

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, February 9, 2021

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Ruth Hufbauer, Vice Chair; Melinda Smith, BOG Representative; Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President; 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; Alan Bright, Natural Resources; Melinda Smith, Natural Sciences; Jennifer Peel, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences; Sami Haddad, Student Assistant

Guests: President Joyce McConnell; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee; Dinaida Egan, Committee on University Programs; Jose Suarez Garcia, Committee on University Programs

Absent: None

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

February 9, 2021 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – January 26, 2020

Chair Doe: Asked: Are there any corrections to be made to the minutes from January 26th?

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on February 16, 2021 on Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on March 2, 2021 on Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.
3. Reminder of Harry Rosenberg Award

Chair Doe: Encouraged members to read the description of the award on the home page of the Faculty Council website and to consider possible nominees. Stated that Carole Makela was awarded one year. Had a couple ideas in mind for consideration. Suggested Stephanie Clemons, who recently retired and had served many years as the Board of Governors Representative, Vice-Chair, and on the Committee on Teaching and Learning. Second suggestion is Tim Gallagher,

who was Faculty Council chair twice and served in a number of different roles. Would love to get thoughts on this.

Linda Meyer: Commented in the chat that both Clemons and Gallagher would be excellent nominees for the award.

Chair Doe: Had one thing that was discussed last time which had to do with constituting the tenure and promotion committee. This was a proposal that Sybil Sharvelle created as an idea to float by the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty sent out a unit-level query about who might be impacted by a change in the code that would shift the definition of who is on the tenure and promotion committee. They are taking it up and the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty is giving it due diligence.

B. President Report – President Joyce McConnell

President Joyce McConnell: Wanted to thank everyone for an amazing start to the semester. We are coming up on a year of dealing with this pandemic, know many people are beginning to think about how long it has been and how hard we have worked. Wanted to thank everyone for the work done for the University and for the students.

President McConnell: Have been getting quite a few questions about vaccinations, what the University is doing to advocate for vaccinations on campus. Spoke a bit about this at the last Faculty Council meeting. Have been working very hard on advocacy with the state, whether it is in the Governor's cabinet, the Colorado Department of Public Health, or the Colorado Department of Higher Education. Have not been able to crack through the Governor's positions that faculty members in higher education institutions are not considered in the same tier as pre-K through 12 educators. We are continuing to work on that, making the argument strongly and frequently. The state is sticking to its tiered approach and slowly rolling out quantities of vaccines to the counties. The federal government is going to create a supply chain of vaccines, but these vaccines are primarily going to retailers and pharmacies. Advice for everyone is to sign up for a vaccine at UHealth, even if you do not have a physician there. Can also sign up on King Sooper's and Wal-Mart's websites. Will put your information in and they will contact you once vaccines are available. Have been working very hard to get the attention of the Governor and cabinet to elevate educators in higher education, as well as staff. Encouraged by federal government increasing supply chain.

President McConnell: Wanted to commend those who are applying for the advanced grant from the National Science Foundation. Going in for an early proposal. Proposal would allow us to fund more than we are already doing around diversity, particularly diversity in the STEM disciplines.

President McConnell: Brief update on the Board of Governors meeting. We had a retreat on Thursday, February 4th that focused on what CSU can be doing to meet the needs of Coloradoans who live in rural areas. Friday, February 5th, was the regular Board of Governors meeting. There was nothing new at this meeting, which is pretty typical for February. Legislators don't go into

session until February 16th, so there is not a lot happening in terms of state budget at this point. There was some conversation about how we will move forward in the budget this year. Everything is uncertain at this point. Uncertainty is centered around the additional federal CARES Act money. What we heard on the legislative call this morning is that the CARES Act money will likely be split 50/50. Original CARES Act funding was 50% to support students who are experiencing hardship and 50% for the University to meet the costs of the pandemic. Will keep everyone posted on this. Expressed hope that in another month or so we will have a much better idea of what we can depend on for the upcoming fiscal year.

President McConnell: There has been some conversation at the Governor's level of cutting back on funding of capital projects. Believe there will be some funding, but not as much. We will not know outcome of that until later in March.

