

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, September 14, 2021

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Andrew Norton, Vice Chair; Melinda Smith, BOG Representative; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Jane Stewart, Agricultural Sciences; Rob Mitchell, Business; Sharon Anderson, Health and Human Sciences; Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Liberal Arts; Linda Meyer, Libraries; William Sanford, Natural Resources; Mike Antolin, Natural Sciences; Jennifer Peel, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Guests: Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Marie Legare, Chair Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty; Fred Haberecht, Facilities Management; Aaron Fodge, Parking and Transportation Services; Erika Benti, Parking and Transportation Services

Absent: Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering (excused); Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President (excused)

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

September 14, 2021 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – August 31, 2021

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the minutes from August 31st.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Moved to amend the August 31st minutes to reflect the circulated questions that he posted in the chat.

Mike Antolin: Objected to the move to amend. Stated that these questions were coming from an individual and was not an Executive Committee action or endorsed by this group.

Chair Doe: Asked: Would noting that there were questions placed in the chat, but not including the text of the questions, be an acceptable compromise?

Antolin: Agreed that this was preferable.

Pedros-Gascon: May elect to include questions from the last Faculty Council meeting.

Hearing no further corrections, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on September 21, 2021 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on October 5, 2021 – Microsoft Teams– 4:00 p.m.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Vice Provost Susan James: Filling in for Provost Mary Pedersen, who is unable to be here today.

Vice Provost James: Met with Andrew Norton, Chair Doe, and the Provost's and President's communications teams last week to discuss them coming to Executive Committee and Faculty Council. We explained that there is no need for them to attend every Executive Committee meeting, especially if it is a scheduling challenge. Happy to answer any questions, do not have a formal report today.

Chair Doe: Asked Vice Provost James to elaborate on discussion with the communications teams and what was discussed.

Vice Provost James: We discussed making sure we are using everyone's time well, and to make sure, especially at the big Faculty Council meetings, that what was being presented by the President and the Provost is what people want to hear. Discussed putting an emphasis on items that may be new or items of interest. We can direct people to websites where information is posted on more routine items rather than going into detail about everything. We also discussed moving their reports towards the very end of the meetings so other reports and presentations can be completed.

Pedros-Gascon: Suggested in the chat that we keep the format of having their reports first and then other presentations, all in the second half.

Chair Doe: Believe we discussed that but didn't settle on that being the way forward. Think the way we handled them last week worked well. Would be terrific if their offices were amenable to having those reports at the end. Also heard that the membership of Faculty Council is most interested in the Q&A sections, in addition to the new and breaking news. We also discussed having the PowerPoints ahead of time. Could have a good Q&A on the substance of those presentations. Also discussed timing of presentations. The President's and the Provost's offices are with us on this, and actually encouraged us to have a timer. We are working on utilizing a digital timer that we can show on the screen. Feel all parties would be helped by this.

Vice Provost James: Other thing that was emphasized was that this would be an opportunity not just for better Q&A but to get real feedback and input from members of Faculty Council. They did some in the last year, but taking that input would be valuable.

Chair Doe: We are using a form that provides an opportunity for follow-up. We have a mechanism now for recording those moments and keeping track of those items. Feels it was a great opportunity to have a debrief conversation.

Rob Mitchell: Asked in the chat: Would we get the PowerPoint slides by a set time beforehand and can these then get sent out to faculty?

Pedros-Gascon: Commented in the chat that this way people who are interested in a point may join the discussion, even if they are not members of Faculty Council.

Mitchell: Clarified that it would be helpful to have these presentations either the morning of or the day before, so we can ask faculty if they have any questions. We are representing different departments and colleges, so this would be great. Commented that putting limitations of “one person, one question” or time limits would help us be more efficient and effective.

Chair Doe: Thanked Mitchell. Great points. A review of our procedures revealed that there are rules for even informal discussion in Faculty Council. This is formalized for a reason. The bigger the group gets, the more important parliamentary procedures become. Some discussions can spiral into something unproductive. Noted that we have held separate meetings in the past to have discussions, so there is a precedent for that.

Vice Provost James: Confirmed that the idea was to share their presentations ahead of time. We asked for a week, but it is more likely that it will be not much more than possibly a day ahead given schedules and late-breaking news.

Andrew Norton: Our request was to have it early enough to have it go through Executive Committee first. Their response was if it was interesting, it was also late-breaking, so a day ahead was probably more likely.

Mitchell: Thinks that is fine, as long as the expectation is that it can be shared widely across the University, or within departments, because that would be more helpful. If we’re expecting some preparation, people who want to submit questions will be covered.

