be the same bat time, same bat channel. Had questions about anonymity when using Polly, would like to have Amy speak to this for just a moment.

Amy Barkley: Reported that you can choose to not share the results with the audience, and that there's an anonymous voting option. Would be able to see the results and who is voting as creator. Members would be able to see the numbers either way, but not who voted each way.

Chair Doe: Sounds like a pretty good solution. Can see how this goes and if we bump into more issues with it, we will solve those problems as we come to them. Thank you, Amy, for continuing to look into that.

Chair Doe: Want to bring to your attention that our Provost has a standing meeting every Tuesday afternoon at 4:00 p.m., so we may need to change the order of our agenda a little bit so we make sure to have plenty of time for her to give her report. Asked: Is there any objection to moving the Provost up in the agenda for future meetings? Might be challenging for the actual Faculty Council meetings, not so much the Executive Committee meetings. Getting text and chat messages to suggest this isn't really a problem. Had originally moved the reports to the end of the meeting to not lose time in giving reports. This will stay the same for Faculty Council meetings. We will move up the reports in Executive Committee meetings to accommodate the Provost's schedule. Approved by Executive Committee members.

B. *Old Business*

C. *Action Items*

1. Motion for Graduate Positions on Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising

Chair Doe: Asked: Is Leo or Steve here to make this motion? Stephanie, can you make this motion?

Stephanie Clemons: Would like to make a motion on the graduate student representatives presented here.

Chair Doe: You will see the names. There are not graduate members yet for some committees, but there are some listed here. They have been invited to participate in these committees with our approval. Thanked Stephanie for the motion.

Linda Meyers: Second.

Tim Gallagher: Believes motion needs to be placed on the October Faculty Council agenda as an action item, not for Executive Committee to approve these names.

Chair Doe: Motion passed. Will appear on the Faculty Council agenda for October 6th. Names will appear and we will take it from there.

2. UCC Minutes – September 11, 2020

Chair Doe: Brad Goetz has brought us the UCC Minutes from September 11th. Asked: Is there any discussion or questions? Hearing none, can we have a motion?

Melinda Smith: Moved.

David Koons & Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Second.

Chair Doe: Asked for yays and nays to appear in the chat.

Motion approved. Minutes will appear on the October 6th Faculty Council agenda.

3. Title Change to All-University Core Curriculum (AUCC) Category 1C – University Curriculum Committee – Brad Goetz, Chair

Chair Doe: Next item is also for Brad from the University Curriculum Committee. Asked Brad to speak about this item.

Brad Goetz: This proposal would change the name of the new 1C Category that Faculty Council approved a while back. Used to have a long and cumbersome title, proposing to change that title to be in accordance with the current topics, which are intermediate writing and quantitative reasoning. Becomes shorter, less cumbersome, but still the major topics of the category. Important to note that the category title is not necessarily the title of all the courses that fall into that category. This proposal is to shorten it from Self, Community, World: Dialogue About Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

Chair Doe: Thanked Brad. Asked: Can we make a motion and then have any questions or discussion?

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Yolanda Sarason: Second.

Chair Doe: Asked: Any questions?

Pedros-Gascon: The category may be really counterproductive to some of the courses and practices already in place, trying to teach diversity in many departments that are currently being taught. Should expect some kind of engagement regarding those questions.

Chair Doe: Thank you, Antonio. Interesting since the motion, the proposal, is really just about a change in title. Can see what you are saying, could engender another discussion about the content of the entire shift. Asked: Any other questions, or Brad, any comments on that?

Goetz: You're right, this is only asking to change the title. This wouldn't restrict them from teaching their classes, and don't think there would be any restriction from them proposing their classes as a Category 1.

Pedros-Gascon: Appreciated explanation. The biggest concern was how restrictive or specific was going to be the descriptor applied. The way in which it was described could be a counter to the realities of many disciplines that you are trying to teach already regarding diversity and similar topics. Do not specifically only address the US or similar issues, felt it was extremely constrained, sometimes faculty feel like it is a parochial interest for only dealing with the internal house and not the context for more global.

Chair Doe: Asked: Any other comments or questions? Concern around global issues was one of the things that animated this proposal. Concern in some quarters that this was becoming kind of a parochial concern as opposed to an emphasis upon global questions. Was part of the original concern, but probably right that just seeing the title might pull people back into that conversation even though the proposal is about the title, because the essence and substance of the changes have already been approved.

Chair Doe: Asked for Polly to vote on motion.

Motion passed. Will go on Faculty Council agenda for October 6th.

D. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: Glad to join you for a short period of time. Would really value some input on the calendar for spring quarter. Having discussions right now about the time frame. Concerned about faculty and the time frame, know everyone is fatigued. Hearing from you all would be valuable. Right now the issues we are looking at for the spring semester are the start date, do we have a spring break, and then the end date. Start date is one we could change, but lots of issues around that, mostly because of financial aid distribution for students, since it is based on the first day of class started. Would be difficult to change that date. Other discussions about

getting rid of spring break, whether to go remote after spring break, move spring break later, or replace spring break with three day weekends. Would love your thoughts and input. Asked: As far as faculty goes, what are some of the things you think would support them the most of have the least impact on workload for the faculty?

Yolanda Sarason: Have a comment on spring break. Teaching graduating seniors, asked them last spring how many were going to travel anyway, many were still going to travel. There is fatigue of students as well. Hearing a lot of “this is my last spring break before I graduate”.

Ruth Hufbauer: From the faculty perspective, we breathe a huge sigh of relief when we reach spring break. Not having a break halfway through the semester would be hard.

Provost Pedersen: Asked: What are your thoughts about shifting it further into the semester so the idea of going remote would be not as big of an impact? Thinking about the labs and courses that are extremely challenging to do remotely.

Hufbauer: Good idea, have it later just like Thanksgiving is. In-person material can be focused on in the beginning of the semester, but still have a light at the end of the tunnel before the final push before finals.

Clemons: Heard that other institutions were giving a couple days off in the beginning of October even though they also have a fall break, just to give both faculty and students a break. President McConnell has been encouraging us not to work on Fridays, but faculty are still working on Fridays, and oftentimes the weekend. Discussed fatigue of students. Heard from Jody Donavan that based on faculty or student input that the fall break is too far into the semester anyway, and that spring break works better. Have had proposals from faculty in the past that want to move fall break sooner to keep students engaged.

Provost Pedersen: Know that President McConnell is looking into going to the Board of Governors to see if she can give some extra holiday time for faculty and staff.

Pedros-Gascon: Wanted to mention what people were discussing in the chat. Need to facilitate staff with kids, need to coordinate with school districts. No matter what, we need a whole week of break. Would discourage the option of no breaks and just weekends, will be tired at a certain point, and do not feel it would be conducive.

Provost Pedersen: Kelly Long has been working with Poudre School District. They do not have plans at this time, but we have been paying attention to that. Planning a Town Hall on October 2nd, hoping to get information out tomorrow about that, date has been shifting. We will discuss the research and date, testing, wastewater. Something we can look at while looking at spring semester. May need to do extensive testing as people come back.

Pedros-Gascon: Have received a few emails from faculty about COVID. Will read you the main questions that were sent. Asked: Could the faculty please be provided with more information about when they will and will not be notified about positive cases among their students? Also, could faculty please be provided with more information about guidance provided by CSU Public

Health Team and Larimer County Public Health regarding circumstances that would call for a change in modality? And if department heads or these teams deny faculty members' requests to change modality, would there be a process available to have that decision overturned?

Provost Pedersen: Had a notification that was supposed to go out yesterday, may still be being edited. Should have information about when faculty will be contacted with regards to positive cases, should go out soon. Second question is tough, one we have been struggling with. Trying to define parameters for that with the Larimer County Public Health Team. Work in progress. Will explore the third question, start to pursue this.

Clemons: Asked: Can faculty request a student that has indicated that they have tested positive for such documentation in order to waive participation or attendance?

Provost Pedersen: Brought this up with the pandemic team, how faculty can get some type of verification. They said the case manager would be the person to go to, they work in student affairs and are the ones supposed to be working directly with every student who is positive to make sure they are getting their class materials. Guidance was to have faculty contact the case managers. Not sure who to call, but case managers have complete list of all positive students.

Chair Doe: Asked: Would that involve not only just the students who test positive but the students who are quarantined?

Provost Pedersen: Really good question. Quarantine students are also getting support from case managers, so case manager should have both lists. Will verify this.

Pedros-Gascon: Have several emails, this is the second one. Read that a student had tested positive, informed the instructors, filled out the symptom checker and informed CSU. Instructor called health office two days after the student tested positive, pandemic team did not know anything about the case. Asked: How do we know if the student who has tested has informed CSU, and can we make sure they have informed CSU? And how do we know if the pandemic team is following through?

Provost Pedersen: Have actually addressed this situation in the letter we wrote, have had this come up a couple of times now. Students are testing outside of the CSU Public Health, and students are putting down an address. Now asking specifically if students are CSU students. Information going into different databases.

Pedros-Gascon: Seemed like a lack of internal communication, student had informed CSU and filled out symptom tracker.

Provost Pedersen: Not sure of window of symptom checker. Trying to get all within a 24-hour window, but sure there are a few that have fallen outside the window if they take a little bit longer.

Chair Doe: Asked: We want to be conscious of your time, can we leave you with three items that we can come back to?

