

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, November 30, 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; Mike Antolin, Natural Sciences; William Sanford, Natural Resources; 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; Marie Legare, Chair Committee for Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Absent: Melinda Smith, BOG Representative (excused)

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

November 30, 2021 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – November 16, 2021

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any changes to be made to these minutes.

Hearing none, minutes approves by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on December 14, 2021 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on December 7, 2021 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.
3. Evaluation of Faculty Council Chair

Andrew Norton: As part of our duties as Executive Committee, we need to provide an evaluation of the chair each year. Will need confirmation of when this is due. We will go into Executive Session at the end of our next meeting to finalize that evaluation. Will be sending out some materials soon to request input for that process.

Chair Doe: Thanked Norton. Asked if there were any questions.

Sharon Anderson: Requested clarification on this. Asked: Is the evaluation process open for everyone or just Executive Committee?

Norton: Will be at our next Executive Committee meeting, not the Faculty Council meeting, two weeks from today. We will save some time to go into Executive Session to complete the evaluation. The evaluation goes to Chair Doe's chair. Believe it serves in place of a regular evaluation. Since Chair Doe has been serving us, we provide the evaluation.

Chair Doe: Believes this ends up looking like a typical evaluation based largely on this group's feedback. Thanked everyone for participating in this and Norton for leading the way.

Chair Doe: Only other announcement is that the Board of Governors meeting is on December 2nd and 3rd. It will be conducted virtually and can be accessed from the CSU System's website. Am told that most of the reports will occur on Thursday. Encouraged members to tune in if they can.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: No formal report today, but happy to answer any questions.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Would like to get the opinion of the Provost pertaining to Faculty Council chair compensation. We are currently using a format that was agreed upon a year and a half ago. Would like to know if this format will continue to be pursued or if there is intention to change it to a different system or propose a different system.

Provost Pedersen: We do not have any proposals to change anything. Would need to speak with the chair to determine if the time is adequate in terms of compensation. We would need to review this. Asked Vice Provost Susan James about this.

Vice Provost Susan James: We kept the same compensation going as was decided on last year. This was a change to how this was done before. Before the change, the compensation was at the level of your current salary, whatever it was, and you went from nine months to twelve months. What happened before was other chairs were at a higher salary, so this was brought up to Executive Committee and agreed on a formula to use. Asked Pedros-Gascon for clarification on whether the formula was the median or the average.

Pedros-Gascon: Stated that it was the equivalent of a twelve-month salary at the rank of a professor or associate professor as a way of making this more equitable.

Vice Provost James: The average of this. We did have the chairs of other Faculty Council committee do a sort of workload audit last year and we want to take this into account and come up with a more consistent policy since we do not currently have one. To answer the original question, there is not an intention to challenge the current approach. We would just like to write it down so those interested in becoming Faculty Council chair are aware of what this is.

Provost Pedersen: Supportive of this and creating a model that is equitable between different individuals. Having a reference point like the one suggested makes a lot of sense.

Vice Provost James: Will work on getting something done on this soon.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen and Vice Provost James.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – November 12, 2021

Chair Doe: Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything in these minutes to take note of.

Brad Goetz: No, these are a brief set of minutes.

Chair Doe: Requested a motion to place these on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Chair Doe: Asked if anyone was opposed to the inclusion of these minutes in the packet. Seeing no opposition, minutes approved for placement on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

2. New Joint Degree: Master of Addictions Counseling in Psychology and Social Work, Plan C – University Curriculum Committee – Brad Goetz, Chair

Goetz: This is a proposal for a new degree program. The distinction of this one is that it is the first joint degree program. The Graduate School offers dual programs and joint programs at the graduate level, and this will be the very first joint degree program at CSU. The benefit of the joint degree and a dual degree is that a student can share common coursework between the two. The primary distinction between a joint degree and a dual degree is that a joint degree has to be completed as a single set of coursework and will be recognized with one credential, with a diploma that reads out the entire title. The dual degree will end up being two credentials and a diploma in each of the areas. Have asked Brad Conner to be at Faculty Council to answer any specific questions about the benefits of these two things being combined and any other questions about the program. Wanted to recognize that this will be the first joint degree offered by the Graduate School if it is approved.

Chair Doe: Thanked Goetz. Asked if there were any questions before calling for a motion.

Vice Provost James: Asked if this was the degree that says it is housed under the Provost's Office. Asked if Goetz could help clarify why this joint degree is housed that way. Not sure other degrees are housed similarly.

Goetz: Unsure of all the details, but it might be because they are shared between two units and counting students and credits and other things that would need to be sorted out. Dean Mary Stromberger may be able to respond to this and clarify why that is the case.

Vice Provost James: Can chat with Dean Stromberger and have that discussion at the Faculty Council meeting.

Norton: Believe the graduate program in ecology and the CMD program are housed the same way. Recalled seeing Provost/Executive Vice President as the housing for that.

Vice Provost James: Think they were housed under the Graduate School. The Graduate School is under the Provost/Executive Vice President and reports to them, so may just be semantics. Feels it is worth understanding.

Chair Doe: Seems that this would be important to understand. If it is housed under the Provost/Executive Vice President, we should know the implications of that. Asked Goetz to ensure that that Conner and Dean Stromberger are present at Faculty Council to speak to this and clarify these things. Does seem a little confusing. Am sure the Provost's Office doesn't want to start amassing different programs that they are responsible for.

Goetz: Will check with Dean Stromberger and try to also get someone from the Registrar's Office to attend as well.

Rob Mitchell: think these are the kinds of programs we want to be doing. Something to ask is what we are doing with this specific program, and how we can create a structure that makes these kinds of programs easier to develop. Creating a conversation about how we might manage this moving forward in a sustainable and efficient way could be helpful.

Provost Pedersen: Thanked Mitchell for the comment. Was having a conversation about this earlier today and feels this will be critical.

Vice Provost James: Think there is language in the Manual that makes the default be the Provost's Office. Not clear in the Manual how to do this. Expressed agreement with Mitchell, we do need to figure this out.

Anderson: Asked if the 82 credits listed was accurate for this degree. Feels that this is a lot.

Goetz: Confirmed. Keep in mind that this is two programs coming together.

Chair Doe: Asked if this would naturally lead to a PhD program.

Goetz: Not sure about the intent for PhD-level programs. The benefit is where there is overlap. It is a lot of credits when you look at it, but in reality, it is two degrees. This is a joint degree so it will read out as one, but in the dual degree scenario, it would be two masters-level degrees.

Anderson: Expressed agreement with Mitchell's comment about this being the type of thing CSU needs to do. It is innovative having two programs come together. Expressed concern over the expense of 82 credits. Understand that it is two masters programs and they can pursue two licensures, but the debt that students will have could be huge. Concerned about the student debt when they leave CSU.

Chair Doe: Might be interesting for someone involved with this process to speak to the earning potential for someone coming out with this type of degree. Could possibly speak to this concern.

Goetz: Have talked to Conner about this, who is planning on being at the Faculty Council meeting and could possibly speak to that. Conner could maybe clarify why there are so many credits and respond to any other questions that may come up.

Chair Doe: Thanked Goetz. Asked if there were any other questions about this action item. Hearing none, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

William Sanford: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

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

Chair Doe: We have an election for representatives for the Committee on Faculty Governance, Doug Cloud is nominated for the College of Liberal Arts, and Claudia Gentry-Weeks is nominated for the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences. Unless there are questions or concerns, requested a motion to place on Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

Amy Barkley: Noted in the chat that this is an updated ballot with an additional name, Doug Cloud, from when we saw this earlier this month.

Anderson: Moved.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any objection to placing this on the agenda. Hearing none, motion approved to place the ballot on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

4. Late W Motion – Committee on Scholastic Standards – Karen
Barrett, Chair

Chair Doe: Reminded members that the question before us with this motion is whether it is ready to stand debate on the floor of Faculty Council. We are not making this decision ourselves. Pointing this out because Executive Committee has made this decision in recent semesters when we have been under challenging conditions due to the pandemic. We had approved this in the past, but we are doing it the normal way and are just seeing a proposal today and determine its readiness to go to Faculty Council. Asked Karen Barrett to speak to this.

Karen Barrett: The proposal is to have the withdrawal period for courses to three-quarters through the semester rather than halfway. Students can still withdraw from the entire program on the last day, but not individual courses. The biggest problem that had been discussed is about the timing. Many classes have not yet had any major assignments by the halfway point, so the

student has very little information on which to base their decision-making about whether they will succeed in a class or not. It was also noted that other campuses, including Boulder, have later deadlines for the course withdrawal period.

Barrett: The question now is how late to move the date. During COVID, we extended the withdrawal period to the last day of the semester. This was considered. However, the problem with having it on the last day was that students knew they could fall back on it and did not worry about withdrawing in a timely manner. They may be involved in group projects or other things that would affect other students if they don't participate.

Barrett: We did talk with the Registrar's Office, and it does seem that doing it three-quarters of the way through is possible for them. We also looked at financial aid, and as long as the student was there on the date of census, which is much earlier, most students do not lose out on their financial assistance. There are specific circumstances with some people and it is something students should discuss with advising and financial aid before they do it. One negative thing that we have heard about this time frame was from advising. Since this is a time when many students come for advising, they were worried that they may be overcome with students.

Barrett: Commented that during COVID, having the extended deadline made a huge difference in terms of students' persistence. Students were much more likely to persist if they were able to drop individual classes rather than having to do a University withdrawal and losing a whole semester. Students seemed to use individual course withdrawal effectively to raise their GPA and to help them persist.

Chair Doe: Asked: Would it be fair to say that the financial implications for students would be substantially different between dropping one class and dropping all classes because you are not getting your money back on any of them that you withdraw from, correct?

Barrett: That's correct. This was something the Committee on Scholastic Standards discussed. We have to do some retroactive withdrawals for students, which is a university withdrawal. We couldn't do it class by class. The reason we do a retroactive withdrawal is because at that point they knew they couldn't withdraw from a specific class, so they end up losing all their good grades off their record, even if most of their classes are F's. It is advantageous for them to do and they have reasons for withdrawing, but they lose the good grades with the bad.

Chair Doe: This could be demoralizing as well as having financial implications. Would understand if students didn't want to come back after that kind of experience.

Barrett: Most students, if they receive a loan, would not have to pay it back, but students do lose in a sense since they will need to pay for the course again.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any anticipation from the Committee on Scholastic Standards of concerns from faculty regarding their own effort with students.

Barrett: Have discussed this in the Committee on Scholastic Standards. We also discussed this with the Academic Policies Committee. Many of the faculty seemed to think it was much less

bad to do it this way than to do it on the last day of the semester. A student who is struggling throughout the semester, if faculty are supporting them the entire time, that is much more effort than doing it three-quarters of the way. Faculty expressed that halfway is too early, and that the students who need to drop don't know it. Halfway through the semester, you may not have enough assignments to make the decision.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any additional questions or thoughts. Hearing none, question before us is whether this is ready to stand debate on the floor of Faculty Council. Requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

Sanford: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

5. Academic Calendar, Fall 2026 – Summer 2028 – Andrew Norton,
Vice Chair

Norton: This is the academic calendar for Fall 2026 through Summer 2028. Utilized a previous calendar, to draw this up. We have to have a total of 79 days of classes. We did contact the Registrar's Office for comments, and they gave us a few notes. We recognized as we were putting this together that if the previous motion regarding late withdrawal passes, we will need to revise this because the course withdrawal period will be different. Happy to answer any questions about this.

Chair Doe: Seeing no questions, can entertain a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

Anderson: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat. Asked about the late withdrawal motion and the understanding that the calendar might have to be amended. Asked: Could we entertain a friendly amendment if the late withdrawal motion is passed?

Norton: Believe it should be separate, because we have a few years in between that that we will need to deal with. Not sure whether the late withdrawal would apply for spring, would need to change that calendar quickly. Think with this change, it would be something Executive Committee could do, because we are approving that change by approving the motion.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

6. 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

Marie Legare: Section D.4 was approved by the Executive Committee, went to Faculty Council and was approved. It went to the Office of General Counsel, who sent it back with concerns about the appropriateness of department heads suggesting counseling to a faculty member. We struck that out, so it is no longer recommending counseling by the department head as part of the reprimand process. That is the only change.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Pointed members' attention to the strikeout concerning counseling. This is the only change, and as Legare stated, this is coming from the Office of General Counsel. We will need Faculty Council to look at this again.

Legare: Reminded members that this was previously approved by Faculty Council. If this gets approved by Faculty Council again, the Board of Governors will see the combination of the two approval processes that went forward.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Commented that this will not be going forward to the Board of Governors for their December meeting but will go to them in February. Requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th if members feel it is ready to stand debate on the floor.

Linda Meyer: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

7. Resubmission of Proposed Revisions to Section E.15 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Marie Legare, Chair

Legare: We had a robust discussion about this both in Executive Committee and in Faculty Council. The main thing that people were opposed to what the combination of the two committees into one committee. This was ultimately returned to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. Essentially everything is the same in this version except we removed the contingency about the committees, so now it is back to the two committees. Nothing else has been changed.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Asked if there were any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Have a stylistic question. In Section E.15.3, there is a line in the paragraph that begins with “if an agreement is reached.” It says “other separation” – and repeats twice. Wondering if it should be “or separation,” because the other ones are not separation. The full statement is “If the Provost determines that the agreement is appropriate and the agreement involves a demotion, reduction in pay, resignation, or other separation from the University.” Wondering if there should be a comma before separation from the University or if the word “other” should be taken out.

Legare: That is stylistic. We have not made any changes to this according to what is in the Manual right now. The Office of General Counsel has looked over this section quite a bit, and this is the way they want this written. This is how it has been in the Manual, so we did not make any changes to that.

Pedros-Gascon: Unsure what “other separation” means.

Norton: Believe it is referring to resignation, which is one type of separation, and then the other types of separation that we have.

Pedros-Gascon: Other question is about the use of “Provost,” instead of “he or she” because it appears differently in a couple places. Wondering if we should try to unify their formats and get rid of “he or she.”

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. The pronoun changes were made about a year and a half ago. May not have caught them all. We refer back to the original noun, the antecedent. We do want to say “the Provost” rather than “he or she.” Can make a note of this. Believe we can do this since it was already previously approved.

Legare: Was already approved and is a minor stylistic change. This would not even need to go back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any other question. Asked Legare what the language in the section about “no administrative duties” means.

Legare: Think the concern originally was not wanting anybody associated with administration or having an administrative post participate or vote on this type of committee for faculty standing. It must be faculty to faculty.

Chair Doe: Asking about this because there is increasing participation of faculty in administrative roles. Not talking about people who have supervisory responsibility but about those having administrative duties of programs in their job description. Not sure whether our language has caught up with reality.

Legare: This section refers to Section K.12.a. Have not read this section but may be outlined more there as far as what exactly that means. May be older terminology. We need to rethink this because of the substantial involvement of faculty in program administration.

Chair Doe: Had another question about the issue raised in Faculty Council regarding recording. The response was that recording is something we do now as opposed to transcribing things.

Legare: Answer to that is a recording is much more accurate. There are more errors made when someone transcribes from a recording than if you just use the recording.

Chair Doe: Follow up question is about the statement that the recording will be made available to the faculty member at the member’s request without cost. Thinking about when we transcribe

something, we wind up with a document that is easily transportable in terms of changes, but with a digital format for media, wondering how stable this is in terms of long-term documentation.

Legare: Information Technology is on top of this all the time. Think during the period that this would be happening, an audio file would be acceptable across the board. Wouldn't necessarily be pulling up an audio file ten years later. If it is a hearing happening right now, it would be easier to provide an audio recording if requested.

Chair Doe: Know there was some concern about this particular delivery method or platform. Last question is about the final rationale point, about making it clear that the University Grievance Officer is present at all steps in the process. Asked: What precipitated that concern?

Legare: Think the issue was ensuring the faculty member was apprised of things every step of the way. There have been some occurrences in the past when meetings have been convened and things decided without the University Grievance Officer. The next step is grievance, so if they do not know what has gone on before, it can get complicated. It is important for the University Grievance Officer to be present when these things happen.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Asked if there were other questions.

Sanford: There is mention in here about email. Have had some colleagues that have gone away for research or work and have limited access to email. Wondering if there is a way around this.

Legare: This was precipitated historically because a faculty member could move to a foreign country and a letter could not be delivered there. Email is standard nowadays. Can see the concern, this is a good question. May be a small thing to add in here that it should be documented as received or that it has been opened.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Asked if there were other questions. Hearing none, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

Mitchell: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for December 7th.

Sanford: Commented that Section K.12.a does not exist. The section that talks about administrative duties is in Section K.11.

Legare: The numbers may have been changed around at some point. Will check on this and ensure the number is correct in there. Will get small corrections included and resend for inclusion in the agenda packet.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Met with the AUCC 1C Task Force prior to the fall break. They will be meeting one more time this semester. This is a Faculty Council-driven effort in an attempt to more fully involve the faculty in this curricular change. This group will need our ongoing support and encouragement. Expressed hope that there will be more to report following the first of the year.

Chair Doe: Another task force, the core curriculum task force, led by Norton, will be considering formations we may need to address ongoing concerns about the oversight of the core curriculum, including adjustments that may be needed to the current University Curriculum Committee's workload. This task force will consider matters related to the core curriculum and thinking through the implications of big changes and quality assurances around curriculum that can be dealt with in a regularized and systematic way. They have not launched yet, as we are still in conversation with various entities. Working on what the goals of this group would be.

Chair Doe: Have been working to visit each of the standing committees this semester. Will be attending the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics meeting tomorrow, December 1st, and the Committee on Libraries next week. Expressed appreciation for the opportunity to visit.

Chair Doe: Wanted to check in with members about how they felt about the Courageous Strategic Transformation discussion we had before break. We had an in-person meeting and Vice President Jenelle Beavers took us through the process. Asked what members thought about this exercise and their thoughts about the process.

Anderson: Enjoyed it but felt overwhelmed much of the time. There was a lot of information.

Chair Doe: Yes, it was tough to come in to a process that is at that stage and try to meaningfully sort through a huge amount of information.

Mitchell: Felt it was good to do this. Had questions for them about how they would be synthesizing the different goals, criteria, and priorities to ensure they are not piecemeal. Thinks the fact that they were doing this expressed a desire to engage a number of stakeholders rather than going through the motions of getting stakeholder input and then doing whatever they want to do. Expressed appreciation that they came to Executive Committee to do this.

Mike Antolin: Not sure what assurance there is that we were listened to. Asked if there was a next step kind of assurance of all lists or anything like that.

Chair Doe: Good question. Not sure of any assurance at all. Believe they started drafting after they met with us and spent the break doing that. Would imagine they have a full draft at this point. Believe they have to present the Board of Governors with something at the end of this week. Will be curious to see where they landed.

Antolin: Feel our comments may be used, believe we had some suggestions that had not yet been captured in other focus groups.

Mitchell: Spoke with Scott Shrake afterwards. He said there were some pieces that hadn't been considered, which they found helpful. A big part of what they are doing is big data collection efforts. He also noted that much of what we said aligned with what others had said, and that is helpful when you are engaging in strategic planning. It is helpful to get a sense that you have these coalitions because it makes it strategically more actionable.

Antolin: Had a question. We were asked to rank statements that had already been made in different areas. Asked: Some of those things were written by other people like our group and this is where they came from, correct?

Chair Doe: Yes, there were working groups in each of the categories, everything from Athletics to accountability.

Chair Doe: Expressed concern about what happens to the items that didn't percolate up out of these integrative synthetic meeting that we are involved in. Expressed hope that we are not inadvertently letting go of items, as these working groups identified these items as important.

Mitchell: The fact that they were identified as important things is helpful. Worry was that they were going to move forward with their identified things and not figure out how they might resonate with the rest of faculty. The fact that they identified accountability and enrollment suggests they were already considering this as important.

Chair Doe: Thanked Mitchell. Asked if there were any other thoughts on the process. Thanked everyone for participating.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Unable to attend – no report at this time.

F. Discussion Items

1. UGO Evaluation Survey – Linda Meyer

Chair Doe: Meyer has stepped up in the last few years and has helped us put together a much better instrument around evaluation of the University Grievance Officer. Asked Meyer to help us direct our conversation around this. Noted that some of the dates in the first section will need to be updated for this current year.

Meyer: Will update the dates. Thinks it would be best to send this out the first week of February if possible, so we can compile the results by the end of February and give people about ten days to complete the survey.

Meyer: We have used these questions for about two years. Don't believe we tweaked the questions much last year. For those new to this discussion, we wanted to survey everyone on campus, not just those who interacted with the University Grievance Officer. We wanted to find out what people knew about the office. There are five categories of people we are looking at. The

fifth category is if they did not interact with the University Grievance Officer at all. The other four categories are asked more extensive questions, but for the people who answer no, they are directed to questions at the end determining if they ever wanted to interact with the University Grievance Officer and chose not to, and the final question is getting more information about that. These questions are not specifically about reviewing performance but gathering information that can inform how the office can better communicate with people.

Meyer: For anyone who answers yes, there are further questions that help them evaluate the University Grievance Officer's performance. Commented that in 2019, we received responses from people who were not clear on who was being evaluated. Noted that this is why questions were updated to reflect Richard Eykholt as the specific person being evaluated. Issue was that we also received feedback on Eykholt's performance as a faculty member rather than as the University Grievance Officer, so we had to sift through those.

Meyer: Would like Executive Committee to look at these questions and provide any suggestions they have for how to improve the survey. Would suggest looking at this again at our meeting on December 14th. Expressed hope that the questions can be finalized by then so we can place them in the Qualtrics survey. Commented that the survey is often sent out by Vice Provost James' office and sent out to faculty. We will try to give them a week to ten days to complete the survey and then we gather the information.

Chair Doe: Asked if this was something Institutional Research assisted us with last year.

Meyer: Cannot recall if they did. Recalled downloading it into Excel and provided this for everyone to look at.

Chair Doe: Think they did not. Believe the conversation was that we might investigate if they could assist us with this. It is expensive, as we found out with the Presidential Survey. They covered this cost last year, but unsure if they will in the future. We spent a lot of time on this because there are open-ended questions at the end of almost all the questions.

Anderson: With questions 9 and 11, we are essentially asking about two things in one item. Might consider separating grievance from mediation.

Antolin: Wondering if the results from last year could be shared. Trying to gauge how much people know about what the function of that office is.

Meyer: This is part of what we are trying to assess with this survey, so we made it not just an evaluation of the University Grievance Officer, but also to get feedback about what people know.

Antolin: Wondering if a question should be added for everyone at the end to clarify if they are aware of the circumstances under which they can contact the University Grievance Officer. Could be a way to gather people's awareness of what the University Grievance Officer does.

Meyer: Part of that is in question 30. The questions lists various instances in which the University Grievance Officer may be contacted. Wondering if we want to test people's

knowledge of the University Grievance Officer or just provide them with that information and find out why they did not contact the office, even though one of the situations that apply may have come up.

Chair Doe: Good thought to try to get faculty understanding of circumstances where they may benefit from knowing the services of the University Grievance Officer.

Meyer: Wondering if there are things we can add to what is in the parentheses for other things people can go to the University Grievance Officer for.

Chair Doe: Have some confusion about the last question. It says you chose not to contact the University Grievance Officer with questions or concerns, but am not sure whether that implies that they wouldn't contact the University Grievance Officer about processes.

Meyer: Could be worded better. The stuff in the parentheses may distract from the next part, which is what we are trying to find out if you chose not to contact the University Grievance Officer. It asks people to describe the reason for this choice. Maybe after we can put in parentheses the things that the University Grievance Officer can help with.

Chair Doe: Think there is value in using this tool as an educational instrument. Might be worthwhile to have this so that we can find out what people do not understand.

Antolin: Suggested adding a question where the first part asks for the reason for not contacting, and then the final question would be whether they are aware of the issues they can contact the University Grievance Officer to address.

Norton: Wondering about the first question. Wondering if it would improve results to have the question be that they did not interact with the University Grievance in their official capacity. Recall there were responses where that was the case but they still wanted to provide responses, but it might enable us to exclude those comments on performance. For question 30, like the idea of making it educational. Was clear last year that many were not clear what the University Grievance Officer does. Got the sense that there was a certain amount of frustration in the responses because they wanted something different. Wondering if it is worth putting in there what sorts of support that are available through the University Grievance Officer or another office for counseling, mediation, or the formal grievance process. That could give us useful information. Sense there are some things we could be doing that we are missing, and it is not the University Grievance Officer's role for these things.

Meyer: Think we do have a link to the University Grievance Officer webpage in the preamble before the questionnaire. There are a few fact sheets and there is another link for employee resources for conflict resolution. Not sure if it would be useful to provide the link to the fact sheet in question 30 to give people more information.

Norton: Recall there were responses that stated that the University Grievance Officer stated their case was not grievable, which resulted in a negative evaluation of the University Grievance

Officer. Not sure whether people would go to the link and read it, or how educational we want to make this.

Meyer: Commented that the University Grievance Officer usually provides a report to Faculty Council at their February meeting. Generally we like the survey to go out following the report. Asked if Barkley could get this on the list of reminders so we have the report by mid-January.

Norton: Suggested adding an announcement for the survey about having just received the report from the University Grievance Officer, and as part of their evaluation, we are asking that everyone take this survey.

Mitchell: We are talking about the evaluation, but we have stated that there are two purposes. One is education, and one is to evaluate. Think there is a risk of co-mingling these too much. Feels it would be helpful to involve Eykholt in the education portion, since we can't involve Eykholt in the evaluation portion of the survey. Separating those out might be helpful. We could have the first part of the survey as an education piece and help people understand the role of the University Grievance Officer. What we might find is that there are some misunderstandings. Want to make sure we are not confounding the education with the evaluation, but that we are enabling it to prepare and provide a fairer and more accurate evaluation that we can do something with.

Antolin: Suggested structuring it that if people say no, they go straight to the educational questions. If they say yes, we can ask them what they know about the University Grievance Officer position and what they are able to do for you. Then they can go through the evaluation. Could help with concerns that people may not understand what this office is supposed to do. Can help us separate responses from people who may have the wrong expectations.

Mitchell: This all has the context of people not wanting to do long surveys and getting people to respond in the first place. There is a balance between getting information and being able to get rich information from the survey.

Chair Doe: These are all great ideas. Have been taking down notes and have a couple weeks to come back with some revisions at the next Executive Committee meeting. Requested members send any other revisions within the next day so they can be considered.

2. Items for Executive Committee Consideration in Spring 2022
 - a. Athletic Budget presentation by Athletic Director Joe Parker

Chair Doe: Last year we had a report from Athletic Director Joe Parker. Asked if members would agree that this should happen again this spring, since he agreed to do so.

Norton: Wondering if we could expand on this and have a separate presentation on the progress of the action plan for the Husch Blackwell response. Wondering if this would be a separate presentation, or would it come from Athletic Director Parker.

Chair Doe: Will ask that. Think it would be good to get an update on that.

Pedros-Gascon: Requested that this report be kept brief to allow more time for questions.

b. Update from Office of the Vice President for Inclusive Excellence

Chair Doe: Asked if members would like to hear from the new Vice President for Inclusive Excellence. We had Mary Ontiveros here a year ago, and it was greatly valued. Asked if there was any opposition.

Hearing none, will plan to have Vice President Kauline Cipriani come for a meeting.

c. Survey Input to the President's Evaluation

Chair Doe: We want to start thinking about our Presidential evaluation. It comes fairly late in the year. We need to look into the cost. Asked members if they are interested in spearheading this effort to reach out.

Pedros-Gascon: Requested in the chat that we have a report from the Ombuds.

Chair Doe: This is something we have asked for, so will make a note of that as well. Asked members for other ideas. Going back to Mitchell's comments about thinking strategically about priorities and interdisciplinary initiatives and thinking about the future. We might want to come back to that and think about how we can be involved in that in tangible, operational ways. We can discuss this again on December 14th with any additional ideas anyone has.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that we hold a Parliamentary meeting on Mondays at 1:00pm. Barkley will send invitation to everyone if you are able and want to join. This is a valuable meeting. We review the agenda to see where we may anticipate trouble and look at the parliamentary processes available to us.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further business, will call this meeting adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

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