Carole Makela: Commented in the chat that it was a welcome statement in the Denver Post per in-state tuition for Native American students.

Chair Doe: Wondered what the big expenses are that may have an impact on the overall budget of the University. Sounds like there is an optimistic outlook right now, but sure there are a tremendous number of expenses that we have accrued during the pandemic that will probably affect the bottom line. Trying to grasp what the likely impact is as we come into the spring and on unit planning and overall fiscal planning.

President McConnell: We made a commitment last year to do everything possible we could to save jobs and we were successful. To do that, we took \$17 million worth of cuts across campus. We incurred more than that and used reserves from the system which we will have to return over a period of time. Idea of the system was to allow us to take our losses and extend them over time so we didn't have to take such a hard hit all at once. Has been expensive to meet the needs of the pandemic and keep campus as safe as possible. Might be interesting for us to do a breakdown for Executive Committee and Faculty Council to give people a better understanding of how much the pandemic has cost the University. We are optimistic, we are seeing good trends in enrollment across the board. Changes that the Biden administration are making on immigration may have a positive impact over time. A lot of good things on the horizon, working very hard on re-branding and marketing and what we do in terms of recruiting students.

Chair Doe: Always good to be in the know about where we stand. Been a lot of good news about enrollment. Always helpful to hear any details that we can. Commented that Vice President Lynn Johnson will be coming to Faculty Council on April 6th to give a presentation on the budget. Think we will know more about the state budget at that point. Any updates for Faculty Council can prepare us for what is coming.

President McConnell: We know sometime in August about enrollment, but the better the application trends, the better the enrollment trends. Think the reason we are seeing the trends in applications is because the faculty, students, and staff really stepped up. We got recognized nationally for how well we were managing the pandemic and sticking to our primary mission of educating students. That is all about the faculty.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Had a question about the athletics meeting yesterday, February 8th. Would like to know if the meeting was mandatory and if the advocates were allowed to attend the meeting. Stated that neither of these questions were clarified by Albert Bimper at the Faculty Council meeting when they were asked.

President McConnell: Have not received an email about what happened at the meeting but would be happy to share once that information is available. Understanding was that it was not going to be mandatory and that would be announced at the start of the meeting.

Pedros-Gascon: Hoped that people understood how strange it is to announce that a meeting is not mandatory when people are already in the meeting. Should be announced in advance. Stated that some students have complained about the possibility of being in a meeting with the people they feel victimized by. Stated that there should be members of advocacy in that kind of meeting.

President McConnell: Stated that Athletic Director Joe Parker will be attending the March Faculty Council meeting. Would be helpful to discuss this with him at that time.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked: Can we make sure we know what happened in the meeting next week? Requested that the information be delivered to the Executive Committee.

President McConnell: Will try to find out as much as we possibly can.

C. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: Update on fall enrollment, the number of applicants continue to increase. At this point we are up 8%. In terms of students admitted, we are up 5%. One of the defining marks is when they put down their confirmation, and that typically happens when housing opens up, which is recently did. Bit below compared to last year, only at about 9%. Watching this carefully. We know many students and families are waiting to hear about plans for fall, so we are working very hard around communications and plans for fall to support the students' decision-making. Marketing team is developing a lot of plans around marketing for fall semester. Transfer students are still looking good, a high priority for us.

Provost Pedersen: Update on what is happening with fall semester. We are starting with the plans from last fall and then ramping up as much as we can. Looking at trying to provide schedules for students with as many in-person experiences as possible. Trying to plan for a very public health-conscious, safe environment for fall. Trying to increase the number of courses. Still planning on social distancing in the classroom. We don't know what the state of the pandemic will be and are hopeful with the vaccine rollouts. Planning schedules that will be as flexible as possible. We are also expanding in the 4:00pm to 8:00pm time slot, which is critical because we have many classes that are open during that time. Looking to have very specific engagement of all our first-year students. Thanked everyone that are willing to offer sections and get involved in some of our first-year experience courses that we are now planning. The Teaching Continuity Recovery Group led by Vice Provost Kelly Long is working closely with the Deans around these efforts. Will remain flexible but trying to ramp up our in-person offerings.