Norton: Think we can assume that if they are putting something into Faculty Council, it is expected that we will share it. Viewing it as information, a transmittal process, not something exclusive.

Sharon Anderson: Asked in the chat: What would be the mechanism for getting questions to the President and the Provost?

Chair Doe: Believe that is a good question. Would need to establish some new procedures for that. Don’t see any reason we couldn’t collect additional questions, as there will always be more questions than we have time to respond to in the space of our meetings. We need to have a mechanism for getting these questions to the right people.

Norton: Feel this is an excellent opportunity to encourage faculty participation and ability to ask questions. We can vet the questions into topics that can be curated and passed along.

Pedros-Gascon: Complicated area of management, completely understand. On the one side, we want to make sure that responses are provided, even if it takes time. Don’t believe anyone is

expecting immediate responses but would like a deadline if someone commits to responding to something. Administration should also be willing to say that they are working on something, to acknowledge questions and we will receive a response. Otherwise, we are just asking questions that are rhetorical. Also, likes the idea of one person, one question, but if someone is not responding, there is an expectation that there may be a follow-up question.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for this conversation.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – August 27 & September 3, 2021 – University Curriculum Committee – Brad Goetz, Chair

Chair Doe: We have two sets of University Curriculum Committee minutes. Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything of note for members to see.

Brad Goetz: Nothing out of the ordinary.

Chair Doe: Thanked Goetz. Asked if there was anything members wished to pull or discuss. Hearing none, minutes approved and will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for October 5th.

2. Resubmission of Proposed Revisions to Section D.4 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Marie Legare, Chair

Chair Doe: These were brought to us previously, and this is a resubmission of proposed revisions to Section D.4. Asked Marie Legare to speak to this item.

Marie Legare: What we are trying to do with this revision is to describe a process that is already being used regularly. We want it in the Manual, defined. There were no changes from when this was originally submitted, except for revising the rationale a little bit to make it clearer. One of the questions that was asked last time is if it had been run through Human Resources. We did confirm, and they did look at it, as well as the Office of General Counsel and the University Grievance Officer. They are all in approval of this proposed inclusion.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Asked if there were any questions from members about this item.

Antolin: Thanked Legare. Think there may be a typo on page 34 of the agenda packet. It is the last line of Section D.4.2, outlining “Letter of Reprimand.” Says “Letter of Expectation” even though the section is about “Letter of Reprimand”. Asked: Should that be corrected?

Legare: Thanked Antolin. Absolutely correct, that should read “Letter of Reprimand” instead of “Letter of Expectation.”

Chair Doe: Asked: Can we make this a friendly amendment?

Legare: Confirmed.

Antolin: Thanked Legare. Really appreciative of this change. Had to go through Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel to do this before, and this provides a clear path.

Chair Doe: Requested that Legare do the slight revision and resend.

Legare: Confirmed, will revise and resend following the meeting.

Mitchell: Have a clarification question. Codifying this might be helpful for a department chair to have the letter go through Human Resources review and University Grievance Officer review.

Asked: That isn't in our current process, correct?

Legare: Not necessarily in our current process, which is why it is written up here. If you have been a department chair like Antolin, and you do this the smart way, you may go through these offices before giving a letter of reprimand.

Mitchell: Wondered if it would be helpful to explicitly state that. Imagining being a new chair and trying to figure out this process. If this feels like the language is clear enough, then fine advancing it to Faculty Council.

Legare: Would say that since this was already reviewed by Human Resources before even being submitted to Executive Committee, if they didn't feel the need for that, feel the language is fine as currently stated. This also isn't necessarily a specific template for a chair. It is more meant for faculty to let them know what occurs.

Pedros-Gascon: Wanted to again express concern around the University Grievance Officer changing the category of the letter on their own volition. Concerned about giving one single person the capacity to change the categorization of the letter.

Legare: Did note this from our discussion at the last meeting. Stated that Section K charges the University Grievance officer with determining whether or not an action is grievable. They then have the authority to allow a grievance when something mislabeled is punitive instead. Feel this question is better suited for the floor of Faculty Council. Don't feel this is a question of whether it should be changed in the document, it is more a philosophical question for the floor.

Pedros-Gascon: Did indicate the plan to bring that question to the floor of Faculty Council.

Norton: There is a distinction between policy and practice. This is a useful thing to keep in mind when you are coming up with policy. There are many different approaches that could be used to make sure we are consistent with policy but trying to write code that is a "one size fits all" gets cumbersome. Feels this is a great addition.

Mitchell: Thanked Chair Doe and Norton in the chat. This is one of the reasons we talked last time about the benefits of the University Grievance Officer seeing this prior to it going to faculty. The question is whether this should be policy or practice.

Vice Provost James: Agreed that this should be discussed on the Faculty Council floor. Commented that this does not read as if the University Grievance Officer is deciding whether a person gets a letter of expectation or a letter of reprimand. They are simply looking at the letter to determine whether it is labeled appropriately.

Chair Doe: The University Grievance Officer has an important role here because they determine if something is grievable. The implication here is that mislabeling can mislead.

Antolin: Way this reads is that it just points out that there could be a judgement based on the content of the letter of which criteria is meets.

Norton: Thinks that changes the scope and duties of the University Grievance Officer in a way that would require separate action by the Faculty Council and the administration. Essentially asking them to review hundreds of letters, of which only a few may bring forward a grievance each year. Think that is outside the scope of the University Grievance Officer.

Antolin: Not reading it like that. If a faculty member gets a letter and thinks something is not right, they can bring it to the University Grievance Officer who can make a judgement based on certain criteria for each letter. Think this speaks more to the person undergoing the disciplinary action rather than the administrators who would be carrying it out.

Pedros-Gascon: There is still the possibility that the University Grievance Officer may decide to intervene even when not called to do so. There is no clear wording that prohibits that from happening.

Antolin: Except that it is a personnel matter, which is confidential from the University Grievance Officer until it is brought to them by the person undergoing the process. The University Grievance Officer does not see this unless they are specifically asked to see it.

Legare: Confirmed, that is the process of what happens today. We want this process to be put into the Manual, because it isn't clearly stated anywhere. Going forward, if someone decides that the process should be added to or altered in some way, that would be a change to the process as it is currently happening.

Norton: Moved in the chat to place proposed change to Section D.4 to the Faculty Manual on the agenda for the next Faculty Council meeting. Believe it is ready for debate by faculty.

Chair Doe: We have a motion on the floor. Asked members to vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will appear on the Faculty Council agenda for October 5th.

3. Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Admissions Requirements and Procedures, Track II Admissions and Plan C – Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education – Melinda Smith, Chair

William Sanford: Will speak to these motions, as Melinda Smith is not yet here.

Sanford: These are both straightforward. This change is removing any language about Track II admissions to the Graduate School, which is just someone who had less than a 3.0 average. Now this is all decided by the department. They determine whether someone with less than a 3.0 average can come to their department, and the faculty write a letter of explanation. The Plan C section is also no longer needed.

Chair Doe: Thanked Sanford. Asked if there were any additional questions or discussion. Hearing none, requested a motion.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will appear on the Faculty Council agenda for October 5th.

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

Sanford: This is just adding some words to the collaborative degree program description. Whenever CSU works with another international university, it is formalized as an academic collaboration agreement as facilitated through the Office of International Programs.

Chair Doe: Thanked Sanford. Asked if there was any discussion for this item. Hearing none, requested a motion.

Mitchell: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will appear on the Faculty Council agenda for October 5th.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Directed members' attention to the report that was posted during the Faculty Council meeting. Wasn't able to address anything in the report, so will touch on a few items now.

Chair Doe: Want to explain that the shared governance proposal that was passed through Faculty Council last spring has been turned back by the Office of General Counsel. They had some concerns about the language. We are still seeking information about where the issues lie so we can move this forward in an amended form. Looking forward to this conversation and will try to get it resolved as quickly as possible. Will bring this up at the October meeting, as Faculty Council members should be aware.

Chair Doe: Wanted to also discuss our efforts to create a Faculty Council bioethics committee, which would be separate from the bioethics committee working out of the Vice President for Research Office. Both Moti Gorin and Jennifer Peel serve on the Vice President for Research bioethics committee, and they would be the people to launch this new committee. The point of this is to provide some faculty input into bioethics issues as they arise to offer recommendations to the administration around those issues. The Provost's Office will be having conversations with this bioethics committee in terms of legal implications. Wanted to announce this and seek people who may be interested in getting involved. Asked Peel if there was anything to add.

Jennifer Peel: Goal is to get onto the agenda as an announcement for the next full Faculty Council meeting so we can advertise this. Would love to see broad participation from faculty.

Anderson: Asked in the chat: When would nominations be desired?

Peel: Responded to Anderson in the chat. We will announce it again at the October Faculty Council meeting, so any time between now and October. We want to get some broad participation to develop goals and scope.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked in the chat if the Office of General Counsel had been able to explain what their issue was with the wording. Additionally stated the given the importance of the bioethics issue, it is important to have a committee that can be proactive and that provides clear standards and not just reactive.

Chair Doe: Requested clarification on Pedros-Gascon's first question. Asked: Is that referring to the shared governance?

Pedros-Gascon: Confirmed. Believe the wording was innocuous. Curious what the Office of General Counsel sees as an issue.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Eager to understand what the issues are and will keep at it. Third item is about the core curriculum. This will be looked at over the next few years. Wanted to know if anyone from Executive Committee has an interest in the core curriculum to be in contact as we think about how Faculty Council can be more involved in the core curriculum discussion. The Higher Learning Commission places the responsibility for core curriculum into the hands of faculty.

Mitchell: Asked in the chat: Regarding the core curriculum, how does this conversation fit with the Academic Master Plan?

Chair Doe: Last update is that there has been an update to the [President's action plan on athletics](#). Asked if a few people wanted to take a look at what is reported there and come back with more information at our next Executive Committee meeting next week. Want to learn from this update and get some questions. Requested members be in contact with any interest in doing this.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Melinda Smith: We are meeting on September 28th and 29th here in Fort Collins. Will have a report following that meeting.

F. Discussion Items

1. Vision Zero – Fred Haberecht, Aaron Fodge, Erika Benti & Julia Innes

Chair Doe: Welcomed Fred Haberecht, Aaron Fodge, and Erika Benti to the Executive Committee. Eager to learn about Vision Zero. Will likely need to have a conversation if we determine this should be an oral report for Faculty Council to determine how best to do it effectively and efficiently due to time constraints.

Erika Benti: Thanked Executive Committee. Work in Parking and Transportation Services, along with Haberecht, Fodge, and Julia Innes. All part of the President's Vision Zero Task Force.

Benti: Vision Zero is an international movement that was first implemented in Sweden in the 1990s. In the past decade or so, America has started implementing their own Vision Zero initiatives. This is looking at eliminating traffic fatalities and severe injuries among road users. Vision Zero is trying to turn the traditional way of looking at safety in our transportation system upside down and look at it from a new perspective.

Benti: There are several key tenants for each city or area that has Vision Zero. The first is that the highest level of leadership declaring that this is a priority. There is additionally a component of data collection and analysis, as well as making that data transparent to the public. There is community engagement, prioritizing equity in planning and managing speed to safe levels. Finally, there is setting a timeline to achieve the goal of zero traffic deaths or serious injuries. We think that CSU may be the first university to have its own Vision Zero initiative.

Fred Haberecht: Work with Facilities Management, serving as the campus planner. A student was killed in late 2019 in a car-pedestrian incident. The President implemented a task force to see how we could make campus safer. Part of the evolution of Vision Zero is an effort to look at safety and access on campus with a broader umbrella. There are many siloed efforts on campus that address both safety and access, so Vision Zero is a way to bring those together.

Haberecht: We are at a point where we have multiple ways of transportation on campus. Our effort is to improve infrastructure, policy and education. We are seeing a lot of interest and buy-in from various parts of the University.

Aaron Fodge: We have some milestones. There are five working subcommittees within the task force that have worked through the last six months to develop action plans that we intend to submit to administration in the fall. The first three are related to data collection and reporting. The first subcommittee is called Complete Street Standards. They ensure that when we build a new building or replace a roadway, that we are designing our roadways and trails to ensure all modes of transportation are accommodated for. We want to ensure equitable access and mobility for all employees and students.

Fodge: The second subcommittee is called Safety and Access Assessment. There are many different assessments we do under the umbrella of Vision Zero. We work to look at known deficiencies and prioritize future investment. The third subcommittee is called Crash Evaluation Reporting, where they go beyond the reporting to the police department and look at location and where crashes are occurring frequently. They collect information on these crashes and do an assessment on the location to determine what changes are needed.

Fodge: The second set of subcommittees are looking at how we are transparent in our investment. The first subcommittee is called Conceptual Review. This patterns what the city of Fort Collins does. When we are looking to design a new building, we are making sure that the Complete Street Standards are upheld and that the building welcomes commuters in a way that ensures their safety. This makes sure that all voices are included when we look to build and design a new building. The last subcommittee is working on this public facing report, which is taking the data that we collect and putting it in a form that is digestible for the public. We have a webpage dedicated to it. We use that data to general an annual prioritization report.

Fodge: This task force is interdisciplinary. We have people from across the University, as well as staff from the City of Fort Collins. We have conducted stakeholder engagement with entities across the University.

Haberecht: Think the big question is whether this has a home in Courageous Strategic Transformation. This is a big, bold initiative that should have resources.

Antolin: Loss of the student in 2019 was a tragedy. Curious what the scope of the problem is, meaning, how many accidents are their annually.