Provost Pedersen: Yes.

Chair Doe: 1) Would like to know about census numbers, enrollment numbers. Maybe a little bit more fine-grained, would be helpful.

2) Also want to begin conversations addressing Colorado budget, maybe at Faculty Council meeting. Not sure what things will look like, possibly discuss this at Executive Committee next week.

3) Third thing is that there are a number of concerns around athletics. There are articles that everyone has access to. Have not heard any responses to some of the breaking news that we are reading. Almost certainly there will be questions at Faculty Council.

Clemons: Want to also address shared governance. Had addressed that at a previous meeting with your experiences and definition, thinks Faculty Council would benefit from hearing those.

Vice Provost Susan James: Wanted to run something by this group quickly. Many sabbaticals last year and this year have been interrupted. We wanted to send information out to people about how to deal with that. Was looking in the Manual, and there is already a provision to take sabbatical in two or three different time periods. Thinking we could simply communicate to faculty that if they want to complete their sabbatical post-pandemic that they can request that and apply for the remaining time left on their sabbatical. We want to create a process for this to happen. Wanted to run this by Executive Committee because we do oversee the Manual and sabbaticals.

Jennifer Peel: Noted that some people's sabbaticals were disrupted, may not have accomplished what they wanted to. Some may need to start over in order to attain sabbatical goals.

Vice Provost James: We will try to be flexible. There are state laws that govern how often someone can take a sabbatical, so need to abide by these. Want to make a process so people can tell us what happened and then look at each case individually.

Clemons: Curious about support to cover people's workloads. Know some that were denied due to workload concerns. Asked: Will there be any support from administration financially to offset that with faculty retiring?

Vice Provost James: That is probably a Mary question. Would have to prioritize the needs relative to other needs.

Clemons: Would like to see a degree of transparency around that so people understand the decision.

2. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Attended the National Faculty Senate Conference, as well as Stephanie. There were over 100 faculty senators or chairs attended on Friday or Saturday. This was their first real conference, may do this more and more. In the future, if anyone is interested, believes any one of

us could attend. Was not taxing time-wise, two major keynote presentations and breakout groups to discuss issues that came from keynote speakers. Took a great deal from the conference, really practical things. Having tools that senates can share, discussed a shared governance survey that could go out to faculty regarding how they feel they are doing as far as participation in shared governance. We have a task force on this, Carole Makela and Lisa Langstraat are leading this task force.

Chair Doe: Breakout group was called “Workload in the Time of COVID”, discussed how people’s work has changed since March. Changes in service load, teaching load, the variety of ways courses are being delivered, and the sense of not being as involved in decision-making as they would like to be. Will be making a document of workload changes, want to create a national picture. Want to address the narrative that faculty are tired and not effective, want to show that students are getting a good product and teachers have pivoted effectively. Struck by what other campuses are doing to shine a light on the good work of people. Some senates reaching beyond faculty groups and creating resolutions of support for certain entities on campus that have really stood up during this period. Heard about one that was for IT, could imagine one for custodial staff. Doesn’t have to be all about faculty.

Chair Doe: Task forces are now all operational. IT work is ongoing, also the intellectual property task force. Brandon Bernier and a number of faculty involved with IT task force, will probably eventually link with intellectual property task force. Carole Makela is leading shared governance task force, Antonio is taking the lead on Presidential evaluation task force, and the diversity, equity, and inclusion task force that I have been working on with Stephanie Clemons, Ruth Hufbauer, and Susan James. All are off and running.

Chair Doe: Attended the Committee on Libraries meeting today. Having some challenges due to Elsevier database. Want to invite them to give a report to this committee, enormous implications for faculty. Need to make some hard decisions and do some negotiations.

Chair Doe: Stephanie and I have drafted a letter to the Board of Governors to invite them to our Faculty Council meetings. That is moving forward.

Clemons: Each will get an individual invitation.

3. Board of Governors Report – Stephanie Clemons

Stephanie Clemons: Board of Governors meeting is coming up on October 8th. No information on that meeting yet, will get the packets two weeks out.

Clemons: Sue and I both attended the National Faculty Senate Conference 2020. Was only able to attend Friday, Sue attended both days. Wanted to share some thoughts. Breakout sessions and keynote speakers had some interesting thoughts. They started off by asking what common challenges are at each institution, trying to find some commonality. They also asked us how we handle faculty morale given the faculty fatigue that is so common in the nation, how are we getting our students to obey the protocols at your institutions, and how many of us were online

versus face-to-face versus hybrid? Mentioned a few differences seen at different institutions that were attending the conference. Felt our institution with reserve funds being used to handle pandemic expenses, not taking any furloughs, and the Rams Take Care program, our university looked pretty well positioned compared to what else was happening at other institutions around the nation.