Provost Pedersen: Monitoring closely the variants and effectiveness of the vaccines. The data is saying that the Johnson & Johnson vaccine they are expecting in early March will provide a significant amount of vaccinations. What we are hearing is that everyone should have the ability to get vaccines by the end of spring and by fall semester we should be in a good situation. Vaccine manufacturers are working on booster shots that will provide stronger protection against the variants.

Provost Pedersen: Wanted to thank everyone for their continued flexibility. Coming up on one year of this has been really challenging and tough. We have rolled out the program to support additional student assistants, and many faculty have taken advantage of this program. Expressed hope that this provides a little bit of support for continued work in this challenging environment.

Provost Pedersen: Wanted to congratulate Dr. Roze Henschel, who has been accepted into the 2021-2022 class of the American Council on Education as an ACE fellow. This is a wonderful leadership opportunity where she will be working on a specific project used to support institutional aspirations.

Chair Doe: Asked about the Town Hall on Friday, February 12th.

Provost Pedersen: Announcement went out this morning. We will have a Town Hall on Friday, February 12th, to update everyone on the state of COVID. We will be reviewing where we currently are for screening, we opened up a new site today. We are putting out another pod on Friday and then another on Monday, February 15th, so we will give updates on those. We will look at our plans for expanded capacity, our plans for fall. Will address other issues such as vaccination. The link is available in the email that went out.

President McConnell: Commented in the chat that the Town Hall is at 11:00am on Friday, February 12th. Will focus on vaccines, testing protocols, phased academic calendar, and restrictions on University events. Will include initial information about CSU's Fall 2021 plans.

Pedros-Gascon: Had a question about the INTO program.

Vice Provost Susan James: Have requested to be placed on the agenda for Executive Committee next week to have a full discussion about INTO. We will have Kathleen Fairfax and Louann Reid join.

Pedros-Gascon: Just wanted to transmit concern. Happen to be a College of Liberal Arts representative and the people who were involved in the center were from the College of Liberal Arts. Deans identified INTO as running red for the last few years, but budget decision was made by the Board and not really by the people who were running the joint venture.

Vice Provost James: The financial issues were not a reflection at all of the people who worked for INTO and were involved in the program. Have not had a chance to talk to Provost Pedersen about that but will discuss this and make sure that communication is clear. Expressed hope that we can learn something from the fact that those budgets were being approved unanimously.

Would like to think about what we have learned from the experience. Will discuss this next week when we are on the agenda.

Chair Doe: Expressed appreciation for the opportunity to discuss. Sensitive topic for those of us from the College of Liberal Arts and colleagues involved with INTO. Will be placed on the agenda for next week.

D. Old Business

E. Action Items

1. University Grievance Officer Annual Review – Linda Meyer

Chair Doe: Thanked Meyer for working with us on this last week. Asked what was needed at this point. Believe the plan was to have this ready by the end of today.

Meyer: Will hopefully have it ready to go soon. Will need to make a few tweaks in Qualitrics, hoping to send it out by Friday. Would still provide everyone a week to respond. May be some input whether Friday afternoon or Monday morning is better to send out a survey. May be overlooked if sent on a Friday when people leave. Thinking Monday might be better.

Meyer: Incorporated the suggestions that were made last time. Did not receive any further suggestions by email in the past two weeks. Wanted to give everyone a last chance to look at it and give further suggestions.

Chair Doe: Thanked Meyer. Wanted to reiterate that this may be Meyer's last time working on this, is scheduled to rotate off Executive Committee this year. In the event that Meyer is not a representative from the Libraries, we will need someone else to pick up this University Grievance Officer survey.

Pedros-Gascon: Commented in the chat that he is willing to take this on if on Executive Committee next year.

Chair Doe: Asked: Are there any other changes to be made to the survey? Asked Meyer if there were any final questions for the Executive Committee.

Meyer: No further questions. Will help Pedros-Gascon or replacement next year with access to Qualitrics so we don't have to reinvent the wheel. Normally this is sent out from the Provost's Office. Believe the process is that once this is confirmed, link is sent to Provosts Office with verbiage and then sent to the faculty from there.

Vice Provost James: Asked: What is the timing of when we want to send that out?

Meyer: Need to decide that too. Unsure if this can be completed before Friday. Asked: Do we want to send this out Friday or do we want to send it out next Monday?

Ruth Hufbauer: Made a good point that Monday might be better.

Meyer: Will try to have it to Provost's Office by Friday with the plan to send to faculty and administrative professionals on Monday, February 15th. Probably best way to go.

Vice Provost James: Great.

Chair Doe: Thanked Meyer. Asked: Any final questions about the University Grievance Officer Annual Review? Do have an additional observation. In years past, think there was some special outreach that was done too, to folks who interact with the University Grievance Officer. Not talking about faculty or administrative professionals, but those who interacted in other capacities. Not sure if that is a desirable piece of the University Grievance Officer's review or not.

Meyer: Don't recall people other than faculty or administrative professionals. It used to be before two years ago that the University Grievance Officer would be the person who would send out the survey because they knew who they had interacted with. Then we changed things because we wanted input from everyone and also not to have people concerned that they were getting the survey from the University Grievance Officer.

Vice Provost James: Looked to see if this is a peer evaluation thing that's going out about people in those types of positions. Will ask Dan Bush about it, see what has happened in the past.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. Requested a vote in the chat to move ahead with the University Grievance Office Annual Review.

Motion to move ahead with the University Grievance Officer Review survey passed.

2. Presidential Survey Task Force Survey Draft – Antonio Pedros-Gascon and Yolanda Sarason

Yolanda Sarason: We decided to separate what is in the survey from how it is going to be administered. Pedros-Gascon put together all the comments that we had received and went through the minutes where we had discussed it at Executive Committee and addressed all of the issues that were highlighted. We went back to the committee and we addressed all the concerns. The issue pending are the two questions about gender and race and ethnicity. Believe we don't get the data back to us.

Pedros-Gascon: Believe it is unclear how it will be administered. That is the discussion that will have to happen after we have agreed on the document.

Sarason: In the minutes, there were comments by Clemons and Gallagher about how it has been used in the past. Asked if there were any other comments.

Pedros-Gascon: Discussed one of the questions on the survey where there had been a word change. The question up until recently was "How satisfied are you overall with President

McConnell's performance as President of CSU", with the word "performance" replacing the word "support". Wanted to discuss the wording of this specific question.

Meyer: Was wondering about this too. When you say "performance" you are asking people to just give an overall opinion about all the other things before, but if you want to ask how "supportive is President McConnell", that would be a whole different question.

Pedros-Gascon: In chair evaluations that is standard, at least for the College of Liberal Arts. Not sure what people may feel more comfortable with. Another way of framing the question would be the same, but instead of "satisfied" use the word "supportive", so question would be "how supportive are you overall of President McConnell's performance as President of CSU."

Sarason: When we were discussing it, we were wanting a question that was just kind of an overall summary of all the other questions. Think that was also the reason why we kept satisfied and dissatisfied.

Melinda Smith: Think if you say "supportive" you are biasing it because you are giving some qualification to it. Was curious of the scoring system. Asked why there isn't a neutral category, not having an opinion and then you can separate that from people that just don't have enough information.

Pedros-Gascon: Proposing to move it into a six-category situation. So we would have highly satisfied, satisfied, neutral, dissatisfied, and highly dissatisfied and then not enough information.

Smith: Just a suggestion so you can separate out people that just don't really even think about versus people who don't feel strongly either.

Pedros-Gascon: What we were trying to avoid was having people who may be assigning an equivalent to zero for very different reasons.

Sarason: Had gone to business faculty that do survey research and evaluation. Their suggestion was to keep it a one to four because it creates more meaningful results and prevents people from neutral. Wanted to push for are you satisfied or not. Samantha Conroy was on the committee and had asked a couple of other colleagues that are familiar with this.

Smith: Asked about not even having "do not have an opinion" over there, forcing them to say one of those four or just that they don't have enough information. Asked why confound the two.

Pedros-Gascon: So we are getting rid of "I do not have an opinion", so it's either you don't have enough information or you have an opinion.

Smith: If you want to try to force them to do the four-scale, that would be good.

Alan Bright: Commented in the chat that forcing a positive or negative response from someone who is in fact neutral is not an improvement on the data.

Andrew Norton: Agreed with Smith's analysis in the chat, to drop "no opinion" to force a choice.

Smith: Agreed in the chat, would prefer a middle neutral category. Neutrality means something.

Jennifer Peel: Agreed in the chat. The middle category is often "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied."

Pedros-Gascon: One of the things we noticed was that we were missing the Libraries in the colleges, so that will be changed.

Meyer: Asked: Are we looking to see if one college more than another tends to be more favorable for the President?

Pedros-Gascon: That's ideally the situation, that we be able to retrieve the nuances of the electorate. Not everyone with the same specific cases have exactly the same outlook. This is why it matters where the data goes and who has it. We were assuming the evaluation could be run by Laura Jensen. Could be run internally so then the data would come to us directly.

Sarason: Pulled up previous discussion from Clemons and Gallagher about where the data goes. They stated that this goes to the evaluation committee of the Board of Governors, that not even the Faculty Council representative is invited to this session. We are expected to provide feedback but once it goes to the Board, they decide what to do with the information. We need more clarification when we distribute the survey so faculty understand this. Clemons stated that this specifically goes to the Chair of the Board of Governors and then becomes confidential. We had discussed the way it is going to be distributed and that it would be a different kind of survey depending on whether we distributed it to campus or directly to President McConnell.

Pedros-Gascon: We were thinking of trying to create an evaluation tool that can be helpful to positively frame any ideas to the President. We will have the results first and then provide that data to the Board of Governors. Whether the Board of Governors shares that information is their call, that should not prevent us from running the evaluation.

Makela: Stated in the chat that this has been used to inform the letter we write to the Board of Governors. They do not see the specific data.

Chair Doe: Think Gallagher's and Clemons' overall point is that we can analyze and summarize the information, but once it gets to the Board of Governors it is completely out of our hands. Do not think that alters anything in particular that we do here.

Pedros-Gascon: We are trying to provide an evaluation that is more inclusive with a higher level of buyout.

Chair Doe: We lose control of it when it goes to the Board, but that doesn't mean that it doesn't matter. This suggests a level of higher professionalism and sophistication around wanting to do this right and fairly represent the views of the faculty and also give them some feedback that will be of use.

Chair Doe: There seems to be a consensus in the chat of re-inserting neutral, having a 5-point Likert scale.

Sarason: Asked: Point of clarification, do we want a five-point Likert scale as well as the question of not having enough information?

Norton: The problem with the neutral is that it is often confused with not having enough information or not having an opinion. Makes analysis trickier to do.

Chair Doe: Asked: Maybe also having the option of “do not have enough information” offers that clarity for people?

Norton: Think the trick is that neutral, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, is a different state of being than not having an opinion. Just gets more complicated.

Chair Doe: Asked in the chat for members to indicate if they prefer a five-point Likert scale with “neutral” offered as an option plus “do not have enough information.”

Makela: Suggested in the chat that the middle category should be “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”, not neutral.

Bright: Commented in the chat that “I am neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” in the middle with a sixth choice of no opinion seems clearest.

Chair Doe: Looks like there is agreement on the five-point scale.

Pedros-Gascon: Have consensus on middle one as “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”. Thinks this makes a lot of sense, idea is to make sure we can create the document to be conducive.

Pedros-Gascon: Second question was about the question we had about gender identification. The possibility of going for a short descriptor versus a long descriptor. The long descriptor was provided by the Office of the Vice President for Diversity.

Sarason: Went back to the faculty that do the research, especially one who does diversity research, to ask about this question. Again, with the goal of increasing response rate while trying to protect anonymity and confidentiality. Probably similar issues with how you identify race and ethnicity. Stated that Hufbauer had sent a very compelling argument about how these are socially constructed categories. Seems that the race and ethnicity are also socially constructed. Depends on how we are going to analyze the data. If we are going to separate it, more compelling reason to leave it in. Could see the argument for taking both of these out as well.

Pedros-Gascon: Understand the concerns. We are also providing the ability not to disclose. Thinks gender and culture are important descriptors. May help us understand and identify some of the discrepancies. That kind of information may be constructive in order to advance any further discussion or impacts on things.

Makela: Asked in the chat: Is personal identity more important than academic identity?

Smith: Asked in the chat: How are we going to use the gender and race/ethnicity data?

Pedros-Gascon: Responded to Smith's question. How we are going to use the gender and race/ethnicity data is for us to define. We are asking for these descriptors, doesn't mean we are going to use them for sure when making the analysis.

Norton: If we are going to ask about gender identities or sexual orientation identities, we need to be respectful to include all the identities we know people at CSU have. Thinks it is important to be inclusive. Same goes for racial or ethnic identities. We keep saying this is going to be confidential. We need to have a way of making sure it is confidential, and that means there needs to be a firewall between us and the raw data. Usual way you would do this is that somebody would strip out all the identifying information and then provide us bins that are larger than 10 or 20 cells. Brings up another issue that once we start doing the analyzing, the amount of time it takes to analyze the data in these crosstabs starts going up dramatically. Need to have a plan for how we are going to get that analysis done and maintain confidentiality.

Hufbauer: Commented in the chat that we will just need to not separate responses too far down, such as by gender, ethnicity, and college. The standard is not to do a breakdown if the cell size is smaller than about 20.

Chair Doe: Think we have some key questions that are emerging here and have made great progress. Could come back to this, may be very close to having it ready to go. Would like to point out that the item that for people's "rank", those aren't ranks, they are appointment types.

Makela: Commented in the chat that this is to inform us of faculty views, this is not a climate survey.

Smith: Wondered in the chat that with so many subcategories how much power we will have in the analysis.

Chair Doe: Asked members to vote in the chat if they prefer the short descriptors or long descriptors.

Chair Doe: There seems to be consensus on the long descriptors.

Sarason: We will make these changes and send it out again.

Pedros-Gascon: Amy Barkley was offering to do the treatment of the data. Could be the person administering, receiving all the information.

Chair Doe: Have had a robust conversation around this. Might need at least another week before we can give this the green light. No motion on this today.

F. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: May have heard about the briefings going on about affordable housing and the planning for the Hughes property. Encouraged members to take advantage of opportunities to hear briefings about the property, there is a lot of interesting information coming out. There is another property on Timberline that is going to offer some affordable options that will help many CSU employees. As things clarify in the spring, maybe could have Brett Anderson and others come brief Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Think at some point we should hear from the Retirement Plans Committee or the University Benefits Committee to hear about the work they have been doing.

Chair Doe: There was a poll survey that was done in the fall put out by the employee councils that was a workforce questionnaire. Think the report is about to be released. Many things have changed between October and now, unclear if there will be another survey. Employee councils are working collaboratively to get a sense of how people are doing during this time.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Smith: Did not attend the retreat meeting, which was the first day, but attended the second day. Do not have much to say except to reiterate what President McConnell stated which was the Board will not have clarity on the budget until May or June.

Smith: Other thing that stood out was that the Board voted to reduce summer tuition by 30%. Idea behind this was that they want to increase enrollment in the summer and keep more students here rather than going elsewhere.

Smith: CSU Global is also ranked in the top ten online programs, so that was encouraging.

G. Discussion Items

1. Committee on University Programs and CIOSU Biennial Review Update – Chair Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Gave a short review. We had Mo Salman at Executive Committee to present the Biennial Reviews from the Committee on University Programs. There were a number of discontinuations. Salman explained to us the relatively new digital platform and the attempts to reach centers and institutes that were missing some items. Executive Committee moved to support the Biennial Reviews and once the Faculty Council agenda went out, we started receiving feedback from centers and institutes that were concerned they were being discontinued. Had also received some calls from Deans who were concerned as well. Brings us to this moment, because we pulled it off the agenda. Invited Dinaida Egan and Jose Luis Suarez Garcia to speak to us and help us understand how to move forward and what the recommendations would be for how to solve the immediate and long-term problems we have.

Dinaida Egan: Associate Director of the Research Acceleration Office. We are a research development office under the Vice President for Research, and we are assisting in this process to ensure it went smoothly. Run the InfoReady review system. Was assisting Salman with collecting the reports and that they came in a timely manner with the information needed to take to the Committee on University Programs.

Jose Luis Suarez Garcia: Work in foreign languages, member of the Committee on University Programs. Not representing the committee right now, just a member.

Chair Doe: Clarified that Egan and Suarez Garcia are not representing the Committee on University Programs. Stated that Salman has stepped down as chair, part of the challenge we face now. Have put out a query to the committee if anyone wants to chair. Stated that Egan had reached out when report was missing a mission statement. Clarified experience that the platform didn't force the mission statement to be included. This has been discussed, felt this may have happened to a number of centers and institutes. It was over the holidays, so there is also a possibility that directors missed the email that Egan sends out when something is missing.

Egan: There are five things the guidelines say the report should include and there is a disconnect between what the guidelines say to include and what the Committee on University Programs is tasked with reviewing for compliance and for content and whether it aligns with the CIOU mission itself. The system itself can handle collecting the information, if the information is appropriate and has been allowed to be collected as part of the process. There is a disconnect that needs to be addressed.

Hufbauer: Also thought there may be some disconnect. Had impression the Salman thought different directors had been informed, but then these directors stated they hadn't been informed.

Suarez Garcia: Without speaking for the committee, as a committee member, the report that was written about this was different from the ones in the past. There were twelve centers approved for renewal and fifteen were not. Think the issue we are dealing with here is communication at different levels. Need to solve that issue of communication so that we can resolve the problems of some of the centers. The document indicated that the recommendations for some centers might change with the right information. The intention is not to punish anybody or make a judgement but to follow the procedures and processing.

Chair Doe: Seems like we have a short-term problem of centers that may be able to be renewed with some simple amendments. Maybe the long-term solutions include the digital platform forcing certain items to be submitted. Salman had mentioned this, but maybe we also need to look at the way the Manual language defines centers.

Suarez Garcia: Think we need to have a committee meeting and select at least two people to be working with this. Internally we select another chair with the regular procedures. From there, we have some centers where we can change the recommendation easily by getting the right information, Will be a discussion taking place inside the committee.

Egan: The immediate needs are to deal with those centers missing mission statements. Simple discrepancies that can be addressed quickly. There are others that are higher level conversations to be had. Gets back to definition of what makes a CIOSU and that's a layer of complexity. Think the longer-term is how to fix the disconnect between what is requested in the Biennial Report, which isn't specific. Some language issues within the guidelines that need to be addressed so it works with the content that the Committee on University Programs is using for their review. On the Vice President for Research side, need to do a better job of making sure the requests are timed out further from what we have been doing in the past. With change in directorship, some didn't receive report request in time. Need to make sure this is communicated in a timely and strategic way, can be easily fixed. System itself can be changed, have components be required, can't submit without specific items. There are parts of the system that can be utilized to make sure that the Committee on University Programs isn't doing a compliance review but is doing more of a review of the CIOSU itself.

Suarez Garcia: There were four different types of deficiencies. One was the mission statement, another is budget, another is a single department or a single faculty. In some cases, there was one deficiency, in others there were three or four. We have to follow procedures and the process and if all the documentation is not there for the definition of the centers, that is what the committee is there for.

Chair Doe: Asked Egan if there were things that could be done right away to deal with the short-term, so we can move forward and help the committee and have things ready to go for them.

Egan: In terms of information deficiency, can circle back quite quickly. Most directors have been responsive on this. It is the more complex issues, such as the definition of a CIOSU, that need to be discussed further. Will just need to know who to contact on the committee.

Chair Doe: Asked Suarez Garcia if he would be willing to be a recipient and receive information from Egan and get this process going,

Suarez Garcia: Willing to receive this information and call for a meeting. Committee will select another person to be identified as chair, otherwise someone from administration can make a recommendation. Role needs to be limited to getting this information to help the process and to put the committee in charge of the situation. Stated it would be helpful to have Chair Doe present at any meeting called.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any additional questions. May face some tricky questions. Might be resolved by taking another look at the definition of units.

Suarez Garcia: Need to point out that this is done every two years, so it is not brand new. Centers and directors need to be aware that this is coming. Need to create a culture that this committee is very important, not just putting a stamp on it, but that we need to receive the right information.

Egan: Would field many questions around the lack of clarity in terms of content expectations, instructions are vague for each of the documents. Could be an area of improvement.

Suarez Garcia: In the report it indicates some frustration and concern committee members had because of that issue. With the right information, we are willing to make the adjustments that we need to continue with this.

Chair Doe: Might be useful to have some insights from the perspective of people who are center directors and what their experience was doing that.

Egan: That is something that is generally done when we roll out a new process or initiative. With this being the second time around and all of the centers having gone through it, it might be time to revisit it, see what worked and what didn't work.

Chair Doe: Thanked Egan and Suarez Garcia. Expressed appreciation for all the work being done by the Committee on University Programs.

2. Follow-up to Resolution that passed on February 2nd
3. Follow-up on the Intellectual Property Task Force
4. Follow-up on the S/U Grading and Late Withdrawal Policies
5. Follow-up to request from Faculty Council members for additional discussion of topics

Chair Doe: There were other discussion items. Expressed hope that we can figure out how to push forward the resolution that was passed last time, as well as the changes to Sections E and C that were passed at Faculty Council. Going to be wrapping our heads about how to get this information that comes out of Faculty Council into the right hands. CU Boulder writes a story after each Faculty Council meeting of a summary of what happened at that meeting. Will be working with Barkley on this to get that into our SOURCE, think this will provide more information about what we do in Faculty Council and find a way to get the information to the right people. Thanked everyone for their support and being here. Asked if there were any additional thoughts before adjourning.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked about having Vice President Diana Prieto come to Faculty Council to give a report. Stated that Faculty Council members should be aware that our meetings may extend over two hours. Requested that Bimper attend an Executive Committee meeting. Had previously suggested having the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics come to Executive Committee. Feels it is important to understand what they knew about what was going on in Athletics and if so, how they handled the situation.

Hufbauer: Commented in the chat that we should not go longer than two hours.

Smith: Agreed with Hufbauer in the chat. Suggested we consider having a mid-month meeting to address particular issues.

Chair Doe: Think we need to have a longer conversation about this. A chair of a standing committee pointed out that the Faculty Council is not a deliberation committee. Historically, Faculty Council, in our context, has been where motions and decisions are made, but the vast majority of deliberation happens before the meeting. Need to ask ourselves whether we are a

deliberative or investigatory body. Do think this is something that needs to be discussed at greater length.

Hufbauer: Commented in the chat that deliberation and investigation are the roles of the standing committees.

Makela: Just so we move the resolution along, would like to see it shared with the University Curriculum Committee and posted on their website, and distributed to the curriculum committees of the colleges. Questions that were just asked are very important. The Faculty Council committees and their college representatives have to recognize that their role is representing the college, not themselves. More inquiries need to be made by those people within the college to have the deliberations prior to what we get from the Faculty Council committees.

Pedros-Gascon: Specifically regarding the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, we have faculty who are supposed to be representing faculty, not the administration of Athletics. Think we need a follow-up conversation about this, merits discussion.

Norton: We need to determine what exactly our goal and our role is in this Athletics discussion and then decide how to proceed.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for their input. Asked if there was anything else. Hearing none, called the meeting adjourned.

H. Faculty Presentations

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Sue Doe, Chair
Ruth Hufbauer, Vice Chair
Melinda Smith, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant