

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, October 19, 2021
3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Andrew Norton, Vice Chair; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President; Jane Stewart, Agricultural Sciences; Rob Mitchell, Business; Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering; 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; Karen Barrett, Chair Committee on Scholastic Standards; Jenelle Beavers, Vice President for Strategy

Absent: Melinda Smith, BOG Representative (excused)

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

October 19, 2021 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

- A. Faculty Council Minutes – October 5, 2021**
- B. Executive Committee Minutes – October 12, 2021**

Chair Doe: Asked: Are there any corrections to either set of minutes to be made?

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on October 26, 2021 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on November 2, 2021 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: One additional announcement. Reminded members that the Employee Climate Survey is now available. Andrew Norton provided a briefing at the previous Faculty Council meeting. We had a high response rate in 2018 and are hoping more similar participation this time around. Asked Norton to remind members when the closing date for the survey was.

Andrew Norton: Confirmed the survey closes on November 19th.

Chair Doe: Suggested we announce it again at the next Faculty Council meeting.

Norton: Believe there was a request that we announce it at the beginning and then another reminder email a few weeks out from the end. We could do an announcement reminder at the next meeting as well as an email to the Faculty Council membership, if the Executive Committee agrees with the use of that email list.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any objections. Hearing none, we will announce this at the next Faculty Council meeting and then send a reminder email.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Had a comment about the survey. Completed it earlier today. In the identification section, there were limited options for identifying. Identify as an Hispanic individual, but there were no options for selecting identification as an Hispanic from Spain. Would like to see this take a more international approach.

Pedros-Gascon: Would like to also see questions for those who do not speak English as their first language. Suggested a space for them to indicate how they feel they are perceived when they speak in English to others. Expressed hope this will be considered for future surveys.

Chair Doe: Requested this feedback in writing. Was on the committee with Norton that helped develop the instrument this year, and this kind of feedback can be generative for the future.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: Focus has been moving forward on our student success initiative and targeting first-year students. We have a two-hour retreat this coming Friday with all the associate Deans and our leadership group for student success. We will be identifying our first-year students, including first time and transfer students, that might need extra help or are struggling. We are working on what we can do in a more coordinated fashion. We will be providing a report at the December Board of Governors meeting to discuss how it is going.

Provost Pedersen: The Academic Master Plan is going well. We had a good open forum last week and have another one at the end of October. These are open for everyone.

Provost Pedersen: Received a letter today from the Higher Learning Commission about reaccreditation date. They have provided dates in Fall of 2023, as well as Spring of 2024. We could have a site visit as early as September of 2023, which is less than two years away. We will need to give them dates within the next two weeks that will work best for our campus and then develop a timeline. Would like to get input from Executive Committee about putting together a University steering committee for our reaccreditation process. This committee would guide the whole process. Would like input on representation for that steering committee. Like this model because it is a campus-wide collaborative model undergoing the process for each reaccreditation.

Jennifer Peel: Read the email from the Pandemic Preparedness Team right before the meeting. Really encouraging how well CSU is doing compared to the rest of Larimer County. With respect to the vaccine data being reported, feel it would be helpful if we could get information on how many are fully vaccinated and partially vaccinated.

Provost Pedersen: Asked: Are those numbers combined together?

Peel: Confirmed, that is what is on the COVID website. Would be helpful to have it broken down as well by age groups and faculty/staff versus students, and the percentage of people fully vaccinated in those groups.

Provost Pedersen: Will ask about this.

Norton: Had asked about flu vaccine clinics at the last meeting. Expressed appreciation to Provost Pedersen for getting back to us on that very quickly. Have not checked email to see how widely that has been advertised, but feel it would be a great service to campus if this was more widely advertised so we can get herd immunity for the flu as well.

Provost Pedersen: Reported that an announcement was sent in the past few days. [Here is the information that was sent out from HR: Flu clinic update, notifications being sent to faculty and staff: <https://hr.colostate.edu/current-employees/benefits/flu-shot-clinics/>].

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, thanked Provost Pedersen.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – October 8, 2021

Chair Doe: Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything in these minutes to be brought to the attention of the Executive Committee.

Brad Goetz: No, these are short with fairly ordinary action items.

Chair Doe: Requested a motion to place these on the Faculty Council agenda for November 2nd.

Rob Mitchell: Moved.

Chair Doe: Asked: Are there any objections to placing these on Faculty Council agenda? Hearing none, University Curriculum Committee minutes will appear on the agenda for November 2nd.

2. Resolution Regarding Graduate Student Compensation and Fees – Melinda Smith, Sybil Sharvelle, Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Moti Gorin, & Ramaa Vasudevan

Sybil Sharvelle: The edits this time around were minor. We took notes of the comments made at the previous meeting and addressed these minor revisions. We spelled out CSUTP to indicate this was the strategic plan and changed some other verbiage to mitigate confusion.

Chair Doe: We may want to hear from Provost Pedersen and Vice Provost Susan James on this resolution. They may have some comments on this. Had a previous conversation about being careful about specificity, given the range of budgetary claims that are being made.

Vice Provost Susan James: We had a previous discussion at another Executive Committee about the need to improve faculty salaries. We have a need for all our employee groups around salary, including administrative professionals. Wanted to communicate to Executive Committee that at the Provost level, we are going to try to advocate for all our employee groups together, including graduate students, administrative professionals, and faculty, as well as what we can do for state classified in terms of making budget plans. Does not necessarily mean this resolution should not happen but wanted to indicate that we are advocating for all our employees at once.

Provost Pedersen: It is a top priority for all employees that we address salary and equity. We would like to do this in a comprehensive manner. Vice Provost James will be leading and pulling the data around compensation that is needed for faculty and administrative professionals. We also know graduate students need this and we would like to develop a comprehensive picture to address all these issues and start looking at what we need to allocate as a top priority in the budget to start addressing this. We want to do this in a way that is addressing all our employees.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed agreement that the whole institution needs to be addressed. Feels that graduate students should be a high priority and that we need a strong commitment from the institution and the Board of Governors.

Provost Pedersen: Think President Joyce McConnell has shown support for this in the initial budget put together for next year. The graduate students were the only group included as a line item to have an increase. Part of the analysis of building things into the base budget is where we need to address certain priorities and which ones are more urgent.

Sharvelle: Expressed agreement with Pedros-Gascon. This is a pressing matter that was brought to our attention last year by the graduate students. It is particularly concerning with respect to their success and this seems like something that needs to be prioritized. Asked if this resolution would slow down efforts towards the more comprehensive effort.

Vice Provost James: Don't believe it will slow it down. We wanted Executive Committee to be aware of comprehensive approach. We want to look at all groups so we know where the priorities are. We also want to look at our competitiveness, recruitment, and retention for all employees, including graduate students. Don't think the resolution would slow down approach.

Mitchell: Wanted to see if taking this stance on graduate students would preclude efforts on a more comprehensive thing. Commented that there is likely to be inflation pressure this year that is different from what we have seen in the past. There may be a need across the board for addressing some of these issues depending on where we end up with inflationary pressures.

Chair Doe: Wondering if there is value to adding a line at the beginning, situating the resolution in the broader context that we are aware that the institution is looking at compensation across the board and we are just prioritizing graduate students. Wondering if this would confound issues or dilute statement.

Provost Pedersen: Suggested that the word "prioritizing" may not be the best word to use. This may read that one group is more important than the other. Would frame it around expressing a greater gap or more urgent need that implies that there is a higher need or discrepancy.

Chair Doe: Think if it were also embedded within a statement that contextualized the broader need across the board for compensation review and improvement, that might also help.

Mitchell: Like this idea. Also like how it reflects the nature of the conversation we are currently having, with administration and Faculty Council working together on these issues. Feels this is a great signal to be sending rather than having one document that may not be consistent with what is happening in the Provost's Office or President's Office, even if we are all in agreement and consistent. Feels sending this signal to the Board of Governors is a good thing to be doing.

Pedros-Gascon: Commented in the chat that this can be included. Believe it was already understood that we are aware of the issues percolating at all the levels.

Chair Doe: Think stating this and providing context might be important for the purposes of documentation. With resolutions like these, they are on the record.

Pedros-Gascon: Only concern with this is that because we have so many issues, we may not feel like we can address this issue. Problem of indicating that this is part of a larger problem is that we may feel since we cannot tackle the larger problem, we may not want to tackle this either. Fine with anything we feel needs to be added as a qualifier.

Chair Doe: Suggested language that states the possibility within a context of broad need for improved compensation across all employee types, and then go into "whereas the needs of graduate students are more urgent and the discrepancies in compensation greater" or something similar. Just drafting. Wondering if this would satisfy and create the bridge to broader objectives for reviewing compensation while making it clear this is a more urgent need.

Vice Provost James: Would continue to urge caution around specificity. Unless we know the discrepancy is larger for graduate students and the need more urgent, would be choosing the wording carefully. We don't currently have data on administrative professionals, but we do have people living on low salaries in that category and as state classified employees. We have data on graduate students but not other groups, so would be careful with comparisons.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. Intention was not to suggest that graduate students are more urgent than anyone else, but that the graduate student needs are more urgent compared to the graduate students elsewhere.

Sharvelle: Think we can simplify this and state that as part of this broader effort to increase salaries across the board, we have recognized the important of graduate student salaries. Can just leave it there. We are recognizing the broader issue but that this resolution is focused on the graduate student part of that.

Chair Doe: Wrote in the chat suggested language: "As part of a broader effort around improving compensation across the board, this resolution is focused on graduate students."

Norton: Expressed agreement with Sharvelle. Think it is also important to consider who the audience is for this resolution. Does not feel it is so much the administration here at CSU, because administration recognizes the urgent need for all employees, but perhaps the audience is the Board

of Governors. They may not consider graduate students as real employees and may look at them as a revenue source rather than an integral piece to our mission. Another important audience may be the graduate students, to see that faculty are acting in solidarity with them on this issue. Would be an important message to get across.

Chair Doe: Thanked Norton. Important to think about audience. Asked if the resolution group could go back one more time and add this item to bring back next week.

Sharvelle: Can do this easily.

Chair Doe: Thanked the group. Will not take a motion on it at this time, but will look at this again next week. Asked if there were any objections to this.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, thanked members for the discussion.

3. Vision Zero Endorsement Statement

Chair Doe: Read the suggested Vision Zero endorsement statement as seen in the agenda packet. The statement read "Faculty Council recommends adoption of the Colorado State University Vision Zero declaration. The safety of our students and employees is tantamount to providing equitable access and mobility to actively participate in our campuses."

Chair Doe: Reported that this is the statement provided to us by Vision Zero. The question before us is whether we are inclined to endorse this. Believe that an absence of an endorsement would not necessarily mean we are not supportive of the effort. They are seeking an endorsement. Asked members how they felt about this.

Sharon Anderson: Feels it would be better to have this passed on to the Faculty Council and let the endorsement come from them rather than from Executive Committee.

Chair Doe: Clarified that all we would be doing today is deciding whether we will put this on the agenda for the November Faculty Council meeting to consider. The Vision Zero group gave their presentation at the last Faculty Council meeting. Wondering if it may be worth including their presentation back into the packet as a refresher for members.

Mike Antolin: Believe at one point there was a question about whether we were endorsing some use of budget. Believe this is not in our purview.

Chair Doe: Believe Mitchell discussed at a previous meeting about endorsing things and inadvertently committing resources that we do not understand.

Mitchell: Think it is important to think strategically about resources and looking more broadly across issues and what we want to support. Question about this endorsement is the reason behind them wanting the endorsement. Would like to know what the reasoning is behind the request for endorsement and how it will be used. We heard President McConnell talking in support of this, so they already have support from administration. If this is to be able to show broader movement and support for the Vision Zero, then that is a good use of Faculty Council time.

Chair Doe: Might be that we need more clarification from them regarding the purpose of the endorsement. We could bring this back next week and hopefully have a response regarding that and can reconvene around the question.

Antolin: If they have some kind of budget projection as part of our question we would like to have answered before we endorse, don't see a reason we shouldn't ask for that.

Chair Doe: Requested clarification on what we are asking. Asked if we were just asking about the purpose in seeking our endorsement.

Antolin: Would be more specific than that. Would ask about the budget impact or does this include an ask for funds from central administration and what the projection of costs would be.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were objections in proceeding in this manner. Hearing none, will put this back on the agenda for next week's Executive Committee meeting. Will check with the Vision Zero group and receive clarification.

Antolin: Asked if a budget projection slide could be added to their slide deck for inclusion in the supporting materials for the Faculty Council agenda packet.

Chair Doe: Will ask for this. Can have the budget projection and the endorsement statement, which was previously sent in some revised slides.

4. Motion on Extending the Completion for the AUCC 3E to 1C
Curriculum Transition – University Curriculum Committee – Brad
Goetz, Chair

Chair Doe: At our last meeting, we had discussed the 3E to 1C curricular change, and Goetz had indicated that the University Curriculum Committee was interested in extending the deadline for completion from Fall 2022 to either Fall 2024 or Spring 2025. The idea of this motion is that it acknowledges progress being made towards completing the curricular change, but also reflects the delays due to the pandemic and that there is an ongoing need for faculty leadership in the continued careful preparation for this curricular initiative.

Chair Doe: The extension needs to happen relatively quickly. Perhaps the motion could come from University Curriculum Committee, but in the interest of time, went ahead and wrote up a motion from the Executive Committee. Want Executive Committee to consider the readiness of this to stand debate on the floor of Faculty Council.

Provost Pedersen: There are several pieces of this that we have identified that we need to address, and we are trying to do it in a stepwise manner. This revolves around the new 1C category being rolled out with pilot courses. There have been questions around the criteria moving forward, as well as assessment and evaluation moving forward. Impression is that a lot of the work being done was done in the spirit of piloting courses but not necessarily to be permanent for all courses moving forward.

Provost Pedersen: We need a longer timeline to continue to make progress in the 1C area, which is this first step. We also need to then identify the next steps as we are moving forward. One of the

pieces that includes is how to deal with the 3E courses from the Registrar side to make it workable for students, faculty, and the curriculum. Moving forward, we want to finalize the requirements around this new 1C category. Will need to work with Deans and department heads and chairs to look at the impact on faculty teaching loads, budgets, financial situations. It is important to assure faculty that we are doing these changes in a progressive manner that will not impact individuals, positions, and jobs. Really the first step is extending the deadline so we can get the work done and extend it with the notion that we will continue to move forward.

Chair Doe: Asked if Provost Pedersen could speak more broadly to the shift of courses from 3E to 1C.

Provost Pedersen: The original proposal from April 2020 indicated a staged process to immediately move all AUCC 3E diversity and global awareness to fulfill the 1C course demands. They were also forming a committee to craft a template for the new courses that address both diversity and oral communication, student learning outcomes and content criteria. Believe we are between those stages.

Provost Pedersen: What Faculty Council or University Curriculum Committee needs to propose and get approval for is whether we can take and convert all the current 3E courses and move them all to 1C. This is challenging and critical for Registrar's Office. For them to do it in a staged manner, doing the experimental courses first in this group and then that group is a heavy workload because it impacts every single curricular flow sheet. The time frame we need to consider is how long it would take to review courses to ensure they meet the new guidelines, as well as a time frame for a transition period. Want to make sure it is manageable for the registrar as well as faculty.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Asked if there were any questions for the Provost before she needs to leave for a different meeting.

Norton: Believe there was some language around assisting departments moving 3E courses to other parts of the core rather than 1C if the instructor doesn't believe their course fits those requirements. There have been some other discussions about being able to do that sooner rather than later. Wondering if this is still part of the discussion, or if the idea is to move them all to 1C and then at some point in the future decide if they need to be moved.

Provost Pedersen: Feeling is that we want to give the course an option of moving somewhere that fits with their course. Needs to happen in a coordinated fashion. Having the option of choice is a good option.

Norton: Feel the coordinate approach would work well. Think the fear is that it has been difficult to figure out what the expectations are and what the processes are so we avoid having to go through the CIM system twice.

Provost Pedersen: Once the committee decides on how to move forward, we will have a meeting with Vice Provost Kelly Long and the Registrar's Office to understand the back end. Sensitive to our teams making it happen and want this to be as easy on them as possible.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Goetz is knowledgeable about this issue. Asked Goetz what the feeling is about putting forward a motion parallel to what has been put in front of Executive Committee. Would put forward a motion similar to what Provost Pedersen just discussed, about opening the possibility of moving a 3E course to somewhere other than 1C. Asked: Would the University Curriculum Committee be interested in doing that, or would Executive Committee need to take that up?

Goetz: Without this becoming more contrived, it is probably best that Executive Committee put forward a proposal to buy time on the action items that were already approved by Faculty Council. The University Curriculum Committee has not had enough time to work around all the details. We came forward with this because this is already an action item approved on by the full Faculty Council.

Goetz: To provide some additional background, the idea is to do exactly what Norton is suggesting, which is letting people move to other categories of the AUCC unless they feel their course is appropriate for 1C or they can make adjustments to their course right now to be comfortable in 1C. This is what has caused questions among faculty and units. Commented that the current 3E courses already have a different category in the AUCC. The 3E category, the original global and cultural awareness category, was a CSU invention. All these courses in 3E already have a home somewhere else in the AUCC. A lot of the challenges for the Registrar's Office is having the 1C and 3E at the same time. Every undergraduate program of study in the University will require some change. This motion will provide us time to talk with the Curriculum Catalog, Registrars, the Provost, and others about how to implement these changes.

Goetz: We are in the 11th hour now. If we can get this to Faculty Council in November, it can either be passed or if there are questions, we can address them in December. If it's held off until February, we will have passed some deadlines that are necessary for the curriculum catalog. Other concern is that we will then be in violation of the Faculty Council approval of the item.

Chair Doe: Requested some clarification. Suggestion is that we can just move forward with the motion in front of us but understanding from the Provost was that a second motion was requested regarding the shift of 3E to 1C for the purposes of the Registrar's Office.

Goetz: Sense was that the motion here covers the entire action item from April 2020, which then gives us the ability to put off that deadline in Fall 2022 to Fall 2024.

Vice Provost James: Expressed agreement with Goetz. Most important thing is extension of time. We should still work on the move of 3E to 1C with some time limit, mostly for the sake of the Registrar's Office and advisors. If we can do this in the next few months, it will help for planning for next academic year, but it is not as urgent.

Chair Doe: Asked if we would be meeting the immediate needs with this one motion for now.

Vice Provost James: Confirmed this motion is all that is needed right now. We will need the other motion soon but can take some time to work on it. Could be at the December or February Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Doe: This is consistent with what Goetz was saying, that this one motion would incorporate the assumption around the second one, but we would need greater clarity and specificity around the second one a little bit later.

Vice Provost James: Correct. The second motion would also likely come from the University Curriculum Committee.

Goetz: Confirmed. We will need to have significant conversation around whether it will need to be an action item for Faculty Council or whether another approach can be taken with the majority of faculty and courses involved in that process.

Chair Doe: Thanked Goetz and Vice Provost James for the clarification. Asked if there were questions from Executive Committee.

Antolin: Went to the website where these categories are described. It seems to be a renaming of the category. Asked: Is it more of a renaming of the category or is it meant to be a specific expansion or change in focus?

Goetz: Over the course of a decade, there have been some changing needs in the University as perceived by students and faculty. The new category of diversity, equity and inclusion was going to reflect some of those needs that have evolved over time. It is not a simple renaming. It is more a reshaping of the education experience and reshaping of the AUCC. We needed a process to be able to not have additional requirements placed on students or programs, but to find a place in already existing AUCC coursework to expand on the ideas. This was intended to be a category that would address diversity, equity and inclusion on campus in a different way and bringing the campus into better alignment with some needs identified by students and faculty.

Chair Doe: Suggested having an offline meeting with those interested in understanding all this better. Could put together a meeting to discuss this and talk about its historic roots.

Norton: Have been to a few meetings about this and have a better understanding as a 3E instructor of what is going on and why. Have had some concerns about how this proceeded, really found out about this move in other ways. Sensitive to how the process is moving forward. Would like to discuss with Goetz specifics about engaging with instructors in 3E. There is some language making them nervous, such as “shifting 3E to 1C” or “conversion of 3E to 1C”. Some courses may not fit without a complete re-working to meet the objectives of 1C. Want to avoid the situation where 3E courses move to different “3” categories and leave the new 1C without enough courses to meet student demand and graduation requirements. What is being heard today is that 3E’s will be temporary 1C courses as we populate with more courses that meet all the curricular needs as defined by 1C. Think the coordinated process mentioned by Provost Pedersen is the way to go.

Vice Provost James: Think this will be important for the University Curriculum Committee to take to heart. If we are doing the practical thing of moving all 3E to 1C temporarily and having them go through further approval, Norton is right. The category of 3E is not the same as 1C and we do not want students to think we are pulling a fast one on them. The language that comes from the University Curriculum Committee needs to be sensitive to that. As Goetz mentioned earlier, the 3E

courses have another category they live in. Need to be sensitive to this because we are being practical, but it doesn't mean we are going back on what the original intention of 1C.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed the concern of many faculty in the College of Liberal Arts. This category affects our college and many of the classes and the international perspective we have been working for, and this may be removed for a more local approach. Feels this is an impacting decision that requires deeper thought and what we expect out of an education for our students.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any further discussion or questions. Would be happy to field questions and conversation offline.

Norton: Requested a friendly amendment. There seems to be a template issue with the motion, the title and individuals appear incorrect.

Chair Doe: We will correct this. If no further discussion, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for November 2nd with the friendly amendment.

Anderson: Moved.

Linda Meyer: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will appear on the Faculty Council agenda for November 2nd.

5. Election – Faculty Representatives to Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Doe: Requested a motion to place this ballot on the agenda for the Faculty Council meeting on November 2nd.

Antolin: Moved.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that no second is needed. Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will appear on the Faculty Council agenda for November 2nd.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Focus this last week has been on three different proposals. The first was the motion we just discussed and the conversation around how to move forward with a motion to buy us some time. Have also been working on the creation of a task force that would address the 3E to 1C transition. This would put this effort into faculty hands, extending the work of the University Curriculum Committee. This task force would address the challenges as a result of the motion and attempt to bring parties together to bring voices into the conversation so we can discuss impact of

existing 3E courses, impact on international and global perspectives, impact on budget, impact on credit hours. Am also in the midst of creating a task force that will deal more specifically with core curriculum and that will look at the issues of the core curriculum. Have asked Norton to head up that task force. We will be getting feedback from the Provost's Office regarding that and will have more information soon.

Chair Doe: Attended the Committee on Faculty Governance meeting this week. They heard the proposal on the creation of a new standing committee for information technology. Reminded members that we had a task force last year that addressed the need for more faculty participation in information technology. The proposal now stands in front of the Committee on Faculty Governance, and we will be hearing from them soon.

Chair Doe: The Committee on Faculty Governance is also looking at the shared governance language that was turned back. They are considering any changes they wish to suggest.

Chair Doe: Have been talking with Vice Provost James and the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty regarding the two issues they brought forward. The two questions were around how we get unaffiliated non-tenure track faculty representation on Faculty Council and getting more involvement in contract language. We have been doing research to solve these issues. There are also a substantial number of administrative professionals teaching. We will continue to work on this.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that Adrianna Kezar will be visiting on November 8th and 9th. Kezar is considered a thought leader on the issues of status and working conditions of non-tenure track faculty. Her plenary talk will be on Monday, November 8th at 4:00 p.m. in the Longs Peak Room. Encouraged members to attend if able. Asked if there were any questions regarding report.

Pedros-Gascon: Wondered who is evaluating the teaching of the administrative professionals. Asked if we could know this for compliance reasons.

Vice Provost James: This is a good question and one the task force is trying to discuss. Reported that the College of Liberal Arts is being proactive about this and there are many people bringing this to the attention of the Dean and requesting that the teaching is being evaluated. This is one of the things we need to work on.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Hearing no further questions, concluded report.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Unable to attend – no report at this time. Will provide a written report for Faculty Council meeting on November 2nd.

F. Discussion Items

1. Late W Recommendation – Committee on Scholastic Standards – Karen Barrett, Chair

Karen Barrett: With COVID, there were some special provisions in place to help students who were struggling due to COVID and the changes in the way courses were delivered. In the context of this, there was a change to the date at which one could withdraw from courses. There has always been a policy that you can withdraw from the entire University up until the last day of classes, but not for individual courses. Question was raised if it made sense to institute those policies on a permanent basis, or if we wanted to modify the current policy with regard to the date in which a student is capable of withdrawing from individual courses. Currently it is mid-semester, at eight weeks into the semester. At eight weeks, many have not even had their mid-term. Students would have to make a decision about withdrawing from a class without as much information as would be desirable.

Barrett: We had a conversation about this in the Committee on Scholastic Standards, as well as an ad hoc committee, the Academic Policies Committee, that is comprised of various representatives from across campus that work with students. Co-chair the committee with Shawn Archibeque, who is the chair of the Committee on Teaching and Learning, where this has also been discussed. In the Academic Policies Committee, there was strong agreement that the current policy is not desirable and there are many cases in which the students do not have enough information to make an informed decision. We did some research and looked at what other universities were doing. It was brought back to the Committee on Scholastic Standards, and the decision was that 12 weeks, or three-quarters through a semester, was a good date. The metric would be three-quarters through the course, even if it is not twelve weeks. There were discussions about doing it later in the semester. Downside to this is in many courses there are group projects or major projects due past the mid-point in the semester and projects like these can have a large impact on grades. If we do a late withdrawal, students could realize they can withdraw at the eleventh hour and therefore not need to participate in any projects. The three-quarters through the semester date seemed to be a good compromise. We can discuss whether that sounds like the right date.

Chair Doe: We have some options here. Wondering if this will be a motion to propose a specific date or if a conversation is needed to gain more input from faculty. We could possibly discuss this in November and then have a motion in December.

Norton: Last summer when we moved the withdrawal date, was wholeheartedly for it and saw no downsides. Am teaching a class this semester and have a fear that students stopped after their first test and would not respond to communication. Would be helpful and would make a more compelling proposal if there was some data on student success and how it has been affected by changing the late withdrawal policy.

Barrett: We do have data on that and it helped inform our decision. The data suggested that students are much more successful when they have this option. It does increase the likelihood of persistence. It looks like a successful intervention for students when they can do it judiciously with specific classes. Some of the downsides are in terms of items like group projects, where a last-minute decision could impact them.

Antolin: Asked: What are the impacts to students in terms of tuition and what goes on their transcript?

Barrett: The financial piece is complicated. May be helpful to get additional input from financial aid. Understanding is that it does not impact a student's financial aid at all. The language is vague in

the documentation, so will check with financial aid because there seemed to be some instances where it might impact their financial aid. Can get additional clarity on this.

Antolin: Asked: If the student is not on financial aid, what about their tuition?

Barrett: They do not get their money back. That part is clear, but there are some cases where they may have to pay back financial aid for the class they are withdrawing from. At the very least, they would need to be informed of their decision because this could be a consequence.

Antolin: Asked: What goes on their transcript?

Barrett: It would be a W.

Chair Doe: Asked: Who would inform the student of the possible implications for financial aid? Wondering who would have this responsibility and how it would happen.

Barrett: That is something we want to talk about in terms of how to get it implemented. Agree with idea that they need to be informed. Advising would be a strong group to help with this. Advising could tell them to speak with financial aid as part of the process and students would be strongly encouraged to speak with advising before withdrawing, because they can tell them more than just the financial implications. They can also discuss Graduate School and standing in the department and regarding courses they need to take.

Chair Doe: Seems like there are items to get more information on. This could be a presentation to the faculty and present this as a discussion item. We could discuss this and then look for a motion at the following meeting.

Barrett: Will get the additional information and put together a slideshow that includes some of the data we used to inform this decision.

Chair Doe: Requested a motion to place on Faculty Council agenda as a discussion item.

Antolin: Moved.

Meyer: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will appear as a discussion item on Faculty Council agenda for November 2nd.

Barrett: Requested clarification on proposed discussion. Asked: Is the discussion around the three-quarters through the semester part or the idea of it being sometime before the end of the semester but beyond the mid-point?

Chair Doe: Would likely be better to have a more specific date that have a general discussion around possible dates.

Antolin: Feels it makes more sense to present the proposal and justifications.

Chair Doe: Thanked Barrett.

2. Courageous Strategic Transformation Update – Jenelle Beavers, Vice President for Strategy

Chair Doe: Welcomed Vice President Jenelle Beavers. Eager to hear how the Courageous Strategic Transformation process is going.

Vice President Jenelle Beavers: Thanked Executive Committee. Have three major updates. The drafting groups have been hard at work, and almost all of them have come up with some initial draft goals that are being put on the website. Encouraged members to go check those out. Took suggestion about having departments and affiliations listed with the group memberships.

Vice President Beavers: We have begun hosting open fora for each group and they have been going well. Around seventy people attended the one regarding Inclusive Excellence and we had about 100 people at the Academic Master Plan one. Very encouraged by the level of participation. Feels it is great to have smart, committed people from around the University getting in a room to talk about these issues and coming up with a plan together.

Vice President Beavers: An email went out regarding the inspiration proposals, which are now due October 31st. We have received a lot of them, and due to the generosity of a donor, we will be able to fund some of them.

Vice President Beavers: There are a couple workshops coming up where members of the drafting groups will be sitting down and looking at the goals together and considering how they overlap and do some prioritization. Excited for these groups to do that together and think about how their work is impacting other groups. Would like to do this exercise with everyone all over campus. Wondering if this group would think about wanting to do this exercise with the goals as a faculty group. We are at the phase where we are looking at this work and thinking about what is next.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice President Beavers. Asked for clarification about request. Asked: Are you wondering whether Executive Committee would be interested in hosting a session where we discuss the overlaps and connections?

Vice President Beavers: Yes. Did this with the operations team. We did some ranking exercises and had conversations about the things that went together. Commented that this process took about two hours, so it is a time commitment. There is also a survey that can just be completed.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice President Beavers for the invitation and will contemplate this. Suggested getting the chairs of the standing committees potentially involved as well.

Vice President Beavers: Commented that we are not worried about faculty involvement in this process at all. Just think Executive Committee is uniquely positioned, which is why this was offered up as a suggestion.

Chair Doe: Asked members to consider this and we can take it up at the next meeting for consideration and discussion.

Vice President Beavers: This would work. At some point we need to start drafting, but would like as much information as possible before then. We are attempting to be done with these exercises by fall break. If Executive Committee can discuss at the next meeting, that would be great. Will also ensure group gets the survey that goes out as well.

Chair Doe: Have been impressed by the critical engagement of people attending the open fora. There has been extremely thoughtful feedback provided. Encouraged members to attend sessions if able. Will take this idea of further engagement up and discuss at our next meeting. Asked if there were further questions for Vice President Beavers.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, thanked Vice President Beavers. Unless there are objections, will call this meeting adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

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