

**MINUTES**  
Executive Committee  
**Tuesday, September 28, 2021**  
**3:00pm – Microsoft Teams**

**Present:** Sue Doe, Chair; Andrew Norton, Vice Chair; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; 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

**Absent:** Melinda Smith, BOG Representative (excused for BOG meeting); Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President (excused for BOG meeting)

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

**September 28, 2021 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. Minutes to be Approved**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes – September 21, 2021**

Chair Doe: We have some Executive Committee minutes to approve. Asked: Are there any corrections to be made to these minutes?

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 12, 2021 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: Our next Executive Committee meeting will be two weeks from today at 3:00 p.m.

2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on October 5, 2021 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: Our next Faculty Council meeting is next Tuesday. Reminded members of the time difference. The Faculty Council meeting starts at 4:00 p.m.

3. Vision Zero follow-up

- a. Vision Zero requests that: *Faculty Council recommends adoption of the Colorado State University Vision Zero declaration. The safety of our student and employees is tantamount to providing equitable access and mobility to actively participate in our campuses.*

Chair Doe: Reminded members of the presentation Vision Zero gave on September 14<sup>th</sup>. There was one point where they mentioned they could use Faculty Council support. We clarified this with them and they came back with a note that included this statement. They requested Faculty Council's endorsement of their initiative. They are hoping that Faculty Council will support CSU's adoption of the Vision Zero declaration. Requested members reach out with any concerns or questions regarding this.

Chair Doe: Will be resuming Laps and Chats. Had conducted office hours last year in the outdoor settings by walking around the Oval. Will be resuming these on Wednesdays at 2:30 p.m. Encouraged members to join if available and interested.

Chair Doe: Professor Adrianna Kezar will be visiting on November 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>, sponsored by the Provost's Office. Adrianna Kezar is a leading thought leader on issues relating to the changing faculty, specifically the ever-increasing move from tenure-track to non-tenure track. She will be having an open forum on November 8<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 p.m. More details to come.

Chair Doe: Final announcement is around a note received yesterday from the Provost's Office regarding our shared governance Manual language changes in Section C that was turned back by the Office of General Counsel. This was approved by Faculty Council in May, but was not taken forward to the Board of Governors. Vice Provost Susan James is here today and can speak more to the advice we received yesterday.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any questions regarding the announcements. Hearing none, turned the floor to Vice Provost James.

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

Chair Doe: Provost Mary Pedersen is attending the Board of Governors meeting and is unable to be here today. Was listening to her presentation half an hour ago, where she discussed the Academic Master Plan. Welcomed Vice Provost James.

Vice Provost Susan James: Thanked Chair Doe. No formal report beyond the shared governance item, which we will get to in a moment. Reminded members of Provost Pedersen's main goals this year. Provost Pedersen wants to get prepared for reaccreditation, which is happening in a little under two years, focusing on student success plans, and the Academic Master Plan. The retreat for the Academic Master Plan is this Friday, October 1<sup>st</sup>. Wanted everyone to be aware of this, as departments should be aware of the Academic Master Plan and participating. This is a long-term strategic planning around our academic mission, enrollment, and what kinds of programs we offer.

Vice Provost James: We heard back from Jannine Mohr from the Office of General Counsel regarding the shared governance Manual changes. We met with her, as well as Vice President Jenelle Beavers and Ann Claycomb. Stated that everything that goes to the Board of Governors needs to go through the Office of General Counsel first. Mohr had commented that other items had been sent back in the past, confirming the precedent for that to occur.

Vice Provost James: Part of the concern was the placement of the language in the Preface, because the Preface applies to the entire Manual, which includes administrative professionals. Shared governance is really about the faculty part of the Manual. Had sent them the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) information on shared governance prior to meeting. Idea was to provide them with the national context. They were fine with the AAUP guidance on shared governance. The AAUP information talks about shared governance, particularly around the academic affairs of the University, such as curriculum or tenure and promotion. Their issue was around the placement of the language.

Vice Provost James: The Office of General Counsel suggested to keep it simpler and place it in Section C.1, which describes faculty responsibility for academic policy. Section C is the code around faculty government. They suggested that the language be placed here and have it point to Section C.2.1.2, which describes the powers and responsibilities of faculty.

Chair Doe: Thinking that we might send this back to committee, including the task force that initiated the effort as well as the Committee on Faculty Governance that constructed the language. Would be inclined to send it back to them for review. They may decide to take these suggestions and bring it back to Executive Committee, or they may either abandon it or bring back something entirely different.

Andrew Norton: Has been a few months since reading the AAUP language. Recollection was that there was language in there specifically around shared governance in the selection of administrators. That does not seem to be covered by what is currently in our Manual. Part of our discussions around the end of summer were that this was not targeting any particular part of the University with this. Think the times we run into shared governance issues are with new Deans, department heads or other administrators. Having specific language about meaningful participation, which is AAUP language, would be helpful.

Vice Provost James: The selection of administrators' language was probably part of what triggered the response from the Office of General Counsel. We had discussed this in the summer. There was quite a bit of shared governance in the participation of faculty involved in the various searches conducted, including for the new Vice President for Inclusive Excellence. We thought faculty had been engaged and represented in those searches, which is a good example of shared governance. Mohr likely did not want to give the impression that faculty choose the administrators or have veto power, as the hiring authority in the end decides who is hired. Want to make sure the language is clear that this is not the suggestion.

Vice Provost James: The AAUP language does talk about the roles of faculty versus the roles of administration, with faculty being involved in the areas of curriculum, research, faculty status, and appointments. Suggested that this should go back to committee, knowing the feedback from

the Office of General Counsel and take another look at this. The good news is that the Office of General Counsel is trying to hire more lawyers, so if there is a need to cycle back, hopefully the process will be a bit faster this time around.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any thoughts on this. Encouraged members to think about this. We will return it to committee and have a robust discussion around it. We understand what the objective was, around the national context where shared governance has been under duress. We were trying to have CSU stand out in its ability to articulate a commitment.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Agreed that this should return to the committees and we should inform them of the solution being proposed. Feels that the proposed language is not really addressing the concerns that faculty have pertaining to the way in which the administration is functioning. The committee is aware of all the details that were taken into account during this discussion. Reiterated that there are questions about how many units were effected, etc. that were asked at the Faculty Council meeting to President McConnell. Expressed hope that those questions will be responded to by the end of the year.

Vice Provost James: Requested that Pedros-Gascon remind us of the question asked regarding units and faculty affected. Want to make sure these get back to the President and Provost.

Pedros-Gascon: Commented that he will not be in attendance at the next Faculty Council meeting, since he is flying to Mexico. Will be asking someone to request that the questions asked be included in the record of the minutes. Believe in the right to have these questions included in the record. We were asking about units that are not doing evaluations and how many people are being affected by this. Will share these questions again if needed. Expressed hope that these are addressed by the end of the academic year.

Vice Provost James: Expressed appreciation for the clarification. Was not sure which questions were being discussed. Stated that there is a short-term fix for this year to ensure that all administrative professionals get evaluated. We are working to bring back a process that includes all units on campus, working with Human Resources on this. Human Resources is working on a longer-term solution. They will need to get their new system in place in order to implement the longer-term solution.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. Have a few items to discuss if nothing further to report.

Chair Doe: One of the items from our last meeting was a follow up on the evangelist on the Plaza last week, who was berating students with apparent identities. Had indicated that Gwen Gorzelsky would be contacted regarding the free speech presentations and workshops. Wanted to check on this. More than one person had mentioned the value in rejuvenating our conversations on campus around protected free speech.

Vice Provost James: Have not talked to Gorzelsky yet, but it is on the list. Will talk to her later this week. Thanked Chair Doe for bringing this back up. Am sure they will want to do this if they have the resources. Will work with them.

Chair Doe: Second question is around discussion from our last meeting which had to do with attempting to track non-tenure track faculty contracts. Asked if there was any progress in finding this information.

Vice Provost James: Confirmed that data was sent by Nick Cummings. Shared screen with spreadsheet including courses taught by faculty off the tenure track. Will send this to Chair Doe and Jenny Morse.

Chair Doe: So this spreadsheet shows us people teaching off the tenure track but not in faculty positions. Asked if there was any information available around contracts for CCAF.

Vice Provost James: Don't believe they were charged with that specifically. When the task force requested Cummings do this, we were trying to get a sense of how many employees are doing this. Cummings probably has information about the individuals. Had removed the employee identifications, but can ask him to go back and update this specifically. Will send this to Chair Doe and Morse to see what other information is requested that may be helpful. Can ask Cummings to grab that data.

Chair Doe: Believe the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty's overall point was that contracts are being underutilized. The ability to offer contract was at the heart of the appointment changes in 2018. That was already five or six years after it became legal to use contracts. What they are trying to get at is why these are not being used.

Vice Provost James: Stated that the individuals on the spreadsheet may not be eligible for contracts because they are administrative professionals.

Norton: Asked in the chat: Are their peers evaluating their teaching?

Vice Provost James: Responded to Norton in the chat. Stated that we are not sure, and this is another concern.

Chair Doe: Think these are different issues. This is another kind of revelation, but then the other question has to do with the underutilization of the contract opportunity.

Vice Provost James: We can ask Cummings about what data can be pulled. Tends to have contract and continuing information. Task force did not realize how much of this was going on, so we need to understand this. You worry about academic freedom. The Office of General Counsel stated that anyone who does instruction for CSU is protected by academic freedom, but if you are an administrative professional or non-tenure track faculty member, you may not necessarily believe that to be true. There are also concerns about payment, how these individuals are being paid compared to contract, continuing, and adjunct faculty doing similar jobs.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James, appreciate transparency around this. This is helpful information. There is more information we are seeking around the underutilization of contracts. They had also asked about non-affiliated faculty. Feel these are items that the Executive Committee and the Provost's Office need to take up. These issues are not likely to go away and

they have potential implications. We need to understand the phenomenon and what we can do about it.

Vice Provost James: Can put our heads together with Morse and discuss what further data we can ask from Cummings and then decide what to do with it.

Chair Doe: Clarified that this was brought to us previously by Morse last year, and she reminded us of this issue. We have a responsibility to do what we can to help the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty answer these questions. Asked if there were further questions for Vice President James.

Rob Mitchell: Commented in the chat that it would be good to get at the stories behind these. Saw some courses where he knew who was teaching and why they were teaching. May want to understand the differences before we do anything.

Vice Provost James: Responded to Mitchell's chat. Believe there is a diverse set of stories of why this is happening. Think there is a wide range of what is going on here. The only problem is that without a Human Resources system that can track properly, we do not know that this is happening other than anecdote.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. Asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, expressed appreciation for Vice Provost James being here and sharing insights.

### *C. Old Business*

### *D. Action Items*

#### 1. UCC Minutes – September 17, 2021

Chair Doe: We have University Curriculum Committee minutes from September 17<sup>th</sup>. Asked if there was anything here that needed to be pulled for further discussion.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, requested a motion to put this on the Faculty Council agenda for October 5<sup>th</sup>.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for October 5<sup>th</sup>.

#### 2. Election – Graduate and Undergraduate Student Representatives to Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Amy Barkley: Stated that Steve Reising is not here to speak to these. The only thing that is different is that there are four graduate representatives in addition to the undergraduate representatives that were approved by Executive Committee last week.

Chair Doe: We have a slate of graduate representatives to these committees. Wanted to thank the Committee on Faculty Governance, ASCSU, and the Graduate Student Council. Not sure we have ever had such a full slate of student representatives to serve on our committees. This is terrific. Requested a motion to place this ballot on the Faculty Council agenda.

Norton: Move that we place the undergraduate and graduate students nominated by the Committee on Faculty Governance on the Faculty Council agenda for October 5<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that no second is needed since this comes from a committee. Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will appear on Faculty Council agenda for October 5<sup>th</sup>.

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

Chair Doe: Third action item is the resolution regarding graduate student compensation and fees, which Melinda Smith, Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Sybil Sharvelle, Moti Gorin, and Ramaa Vasudevan have been working on for a while. Since Smith is at the Board of Governors meeting, requested that Sharvelle and Pedros-Gascon speak to this.

Pedros-Gascon: This group started a document that was transmitting the opinions that had been shared in the past by graduate students. We decided that this would be a good starting point. Understanding is that Executive Committee would then look at this and suggest amendments to the wording. This is not a final document.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for working on this. Sounds like feedback from Executive Committee is desired. Asked if members had a chance to look at this and had any suggestions. Requested that Pedros-Gascon share the link to the Google doc so we can review it in real time.

Jennifer Peel: Like this resolution. Question is about some of the details. Where it says “whereas graduate student stipends are lower than those of our peer institutions”, while fees are higher, just want to make sure we don’t get stuck on the details. Asked: Is this true 100% across the board, do we know that? Asked: Who are the peer institutions or the typical peer institutions? Wonder if we need to be more careful with the wording.

Pedros-Gascon: Clarified that some of these are based off the research that was already done by the graduate students. Stated that this city is very expensive to live in. The salaries are small and the fees have skyrocketed, and this has an impact on our capacity to retain and recruit students.

Chair Doe: That kind of sentence might draw in the need for evidence. Wonder if it would be possible to have a footnote to add a little detail around that sentence to describe which institutions, possibly a little table to help substantiate the claim.

Sybil Sharvelle: Think that's a good idea. We don't want to have a debate over details like that and to keep this moving forward. The presentation that was made by the students had those details that we could include. We could get in touch with Dean Mary Stromberger and that group to obtain those details.

Mitchell: Feels this is good to do with any assertions, including the fees and the nature of the fees. Not sure it should be just a footnote, maybe even an appendix of some kind would work. There could be a link where people can go and we can emphasize that we are not arguing over specific details.

Pedros-Gascon: Presented the information that was shared by the graduate students. Can share this with the committee if it is helpful. Stated that the presentation shows that the CSU income is \$1,690 per month, with peers at \$2,035 per month and aspirational peers at \$2,138 per month. Stated that housing is 1/3 more expensive in Fort Collins than at the other institutions listed in the research. Asked if it made sense to add an introduction about when those specifics will be discussed. Expressed concern that anything put in the document would be challenged.

Chair Doe: Seem to recall a resolution a few years ago that was about budget priorities. We had a lot of data and it ended up being more trouble rather than help.

Pedros-Gascon: Suggested avoiding indicating numbers and just produce general understandings.

Mitchell: An important point to consider is that in some sense, this is Executive Committee credibility on the line to make sure we verify that these are actually true. Thinks it is important to show the evidence, because people will ask for it, while making sure we are putting forward accurate information.

Norton: Commented that the final sentence "whereas low stipends paired with a high amount of fees are having an impact on the capacity of our colleges and departments to attract and retain the best students" is more impactful and says the same thing as an earlier sentence "whereas the graduate student stipends are lower..." The statement that the graduate student stipends are lower and the fees are higher is not always true, but generally is true, and is the weaker statement when compared with the parallel statement about the low stipends and high fees having an impact. Thinks we may be able to do with just one of those statements and say the same thing.

Mitchell: Suggested that the parentheticals should be pointed to and not be parentheticals.

Chair Doe: Asked Pedros-Gascon and Sharvelle how they would like to proceed.

Pedros-Gascon: Feels the final resolution statement warrants a bit of discussion. Stated that in general, the group was fine with the idea of a 12-month salary for students. However, not

everyone in the institution will agree with this. Encouraged members to consider if this was something worth advancing.

Norton: Think the aspirational goal will be controversial. It will have to be explained to people how this would be paid for.

Chair Doe: Asked if it would make sense to leave comments and questions in the Google doc for the group to consider and we can come back to this.

Mitchell: Thinking of the unintended consequences of being explicit in what we resolve in the end. It might set expectations for some of the graduate students that we have no authority or ability to actually do.

Mitchell: We also generally approach things from a piecemeal perspective. Gave example of Vision Zero being a resource-intensive proposal. The reality is that sometimes resources are fixed and you need a strategic approach. Ultimately strategy is about having to make choices about where resources are spent and where they aren't. Considering different proposals with respect to one another is important. One of the challenges is that these things can set up friction with the administration. Wondering what strategic element would be involved and how we can move this forward without setting ourselves and the graduate students up for disappointment.

Vice Provost James: Asked in the chat if the group was working with Dean Stromberger on this. Commented that she gave an extensive presentation to the Executive Leadership Team about this topic, with national comparator data and various budget requests from small to large.

Pedros-Gascon: Responded to Vice Provost James in the chat that the info came from her.

Chair Doe: Want to get into the habit of asking how different presentations or initiatives we see fit into the overall strategic planning process.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed that not every graduate student has access to funding. For example, students with visas are not allowed to work outside of the University. Feels we should understand this situation and their concerns. It is important that graduate students be able to make ends meet and be able to eat and receive a salary.

Mike Antolin: One of the things we should think about is that we are asking for the CSU minimum to be considered. The current minimum is not considered competitive by our graduate students. Feels this number is not realistic based on the actual cost of living here. Might just need a stronger argument.

Chair Doe: There are many graduate students making the minimum, and it does vary across units. Feels this creates an inequity between disciplines because there are such vast differences. Suggested we look at the language and think about how to phrase that in a stronger way.

Sharvelle: Should definitely look at the language. Coming from the College of Engineering, do not fully understand graduate support across other colleges. In our college, we don't support

graduate students very long at all. For nine months they are a GTA and then they move to GRA where they are paid year-round for a research project. Trying to differentiate here and understand if there are GTA resources that could be used to cover those three months of summer salary. Point was made about people paying out of their research funds. Trying to understand better how they work in other colleges.

Chair Doe: There is a substantial amount of money that comes into the University, and we often underestimate the overall effect of students in seats. It is GTAs who are largely teaching these students, so it is fascinating that these students are paying their way. The GTAs who are teaching them are not fairly compensated, so it doesn't seem that the math squares with reality.

Sharvelle: Trying to understand what would be the resources that could pay. Wondering if this would come from departments for the 12-month pay or who would do that.

Chair Doe: Might be a question for Vice Provost James, who is helping imagine an entirely new budget model.

Vice Provost James: We are trying to work on new budget models, will keep this in mind. Believe that Dean Stromberger was going to go to the Board of Governors for money to do this.

Chair Doe: Smith made a case at the Board of Governors meeting today for investments for the Board of Governors. One of them was around the compensation of graduate students.

Sharvelle: Thanked everyone for the clarification on the GTA positions. Asked if different language was needed around graduate research assistantships. Those generally come from faculty or research funds rather than departments.

Norton: For the sake of this, believes it is important to treat these the same in terms of equity and not causing further rancor, because students often move between GTA and GRA. Would encourage the group to think of all graduate students needing to earn a living wage, and probably based on a 9-month rather than a 12-month stipend.

Antolin: Expressed agreement with Norton, we should not differentiate. Proposed we stick to the 12-months, because it is important to help find ways to support graduate students in the summer.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for the conversation. Asked the committee about timeline. If we want to discuss this at our October 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, would need materials by October 8<sup>th</sup>.

Sharvelle: Requested feedback by this Friday, October 1<sup>st</sup>. Group will meet early next week.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon and Sharvelle and the group for their work on this resolution. Will look at the document and return to this discussion on October 12<sup>th</sup>.

### *E. Reports*

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Want to first come back to Mitchell's question about the connection between the core curriculum committee that is being imagined and the Academic Master Plan. We are in the midst of standing up a new core curriculum task force to envision how that group might interact with the Academic Master Plan. Have asked Norton to head up this task force to get us launched. We have begun to draft some ideas around this, and we will keep everyone posted.

Chair Doe: Wanted to provide some firsthand feedback on some of the groups working in Courageous Strategic Transformation. Have been working with the Accountability Group. They have formulated four overarching goals for accountability with four or five sub points within those larger goals. We have sent that forward to the Courageous Strategic Transformation Leadership Team. There will be open forums on October 28<sup>th</sup> and November 4<sup>th</sup> at 12:00pm on both days. Ideas will be brought forward to the campus community for input.

Chair Doe: Had mentioned at the end of our last meeting that the Faculty Council office is probably going to be moved from the administration building. Wanted to emphasize that these conversations are ongoing. The context is that there will be significant hiring in the Office of General Counsel, who will need the space in the basement. Will let everyone know more once we know more.

## 2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Unable to attend due to Board of Governors meeting. No report at this time.

### *F. Discussion Items*

Chair Doe: Would like to take last part of meeting to talk about focuses for the Executive Committee. Asked members if they had any thoughts on what things they want to focus on this year as a committee. We had discussed issues like free speech, faculty compensation, and shared governance last time.

Norton: These topics are important to a large number of faculty and they should play a role in these discussions. At the new faculty orientation, we presented the organizational chart of the University and how the Faculty Council standing committees tie into various offices around the University. Stated that one office where we do not have a formal connection is the Office of the Vice President for Inclusive Excellence. Wondered if there needs to be a standing committee or some way we can work with that group in a more formal capacity.

Mitchell: A lot of what has been historically done in Faculty Council is a lot of internal faculty governance. Also have only one committee that works within the strategic element of the University and our ability to compete externally with potential substitutes. Shifting how Faculty Council thinks in respect to that so we can continue to create that value that we create in ways that are different. Think we should understand how we can work well with administration and work on the internal side so that collectively we can compete externally. A competitive advantage is the integration across disciplines and across units so we are not siloed. Requires a rethinking of what our role is and how we interact as faculty members as we interact with

administration. Need to focus on shared governance. Can help us retain the capacity to make the kinds of changes we need to do to remain relevant in the broader societal marketplaces.

Chair Doe: Thanked Mitchell. Can see this kind of approach having a direct impact on, for example, reimagining core curriculum. Can work constructively in creative ways across the silos. Asked if there were any other suggestions for topics.

Pedros-Gascon: Believes it is vital for the future of the institution to focus on shared governance and accountability. Feels this is most urgent to tackle.

Antolin: Wanted to comment on Mitchell's goals. That is a very large topic. Wondering if it could be narrowed down and focused on more specific items, such as curriculum.

Mitchell: Expressed agreement. Had asked about curriculum because that is one area that engages with the student market very directly. Could also fit into the longer-term sense. In engaging with the core curriculum, or even the processes that we use to generate and create curriculum, can help us dynamically respond to the market.

Antolin: Wondering about how we create programs that gives students any number of directions they can go. Not all students who get a life sciences degree end up in that same career. Asked: How do we square what we're doing with what we're sending our students out to do?

Mitchell: Happy to discuss this and envision some innovation and strategy around this. We do need to be action-focused in what the future will look like. In many years, the administration and people involved will be different. Having faculty driving the future creation of value at the University should be a critical part of what we are doing.

Chair Doe: Thanked Mitchell. Will now draw our meeting to a close. Expressed appreciation for wanting to get faculty involved in these conversations.

Chair Doe: Requested a motion to adjourn.

Mitchell: Moved.

Pedros-Gascon: Second.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

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