Haberecht: Believe it was the first death through a car accident and a pedestrian in over 20 years. We are fortunate there have not been more. We have near misses and some serious accidents. We are using guidance to help solve this and create a safer campus. We look at interactions and signage, the systematic things on campus.

Antolin: Not questioning why this is being done, just curious about whether there were additional incidents or things driving this initiative, or whether it is part of the ongoing planning process.

Haberecht: Think it is a bit of both. Those near misses and recorded accidents are the data that drive where the resources are going.

Fodge: Added that the other thing we know about the transportation data related to crashes is that 80% of them do not get reported. We do have a [website](#), where you can toggle through years and see data on crashes. Repeated that most don't get reported, but the ones that do get reported tend to be severe.

Smith: Had three comments. Asked: What kind of investment is being envisioned for this? Wondering if it will require a line-item in the budget or if it is a one-time thing, or continual investment. Second comment is about the orange scooters and how much they play into the traffic issues on campus. Third question was about engagement with the city of Fort Collins. Fort Collins has kind of a fuzzy boundary, wondering how committed they are to Vision Zero idea.

Fodge: We anticipate having a line-item budget dedicated to infrastructure-related improvements. Think that will come out of the process of adopting Vision Zero by the University. Infrastructure-related improvements tend to be expensive. We have done well in some areas, but there is still a lot of work to do.

Fodge: The scooters are popular. From an equity lens, having them available is showing us that the employees and students have access and mobility to campus, and our trails help them do that. From a congestion standpoint, every one of those scooters is getting a car off the road and saving a parking space on campus. Students know it is a bike-friendly campus, and now we have scooters in the mix. The fact that they are being used helps push the University to figure out how to make them safer as they navigate across campus.

Benti: Worked with Fodge in the process of selecting the new vendor, Spin, in coordination with the city. We did a few sneaky things with safety being a top priority. They turn off in the dismount zone, and can only go 8 miles an hour in our slow zones. They additionally will beep at you if you try to take them places that you shouldn't. So there are some internal controls built in.

Fodge: The last question was about relationship with the city. Would say that we have one of the strongest relationships from a transportation perspective. They all want to see our students safe. They try to help us with our transit system. All employees have transit for free as employees of the University. We do extensive planning for bike trails and how lanes connect, not just on campus but in the city network. We also do a lot of grant applications together, so believe they do care and think we are part of their planning for safety.

Smith: Asked: Do they envision becoming a Vision Zero city?

Fodge: They have adopted Vision Zero, but not necessarily with the specificity that we have. We anticipate that they will be kicking off a formal Vision Zero effort with their current planning effort.

Smith: Expressed appreciation for the responses. Asked: Is there a vision for a push for investment in the beginning and then a longer-term investment?

Haberecht: It will probably be different kinds of investments. There will be some initial funding we will ask for, such as for developing our Complete Streets Standards or for consultants. Then

the infrastructure would be a multi-year that we will probably be on a yearly cycle for. We are prioritizing infrastructure projects and then looking at the multiple sources of funding and grants. Fodge and his team were able to secure a \$500,000 grant this year for bicycle infrastructure through the State Architects Office. It will be a yearly prioritized ask with multiple funding sources anticipated.

Anderson: Think this is really interesting. Asked: Who would ultimately end up paying for this?

Fodge: The Vice President for University Operations budget. Discussed the deferred maintenance issues on campus. Challenge is that, the longer you wait, the more expensive it gets with inflation costs. University has had to deal with these deferred projects and they can lead to, in this case, safety challenges.

Peel: Commented in the chat that in terms of evaluating cost benefits, it would be important to consider co-benefits in terms of climate, air pollution. May have already considered this in your systems approach. We have experts on campus in these areas, as well as active transportation and quantifying benefits in these areas.

Fodge: Responded to Peel in the chat. Mode shift and vehicle selection can reduce greenhouse gases. Our data is also part of AASHE Stars reporting.

Antolin: Commented in the chat that this would be worthwhile to present to full Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Thanked Haberecht, Fodge, and Benti for coming. We would like to get this in front of the Faculty Council. Requested that slides be sent ahead of time. What we have determined is if the slides are sent ahead of time, we can get a sense of the presentation and focus more on the questions that may arise. With everything, it shouldn't be more than about 15-20 minutes.

Chair Doe: Would like to move into Executive Session for a brief discussion. Requested a motion.

Norton: Move that we move into Executive Session.

Smith: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Executive Committee entered into Executive Session. All guests left the meeting.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

Sue Doe, Chair
Andrew Norton, Vice Chair
Melinda Smith, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant