

## MINUTES

Executive Committee

**Tuesday, November 17, 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; Yolanda Sarason, Business; Andrew Norton, Agricultural Sciences; 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; 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; Karen Barrett, Chair Committee on Scholastic Standards; Steve Reising, Chair Committee on Faculty Governance; Leo Vijayarathy, Committee on Faculty Governance

**Absent:** None

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

### **November 17, 2020 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

#### **I. Minutes to be Approved**

##### **A. Executive Committee Minutes – November 10, 2020**

Chair Doe: Asked: Are there any corrections to be made to these minutes? Stated that Antonio Pedros-Gascon had sent corrections prior to the meeting.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Clarified corrections in quotes on page 4, page 6, and page 12.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Asked for additional corrections.

Minutes approved by unanimous consent.

##### **B. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – November 3, 2020**

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

Minutes unanimously approved. Will be placed on the agenda for the December 1<sup>st</sup> Faculty Council meeting.

#### **II. Items Pending/Discussion Items**

### A. *Announcements*

Chair Doe: We want to acknowledge those attending the Faculty Council meeting on December 1<sup>st</sup> that it may be their last Faculty Council meeting ever, for all those retiring at the end of December. Encouraged members to invite other colleagues to attend, whether Faculty Council members or not to celebrate those retiring at the end of December. Would love to have them attend.

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on December 8, 2020 on Microsoft Teams – 3:00pm.

Chair Doe: The next Executive Committee meeting will be on December 8<sup>th</sup>, after our next Faculty Council meeting. Determined that a meeting was not needed next week, during Fall Break. Next Faculty Council meeting will be on December 1<sup>st</sup>.

2. Extended Withdrawal Period Proposal – Committee on Scholastic Standards – Karen Barrett, Chair

Karen Barrett: Chair of the Committee on Scholastic Standards, here in that capacity. Last spring, we had special policies due to COVID, largely because we went online so abruptly. Students are significantly impacted by COVID, emotional well-being and their capacity to keep up with the coursework. Decision about this semester had already been made some time ago for a number of reasons, including peer institutions not making changes to their academic guidelines. Was decided that we would not enact similar policies this fall. Committee on Scholastic Standards are now working on these issues for the spring semester. “S”’s in pre-requisite courses being potentially problematic is one reason not to have S/Us. They did not make a recommendation for S/Us, but recommended that course withdrawals could be made up until the last day of the semester, with the rationale being that student might have more problems in some classes than others because of COVID, such as being quarantined at a time that is difficult for one course, but not another, or because a course hasn’t been moved effectively into an online format.

Chair Doe: Asked: We are strictly discussing spring of 2021, not this semester, correct?

Barrett: Confirmed we were discussing spring of 2021. Noted that there is an appeal process that can be used for fall of 2020 to have a late withdrawal. Encouraged faculty members to know about this and help students to have flexibility if they need.

Chair Doe: Thanked Barrett for stepping up and leading this issue. Circumstances were evolving in the spring, some decisions were being made without involvement of crucial committees. We want to make sure that policies like this have the voice of faculty involved. Asked what Barrett would like from the Executive Committee in regards to this issue.

Barrett: Stated that it would be desirable to have some kind of a statement by the Faculty Council in support of this, could be added to the agenda for the Faculty Council meeting, to show support for taking into account the students’ needs. This semester has in some ways been difficult for

everyone, including faculty. Drastic changes were made to courses so that quarantined students could still succeed in the class, which caused a lot of extra work for faculty. On the other hand, some faculty did not make those changes and that caused real problems for the students. No correct answer to problem, so having that flexibility would be desirable.

Chair Doe: Noted that we could have a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for December 1<sup>st</sup>. Asked members to consider this.

President Joyce McConnell: Asked Barrett who made the decision not to extend the S/U and withdrawal decision in the fall. Want to find locus of decision so we can discuss it.

Barrett: Believes the decision was made by the Teaching Continuity Committee.

Chair Doe: Reported that it was completely driven by the timeline. Stated that it was about seven to eight weeks into the semester, and a decision needed to be made quickly. The Teaching Continuity Committee went out and reviewed what other universities were doing, and it became clear that S/U was not being utilized by peer institutions for this semester. Second factor was complications for the Registrar's Office, was going to be difficult for them.

Andrew Norton: Have examples of what Barrett mentioned and more in my class. Receiving daily emails about their grades, can they get an S/U. Doesn't know the answer to these questions. Feels it would be helpful if Kelly Long sent out an email with guidelines for what students can do.

Barrett: Stated agreement with Norton. Doesn't think every faculty member is aware this is an option, because it usually isn't.

Chair Doe: Asked for any additional comments to be placed in the chat. Requested a motion.

Stephanie Clemons: Moved.

Linda Meyer: Second.

Motion passed. Will be placed on the agenda for the December 1<sup>st</sup> Faculty Council meeting.

3. Committee members needed for Student Conduct Appeals  
Committee: contact Mike Katz and cc Sue Doe

Chair Doe: There is a significant need for members to join the Student Conduct Appeals Committee. They have been low on faculty representation for some time. Mike Katz has sent us a request to get involved, will be placed on the agenda for December 1<sup>st</sup>.

***B. President Report – President Joyce McConnell***

President McConnell: Wanted to thank the faculty, only four days away from our goal of keeping students on campus until Fall Break. Feels it has made all the difference, cannot thank everyone enough.

Chair Doe: Stated in the chat in appreciation for Facilities and other essential workers. Their efforts have occurred come rain or shine.

President McConnell: Discussed the Professional Development days, was happy to be able to offer this. Feels it has made a difference in how people are feeling about the upcoming week. Know everyone is exhausted, glad we could arrange these as Professional Development days.

President McConnell: Discussed an email that was sent out about childcare, reminding people of all that is available as schools stop being face-to-face and going remote again. We know there is a great responsibility and burden that is put on parents and caretakers, want to make sure we are doing everything we possibly can, including flexibility and the benefits. Many people have been applying for the CARES fund, which needs more donations. We have been able to support a lot of people with a sudden need, whether from the fires or COVID. The food bank has been very active. Working with a community group about the harm that could come through evictions when the ban is lifted.

President McConnell: Discussed the Hughes property, where the old stadium is. It has been a piece of property that the system has wanted to use for recreation, childcare, healthcare, open space, affordable housing. On Thursday at 10:15 a.m. the city will start with the SPAR process, where city council reviews the general plan and decides on whether it will advise on the plan or not. The Plan Development Project starts about 60 days after the SPAR process, and that is where we'll really here how things will go with those plans. Continuing to talk to all councils, as well as Executive Committee, trying to figure out what is affordable and attainable housing, what kind of configuration of housing will be the most helpful.

President McConnell: Strategic Transformation project, may be able to share more information after the break.

President McConnell: Discussed the progressive salary cuts brought up previously by Pedros-Gascon. When we thought we might have to do progressive salary cuts, we had a base, around \$65,000, below which no one would get cut. Then larger and larger cuts going up in salary. That was the plan back in May. We didn't have to implement it then, but that is how we would do it.

President McConnell: Spoke with the Graduate Council, very important conversation. Know many in the department level are having conversations about graduate students, particularly those who teach and those who are engaged in research pursuing their Ph.D. Will let Provost Mary Pedersen speak to this more, but want to support our students so they can finish given the disruption of COVID.

Pedros-Gascon: Stated in the chat that was not discussing people's salaries. Was asking about departmental budget reductions to departments such as his where there are only 40% tenure lines.

President McConnell: Thanked Pedros-Gascon for clarifying the question. We did do differential cuts in taking consideration different units when we made the final decisions. Impact on departments are important to know, thanked Pedros-Gascon for bringing this up.

Clemons: Teach two classes, 50 students each, and on Monday met with the in-person class with half that class, and every single seat was full. Students did not want to go away. Know students are appreciative.

Chair Doe: Expressed appreciation in the chat for President McConnell's attendance at meetings. Getting these updates and pieces of information is so important, helpful to hear things straight from you.

### ***C. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen***

Provost Mary Pedersen: Wanted to also thank everyone. Understand this is a really hard time for everyone, expressed appreciation for everyone's work. Feels fortunate to be here with such a dedicated group of faculty, staff, and students.

Provost Pedersen: We are discussing things with Larimer County Public Health. We may have to wait until the end of December, about two to three weeks before the spring semester, before a decision can be made about the spring quarter.

Provost Pedersen: Have been meeting with each of the Deans and units, looking at the budgets in detail. We are going to try to be very strategic with how to deal with the budget moving forward. May not have a good idea until April, a lot depends on enrollment. Will be focusing on enrollment efforts, knowing how much this affects budget.

Provost Pedersen: We are increasing testing dramatically. Busy this past week, set a record, many people being tested before leaving for Fall Break.

Ruth Hufbauer: Stated that President McConnell had mentioned speaking to grad students, wondered if there was an update on how students can get research done under COVID.

Provost Pedersen: Yes, this is being discussed. Working with faculty researchers around everything about spring semester, including research. Focusing on continuing testing capacities, looking at various other tests that are available. Had a conversation with one of the colleges, they are interested in supporting students doing research and internships. Pooling all these needs together. Just started these conversations, will be addressing them over the next few weeks before spring semester.

Pedros-Gascon: Stated that some students are really struggling, enormous emotional toll. We also have very clear academic standards when it comes to outcomes from graduate school. Asked what the possibility would be to extend and cover fees should they do their qualifying exams in the following semester. The fees in that case are \$170.

Chair Doe: Noted in the chat that continuing registration is \$170. It makes a big difference for grad students to be able to continue.

Provost Pedersen: Clarified the question, graduate students could delay their exams to the next semester without having to pay certain fees related to that. Will bring this up to Mary Stromberger, and will have her suggest this to the group.

Chair Doe: Expressed appreciation for Provost Pedersen's attendance. Feels Provost Pedersen has hit the ground running, in the middle of a pandemic, and has wrapped her head around this place with great speed.

#### *D. Old Business*

#### *E. Action Items*

##### 1. UCC Minutes – November 6, 2020

Chair Doe: First item is the University Curriculum Committee minutes from November 6<sup>th</sup>.  
Asked: Is there anything that needs to be discussed or pulled for review? Requested a motion.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Hufbauer: Second.

Motion passed. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for December 1<sup>st</sup>.

##### 2. Draft of Resolution Regarding Unit/Department Responsibility for Course Quality, Delivery Method/Instructional Format, and Timely Notification – University Curriculum Committee – Brad Goetz, Chair

Chair Doe: Next item is the resolution from the discussion items over the past few weeks. Reminded members about the content from the previous minutes, essentially that any course that is approved does not need to be separately approved for the type. Courses **may** be offered in these various forms dependent on unit priorities and HLC standards. We wanted there to be consideration around responsibility that units have for considering how courses are delivered and ensuring quality of courses as they move from one format to another. Determined at the last meeting that we wanted to have Carole Makela and Brad Goetz create a draft of a resolution that we could place on the Faculty Council agenda for December 1<sup>st</sup> for faculty to indicate their level of agreement.

Chair Doe: Stated that some have questioned the value of resolutions. Do not think we are developing a genre that we are overusing, but feel resolutions indicate the values and the principles of the faculty. Some items that can't make their way into a motion, can't make into a policy, but we want to show our value on a topic. We are improving the location of where these

can be found on the Faculty Council website. Having resolutions are like having organizational position statements. Provide a reason for then moving into action.

Brad Goetz: Thanked Carole Makela for efforts on this. Intent at this point is to have the Executive Committee review this and make any changes or additions. Idea was then to move forward to the full Faculty Council as a resolution approved by Executive Committee rather than the University Curriculum Committee.

Carole Makela: The initial part of the resolution recognizes the original thoughts from Spring of 2020, tried very hard to keep the focus that this is speaking to the formats rather than the content or the methodology of how courses are being presented. Cannot answer to the specific procedures of how this will be carried out. Our concern is with whatever the procedures end up being, that they are easy to do and thoroughly communicated.

Hufbauer: Had researched UN resolutions, discussed that the first terms are typically italicized with a comma afterwards. Emphasizing background and what we are recommending.

Sybil Sharvelle: Stated in the chat that this outlines reasonable and needed expectations.

Chair Doe: Thanked Hufbauer for the feedback. Have had consistency in past resolutions around the “whereas” clauses and then in the second part with verbs at the beginning of each statement. May consider additional conventions as we get better at this.

Clemons: Supportive of this, feels it is long overdue. Provost Pedersen indicated that things are getting worse, and that we may not know until a couple weeks out from spring semester what might be happening on campus. Questioned timing of the resolution, when the pandemic is kind of guiding what is happening and delivery formats. Asked: Do we think this is the meeting it should be coming out, or should it be coming out in the spring?

Makela: Need to recognize that departments are already being asked to make plans for both summer and fall. This is a general guidance, unsure if we will ever feel we are ready based on what happens with the pandemic. Asked: Is sooner better than later?

Clemons: Suggested putting a start date on the resolution for Fall 2021 rather than starting immediately, so units have a chance to get organized. Feels this is important for our students, not questioning that at all, just the timing. Some units feel totally out of control of how they would be delivering classes and how they could give timely details to students, and then look like they can't keep that commitment.

Melinda Smith: Stated agreement with Clemon's point in the chat.

Yolanda Sarason: Stated in the chat in agreement with Clemons.

Chair Doe: Fundamental question is whether a statement of principles is tied to a particular calendar, or whether a statement of principles should guide, though it can't always anticipate every eventuality.

Pedros-Gascon: Commented in the chat about the financial issues previously discussed that may be affecting departments with their scheduling.

Sarason: Commented in the chat that everyone is overloaded with changes these days. This seems like a resolution for normal times.

Chair Doe: Seems to be a consensus about waiting on this a bit.

Clemons: Think all of us want this to pass, just concerns about the timing.

Makela: Part of this is to message to the departments in relation to what is needed in flexibility of format without having to be approved by the University Curriculum Committee.

Chair Doe: Asked members how they would feel about putting this off until February.

Makela: Asked Goetz to speak to this, what would this mean for the work of the University Curriculum Committee.

Goetz: Thinks that in some ways this is time-sensitive, but is okay if Executive Committee feels February is a more appropriate time to put this forward. From a University Curriculum Committee perspective, would like to put it out when it will have a better effect. The majority of these things are restating what should already be happening. Not certain that a future date makes sense.

Andrew Norton: Wondering if the resolution doesn't have two different ideas in it, which may cause some debate and difficulty. Idea that delivery mode has been what departments have always decided, and then there is a responsibility to be clear and timely. Feels this would be stressful right now for people. Wondering if those two different ideas in this resolution will cause difficulty.

Goetz: Never know how Faculty council will read these, but these items are linked for the future for the online delivery format. If the suggestion is to separate those and approach them differently, or approach this later with more comfort from faculty, would prefer the latter. As of right now, no procedural way to enforce any of this.

Chair Doe: Placed a motion in the chat to table discussion until January.

David Koons: Moved.

Sarason: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion passed. Discussion will be tabled until January.

3. Committee on Faculty Governance Recommendations Regarding CoNTTF Proposals – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair – [tentative]

Chair Doe: Will now hear from Steve Reising on the survey that was done on the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty proposal. Eager to hear what was found out.

Steve Reising: Thanked the Executive Committee for putting the Committee on Faculty Governance on the agenda. Stated that Leo Vijayasrathy was also present. Received input by email from all representatives less than 24 hours ago, pretty short notice. Received comments from over half of the departments on campus.

Reising: Presented slides on the pros and cons of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track proposal as provided by departments giving feedback. Stated that the number of comments in the pros and cons did not reflect the votes.

Reising: Read off the pros from the slideshow presentation.

- Growing share in academic faculty and critical role in the University, non-tenure track faculty deserve increased representation.
- Importance of more proportional representation.
- Further goal of fostering stronger and more collegial relations between tenure track and continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty at the department level.
- Ensure everyone's voice is heard and represented in Faculty Council. Represent a diversity of voices across the faculty.
- Addresses current lack of equity in eligibility of faculty to serve on Faculty Council.
- Some non-tenure track faculty state no concerns in openly discussing matters and voting, even without protection of tenure.
- Aligns with University goals of inclusion and equity.
- No need to protect non-tenure track faculty more than we need to protect non-tenured tenure-track faculty on Faculty Council.
- More diverse groups are always better when working on difficult issues, problem-solving, and creativity.

Reising: Discussed the cons as shown in the slideshow:

- Many non-tenure track faculty are part time. Suggested allocation should be based on the number of full-time faculty rather than the actual number of non-tenure track faculty.
- Ratio of non-tenure and tenure-track in each college varies widely. A "universal ratio" may not be in the University's best interest.
- Total number of Faculty Council representatives could be increased to limit the reduced representation for "research-intensive" colleges.
- CSU is currently a Research I University, proposals may diminish the voice of tenure-track faculty in shared governance, negatively affecting this status. Does CSU want to keep its Research I status or become a teaching-oriented University?
- Agreed with concerns expressed in terms of lack of protection of non-tenure track faculty with regard to negotiations with Administration.

- Purpose of Faculty Council is to decide on issues related to teaching, research, and service. Non-tenure track are not required to engaged in all three, as tenure-track are, so equivalent representation does not make sense.
- Proposals seem to be confounded with the important issues of equity and inclusion. Does not want to conflate the choice of career track with diversity, equity, and inclusion issues.
- Duties, funding sources, and hiring process differ widely between non-tenure track and tenure-track, should not be combined into a single body.
- Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty has been effective in representing non-tenure track faculty. Why not add a few more voting members to this committee to increase representation?
- Compensation of non-tenure track faculty for service on Faculty Council is not addressed in proposal. Have other possible options been adequately considered?

Pedros-Gascon: Commented in the chat that the point about whether CSU wanted to be a research institution or teaching-oriented was insulting.

Chair Doe: Stated in the chat that continuing and contract have a 5% minimum service component.

Vice Provost Susan James: Stated in the chat that it is 5% or 10% depending on appointment.

Reising: Discussed important considerations pointed out by departments.

- Dramatic increase in the ratio of the number of non-tenure track to tenure-track is of great concern to a Research I institution. Faculty Council needs to expand its role in shared governance and its capacity to face these challenges.
- Does increase in hiring non-tenure track faculty instead of tenure-track represent a shift toward teaching and undergraduate education and away from research and graduate programs? How can Faculty Council work to reduce this trend?
- Preserving protection of tenure is equally imperative to increasing representation of continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty.
- Ability of all members on the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty to vote as ex-officio members of Faculty Council should be ended once they have same privileges as tenure-track faculty to serve as Faculty council members.

Leo Vijayasathy: A common thread that came up in the comments was if there was another way to increase non-tenure track faculty representation on Faculty Council without approval of the proposal. Was not discussed extensively. Asked if it was possible to use at-large representatives and make some specific to non-tenure track faculty. Not increasing Faculty Council representatives, but can allocate some positions to non-tenure track faculty. Room for compromise rather than going with what is on the table.

Vice Provost James: Thanked Reising for gathering the input. Comes from Engineering, a research college. Felt the arguments on the con side were pretty mysterious, did not make a lot of sense. This is about representation. Feels we would never put our Research I status at risk. Stated that Pedros-Gascon has argued in the past about having a ratio of non-tenure track to tenure track faculty. This question is about representation, felt the cons were not justifiable enough to warrant

not enfranchising non-tenure track representation. Faculty Council does more than just think about research, teaching, and service. It's also about the management and government of the entire faculty. Asked if Reising could share the slides, would like to discuss this with Provost Pedersen prior to December Faculty Council meeting.

Makela: Stated in the chat that all faculty have appointments in departments. That is where they are to be integrated and where their workload percentages are set and can be adapted and adjusted. Why not have representation with more equity and inclusion. Also stated that undue concern about year in the future are unwarranted, representation policy is not being set in concrete forever. Changes can be made as the faculty composition changes if appropriate in the future. We have been at this long enough not to acknowledge that we are one faculty with varied appointments.

Pedros-Gascon: Feels some of the points are conflating some of the real issues and discussions. Comes from a department with high amount of non-tenure track faculty, felt some of the points were also insulting. Does not feel that this is what puts our institution at risk for losing Research I status. Would encourage Faculty Council as a body to try to come up with a resolution of trying to really push a clear ratio of non-tenure track faculty and tenure-track faculty.

Chair Doe: Asked Reising to clarify where the Committee on Faculty Governance landed on this issue.

Reising: Stated that the Committee on Faculty Governance had a clear majority in favor of putting the motion on the Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Doe: Asked: Can we hear a motion from Executive Committee for this?

Pedros-Gascon: Second.

Smith: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Clemons: Feels that Vice Provost James' comments are critical. Need these facts in order to move forward with this discussion.

Peros-Gascon: Regarding change of the title, used to be called non-tenure track. Have heard from others that the name change does not matter.

Vice Provost James: Have had a wide spectrum of feedback about the name change. Will continue working on the harder stuff. Some people have told us that they really appreciate the name change, but have also heard loud and clear that some want to keep their name as is.

Clemons: Asked Vijayasaraty if any proposals will be brought forward regarding the compromises that were mentioned.

Vijayasaraty: Was not planning on that. Want to emphasize that intention was not to insult anyone. Solicited comments and this is what was said.

Koons: Commented in the chat that faculty were appreciative of having their views solicited.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the December 1<sup>st</sup> Faculty Council agenda.

### ***F. Reports***

#### 1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Will give a brief report. See that Pedros-Gascon has asked in the chat about whether Jannine Mohr will be able to attend our December 1<sup>st</sup> Faculty Council meeting. Have placed a formal request for her attendance, and have not heard back. Will keep everyone posted about that.

Chair Doe: Have formulated and sent forward recommendations on athletics derived from the Special Faculty Council meeting on November 2<sup>nd</sup>. Derived directly from a content analysis of what was discussed during that meeting. Requested that the President speak to the questions around the legal investigations to help us gain a greater understanding and clarity around the University's response to those investigations. Will continue to ask this question.

Chair Doe: Also been in conversation with the University Benefits Committee, think we do have some interesting things that we should probably look at, particularly regarding our retirement plans.

Chair Doe: All task forces are making great progress. Have one task force that has sent forward language on race, bias, and equity and includes inclusion to the Committee on Responsibility and Standing of Academic Faculty. Items we are asking them to consider regarding tenure and promotion and annual review, reflecting a greater valuing and recognition of varied forms of scholarship that might come from diverse faculty, as well as greater recognition for those faculty who are working actively in equity and justice issues in their teaching, research, or service. The Intellectual Property task force has a meeting with the Provost regarding recommendations, and the Shared Governance Task Force has forwarded recommendations and information to the Committee on Faculty Governance for consideration. Presidential Survey task force also making great progress, will likely have something for us in December.

#### 2. Board of Governors Report – Stephanie Clemons

Clemons: Board of Governors meeting with be on December 3<sup>rd</sup> over Zoom. Wanted to also announce retirement at the end of December after 32 years. Wanted to let everyone know what a privilege it has been to work with everyone, members of Faculty Council and our faculty and students, administrators across campus. Decision came recently, wanted to discuss how we are going forward with an election for a new Board of Governors Representative for the second half of this academic year.

Chair Doe: Thanked Clemons for service. Asked Reising how we will proceed with Board of Governors Representative election.

Reising: Explained the process. There is a Board of Governors meeting early in the semester. Will need to solicit the election of the Board of Governors Representative. Will need to be on the Faculty Council agenda for December 1<sup>st</sup> and a deadline for nominations to be submitted to the Committee on Faculty Governance.

Pedros-Gascon: Suggested that Chair Doe attend the February Board of Governors meeting as an ex-officio to allow for a better timeline.

Chair Doe: Something like that could be done. Could either notify anyone that was nominated that there would be a meeting immediately after the election, or could send a substitute.

***G. Discussion Items***

***H. Faculty Presentations***

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

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