Clemons: Also discussed several other issues. Discussed the meaning of shared governance. There was commonality that faculty were not as involved in some decisions, our institution was not atypical in that regard. Quoted the definition of shared governance as “meaningful participation of the faculty in institutional decision-making”. Also discussed intellectual property, many institutions are thinking about this. Working with Tim Gallagher and Paul Dougherty on intellectual property issues specific to faculty teaching materials that are being uploaded to CSU Online or Canvas. The AAUP has links to types of questions to evaluate administrators, could be offered to the Board of Governors. Working with Antonio to bring forward a proposal on how to modify our gathering of data to offer input to the Board of Governors on our President’s annual evaluation.

E. Discussion Items

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

Chair Doe: We have invited the Committee on Faculty Governance to come and discuss their position on this discussion. We have invited Steve Reising and Leo Vijayasarathy to discuss this.

Steve Reising: Thanked Executive Committee for letting them come discuss. Had a short presentation.

Leo Vijayasarathy: Took over after some technical difficulties. Discussed the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty’s proposal. Discussed pros and cons of changing the code in Section C.2.1.3.1. Noted there were some definite benefits of the proposed changes, but also some downsides. Wanted to discuss some ripple effects, and to have us think about what those might be more clearly. Discussed a few questions for Executive Committee to consider:

- Will our role in shared governance be weakened? Non-tenure track faculty have less job security than tenured faculty.
- Will non-tenure track faculty be able to state their opinion?
- How many of us really have resources to fight a legal battle as an individual?
- Would non-tenure track faculty as chair or vice-chair be able to negotiate with the administration?
- This is a sweeping change—if it doesn’t work out, could we reverse it?

Vijayasarathy: Discussed where the Committee on Faculty Governance was on this proposal. Thinking through all the implications. Looking at non-tenure track and tenure track ratios across campus and how this will affect representation. Addressed concern that non-tenure track faculty and tenure track faculty have different interests across the different units around campus. Asked:

How will this change the membership and apportionment since some colleges have more non-tenure track faculty than other colleges. Noted that other changes may happen across the Faculty Manual that would have to be addressed.

Reising: A draft letter to department heads and Faculty Council has been written. Discussed how Faculty Council membership is determined, including at-large members, and what the changes would be in representation.

Vijayarathy: Charge of the Committee on Faculty governance is not just to recommend code changes, but also to interpret the code. Sort of in a bind. Asked: Do they pass this along, or get more consensus first from all departments?

Pedros-Gascon: Appreciated seeing all the numbers. Spoke in favor of the change. Stated we should be able to ask this institution to commit to a minimum percentage of tenure track lines in departments. Could have a maximum non-tenure track faculty number that could vote, for example.

Carole Makela: Sees fairness in representation of non-tenure track faculty. Asked: What are implications when issues and actions related to tenure policies are brought to Faculty Council?

Reising: Appreciated thoughts an input. Consider separate meetings for non-tenure and tenure track issues and how could voting be limited based on tenure status.

Tim Gallagher: Reminded Executive Committee that it is not their responsibility to vote, just whether or not this is ready to be considered as a discussion item. Want a solid process and then letting the full Faculty Council decide.

Vice Provost James: Shared governance is one of the things on our to-do list. Have a task force, various representatives from Faculty Council and faculty in general on task force. Say that in case we can help in any way.

Chair Doe: Having discussion on the floor does not nullify the work of a task force, hopefully the task force would weigh in with their insights and discuss certain issues if it did get onto the floor as a discussion. Think they are very complementary and not exclusive at all.

Vice Provost James: We will keep up with where Faculty Council is on shared governance.

Chair Doe: Thanked Leo and Steve for the presentation. Thankful to hear from both Committee on Faculty Governance as well as the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. Asked: are we ready to see this as a discussion item or should we return to this next week rather than trying to make this decision right now?

Makela: Thinks we are ready to see it as a discussion item. Some issues may not have answers at this time, and these may need more thinking and consideration.

Sarason: Would like to wait until next week to get input from colleagues in College of Business.

Hufbauer: Would like to have a discussion at Faculty Council, but agree with Carole that it would be good to put some parameters around it. Would be worthwhile to have initial discussion at Faculty Council, then delve further at later meetings.

Chair Doe: Asked: Are there any objections to further this discussion next week, setting parameters for the discussion?

No objections raised. Will resume this as a discussion item for the September 29th Executive Committee meeting.

Chair Doe: We will come back to this next week, set parameters for discussion in order to bring this to the floor. Asked: Any other issues for the good of the group?

F. Faculty Presentations

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

Clemons: Moved.

Pedros-Gascon & Smith: Second.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

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