

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, December 14, 2021
3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Andrew Norton, Vice Chair; Melinda Smith, BOG Representative; 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: Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Bolivar Senior, Chair University Benefits Committee; Oren Anderson, University Benefits Committee; Chris Dorich, University Benefits Committee

Absent: none

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

December 14, 2021 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – November 30, 2021

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

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

B. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – December 7, 2021

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council 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 January 18, 2022 – Location TBD – 3:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: Our next Executive Committee meeting will be on January 18th. This is the first day of classes, following Martin Luther King Jr. Day. At end of announcements, we will ask for preference regarding meeting format.

2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on February 1, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m. President McConnell will update members on Courageous Strategic Transformation

Chair Doe: At our February Faculty Council meeting, President Joyce McConnell will be updating us on the Courageous Strategic Transformation process. President McConnell has requested to go first on the agenda to allow time to present and take questions. The President has indicated that she may only attend one meeting per semester, starting in the spring.

3. Distinguished Administrative Professional Award Committee

Chair Doe: We are seeking participation in the Distinguished Administrative Professional Award Committee. Requested members send their interest at earliest opportunity.

4. Faculty Ombuds Overview Presentation

Chair Doe: This has been requested by this group several times. We are in touch with them and are working out a plan for a meeting where they present, followed by a Q&A.

5. Begin to consider nominations for those interested in running for Vice Chair and Board of Governors Representative

Chair Doe: It is not too soon to start thinking about nominations for those interested in running for Vice Chair and Board of Governors Representative. Planning to run again for Chair but will not discourage others who may be interested in doing so. Asked members to send their interest to allow time for consideration at the February Faculty Council meeting prior to the election in March. The March agenda will include the platform statements of interested parties. Nominations can be made from the floor at the March meeting but it is helpful to the members if they see a platform statement as indication of interest prior to that meeting.

6. In-Person or Virtual Meeting Format for Spring 2022

Chair Doe: Asked members to provide thoughts on meeting format for the spring semester.

Rob Mitchell: Stated this would possibly be his last Executive Committee meeting due to conflicts with teaching schedule in the spring. It has been hard to find a replacement. Have been telling people these meetings will be virtual.

Sharon Anderson: May not have to be an either or. Preference is Teams, but it was nice to see people face-to-face. Maybe we could commit to one meeting in-person.

Chair Doe: Thanked Anderson. Could invite Executive Committee members to see the new Faculty Council office. Other announcement is that the Faculty Council office will be moving to the third floor of administration. There is a conference room that can be used.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Do not have a preference. Would encourage meetings that have a specific demand be done in-person, such as for the evaluation of the President. Could have specific days for face-to-face for the rest of the semester. Teams is much easier for people's lives.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for their input. Seems to make sense to stay with the Teams environment and have occasional face-to-face meetings depending on the topic, opportunity, or desire to get together.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

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

Hearing no questions, report concluded and moved on to action items.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – November 19 & December 3, 2021

Chair Doe: We have University Curriculum Committee minutes. Brad Goetz was unable to be here but indicated there was nothing difficult or challenging with these items. Requested a motion to place these on the Faculty Council agenda for the February meeting.

Mitchell: Moved.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any further discussion about putting these on the agenda. Hearing none, we will consider these approved for placement on the February Faculty Council agenda.

2. Election – Graduate Student Representative to Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Doe: Next item is an election for a graduate student representative to the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. Asked if there were any concerns or objections to placing this item on the February Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Doe: Hearing no concerns or objections, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for February.

William Sanford: Moved.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any objection from the membership. Hearing none, considered this ready for placement on the February Faculty Council agenda.

3. Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Informal and Formal Complaints – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – Melinda Smith, Chair

Sanford: This was brought to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education by Dean Mary Stromberger. Many graduate students were not aware of a way to submit formal or informal complaints about advisors or other things going on. This language provides a procedure for how students can do this.

S. Anderson: Asked: Are these modifications or a new policy?

Sanford: This is a brand-new policy.

Jennifer Peel: Wondering if this has been reviewed by other entities on campus, such as conflict resolution or legal. Am assuming the Graduate School did their due diligence but feels it is worth checking into that.

Sanford: Not sure about that. This was proposed by Dean Stromberger.

Chair Doe: We could probably check that these parties have been consulted.

Andrew Norton: Wondering if the committee discussed what the ideal situation is for graduate students and their advisors to resolve conflicts. Asked: To what extent does this foster that process? Wondering what the dimensions of conflicts are being discussed with this if they're irreconcilable differences or something more minor.

Sanford: Think it was meant for a little bit more than that. The students are referred to looking at conflict resolution, and if they can't solve it, they can write this complaint that goes to a nonpartisan party. It all depends on the process, but don't believe we discussed that. Melinda Smith may be able to speak a little more to this.

Amy Barkley posted section from minutes from Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education where this was discussed in the chat.

Chair Doe: Directed members' attention to the chat with the note from Barkley. Read this section to members. Minutes state that Dean Stromberger gave an overview of the proposal about formal and informal complaints bulletin resolution. Dean Stromberger stated that the purpose of this proposal was the make the policy more transparent to students, faculty, and anyone reading the bulletin. The minutes state that the proposal indicates that graduate students have asked the Graduate School about a formal complaint procedure. This new section describes the process as outlined in the existing CSU policy on student complaints. Inclusion of this proposed section in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin will increase awareness of the general steps to resolve conflict and the already-existing process for informal and formal complaints. The minutes further

state that the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education approved this bulletin resolution.

Chair Doe: According to what the minutes report, this is not the creation of processes. These are processes that already exist, and the idea here is to make the processes more visible.

Sanford: This encourages them to speak directly to the person involved, and if that doesn't work, they can go to their department chair for conflict resolution to start with. The next step would be to go on and file a formal complaint.

Pedros-Gascon: Feels it is important to have a clear process for students like the one being presented.

Norton: Feels this bulletin resolution is ready to go before Faculty Council. Would encourage the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education and Dean Stromberger to make a brief presentation to explain this at the Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Doe: Expressed agreement with Norton. Will help Faculty Council be aware that the policy already exists, and this is essentially making it clearer and more available to graduate students who may not otherwise know the process exists.

Michael Antolin: Speaking as a former chair. There is a process that exists for graduate students, so informing them about this would be helpful. Feels getting this out in front of people will help. One of the things that should be discussed more clearly are alternative workarounds for students. For example, if a student wants to divorce from a professor, they need to know there are guarantees against retaliation. Wasn't always clear to students how this would happen. Might be some training we could do for people at the chair level as well.

Chair Doe: Think these are important insights that the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education can take back. If we approve that this is ready to stand debate in Faculty Council, this will be some information they can consider when they present it to the Faculty Council as a whole. Can refer back to our minutes for the discussion. Recommend that if we agree to place this on the agenda for February that associated parties be apprised of the Executive Committee conversation.

Chair Doe: We have a motion on the floor regarding the readiness of this to go on the floor of Faculty Council. Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will appear on Faculty Council agenda for February 1st.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Want to thank a few people. Thanked Norton for getting the Academic Calendar for Fall 2026 through Summer 2028 ready, as well as coming up with a spreadsheet that we can use

in the future. Want to also thank Linda Meyer for the work on the University Grievance Officer survey. Will be discussing this in a few minutes. Meyer has worked on this over the course of many years, and we are at the level of refining it and finding the best ways to distribute it and analyze the results. In recent years, this has been distributed by the Provost's office and then we have internally done the analysis. Meyer will report on efforts to have this distributed by Institutional Research, who are happy to distribute it but are unable to do the analysis. We are working on seeking input from another entity on campus to help us with the analysis.

Chair Doe: We will need someone to launch the President's evaluation processes again in the spring. Pedros-Gascon and Yolanda Sarason took this over last year, along with some others, to refine and construct a survey tool. This was a big step forward in what had been an informal process previously. We will need to consider this again and how we want to proceed in the future.

Chair Doe: We are planning to have a variety of visitors in the spring semester. We have been in touch with the Ombuds office, for example, who seem prepared to come talk to us. Details are soon to be determined. We will also be hearing from the University Grievance Officer, and we are hoping to invite the Vice President for Inclusive Excellence. Will need to discuss priorities, as there is also a desire to invite Athletic Director Joe Parker, who agreed last year to come back and provide a report. Expressed hope to combine this with a report from the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.

Chair Doe: The AUCC 1C Task Force has now met twice and will be meeting again for a lengthy meeting prior to classes starting again. They will try to make headway on the policies around 1C. Rebecca Atadero has agreed to co-chair the task force.

Chair Doe: We also have a task force for general core curriculum. We are trying to imagine how Faculty Council can be more involved and have a voice in curricular decision making, beyond approval of minor and major course changes for the Catalog. Some of the questions coming forward about core curriculum are difficult for the University Curriculum Committee to fully address, so this core curriculum task force will examine what might be done. Norton has sent out invitations for the group and we will see where the group goes and what recommendations will be brought forward for consideration.

Peel: Commented that the Fall of 2022 calendar is not up on the website. There is nothing beyond August and it does not mention the start of the fall semester. Wondering why this is, am trying to think about next year.

Chair Doe: Expressed appreciation for Peel bringing this to our attention. We will look into this. The calendar exists, so we will see what is happening there.

Pedros-Gascon: Would be interested in seeing information about where departments and colleges stand. Would like to know which departments are operating at 100%, and which are operating at lower percentages. Feels this is tangible information that may help us understand a little better about the existing inequities and the areas that are more in demand. Understand this information takes time to retrieve.

Chair Doe: Wondering if this would be a presentation from our Chief Financial Officer or the Provost. Asked Pedros-Gascon if there were specific issues of interest, such as salaries or areas of spending compared to other institutions.

Pedros-Gascon: Would like to understand it all. For example, wondering what it would cost to put the whole institution at 100%. Would be nice to know which colleges and departments are closer to this than others.

Provost Pedersen: This is part of the work that has been started with Vice Provost James. We are working with Vice President Robyn Fergus, Vice President Diana Prieto, and Vice President Lynn Johnson to pull together data for all the colleges. We are also pulling together information on all Administrative Professionals. Goal is to pull this information together for the whole campus so that we can look at each college and department and prioritize where we need to begin addressing these issues. What we are trying to do is get a total dollar amount and then be able to build it into our base budget and look at how we can address this over the next three to four years, prioritizing the highest need areas first. We will also be having a meeting with the Deans since they have had a different approach. We will also be working with Laura Jensen since she will be pulling all the data. Will keep everyone updated and be happy to share.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen. We will look forward to something down the road, this seems very promising. Asked if there were any other questions regarding report.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

F. Discussion Items

1. UGO Evaluation Survey – Linda Meyer

Linda Meyer: The updates we discussed last time are reflected in the version seen in the agenda packet. Noted that we wanted to possibly add a link for the University Grievance Officer annual report, as this may be ready by mid-January for the February Faculty Council meeting. We had also discussed educating a little bit to help people understand what resources are available on campus for conflict resolution. There is now a link provided for a list of all the resources currently available. Explained the different changes to questions that were discussed at the last meeting. Feels we are at a point where we can submit this to Institutional Research to administer the survey.

Chair Doe: Thanked Meyer. Asked if there were questions or comments. Asked Meyer when this survey would normally go out.

Meyer: Ideally, we would send the survey out possibly the last few days of January or the first few days of February. Would like to see the survey close by February 11th, which would give time for the responses to be tabulated. Worried that if we do it too close to the start of the semester that people will be busy and not notice it in their inboxes. Heard back from Institutional Research, who would be happy to administer the survey at no cost. Working to get a hold of

another entity to see if they can help us with the analysis of the open-ended questions. Have some dates and times to meet with them to discuss what we want.

Chair Doe: Thanked Meyer. Think we can move ahead with Institutional Research and our timeline. Asked if there were questions or comments.

Norton: Think questions 30 and 31 should be at the beginning. Like that framework. We would first assess and describe the University Grievance Officer and what they do and what people are aware of, and then go to the specifics of the University Grievance Officer's performance.

Vice Provost James: Echoed Norton. The last two questions are really about educating people on what this office does. Even if they do not fill out the rest of the survey, at least they learn about the University Grievance Officer. Feels the list under the last question is good.

Meyer: Thanked Vice Provost James. Wondered if members had anything additional to add to the list besides what is listed on the University Grievance Officer website.

Chair Doe: Our best resource may be our University Grievance Officer. He may be able to provide a list of things that the office does.

Norton: Like the idea of expanding on this list and thinking about the discussions we have just had in Faculty Council. Suggested maybe oversight and coordination of the processes as outlined in Section E of the Manual.

Chair Doe: In light of those conversations, we could articulate the role of the University Grievance Officer in those hearings that we were discussing at the last Faculty Council meeting. One could imagine that the University Grievance Officer is sitting with you during those hearing processes. Asked if others had ideas about how to characterize some of the services that the University Grievance Officer provides. Asked Meyer what the next steps would be for this.

Meyer: Getting brain wrapped around moving the questions to the beginning. Understanding is that we will insert these prior to question one. Wondering if question 32 would be helpful to still have at the end of the survey.

S. Anderson: If it is to inform, feels it should be at the beginning and the end. Thinking of having the information in both places.

Meyer: Clarified where questions would be located and reminded members about where survey-takers are directed if they answer "no" to the first question.

Chair Doe: Feel we have gotten the feedback we need at this point. Requested any additional feedback be sent to Meyer in the next day for consideration. We can bring a final draft to our next meeting on January 18th.

Meyer: Will not take much to send the survey out once the questions are finalized. The main difficulty will be re-arranging but will ask Institutional Research to do that for us.

Chair Doe: Thanked Meyer. Feel we are close to a final product, and it seems we are in agreement about the rearrangement of the final questions. Will revisit this at our first meeting in January.

2. Microsoft 365 and Other UBC Concerns – University Benefits Committee – Bolivar Senior, Chair

Chair Doe: Introduced Bolivar Senior, who has been the chair of the University Benefits Committee for four years. Senior is retiring this semester, so the leadership of the committee will be changing. The group has had momentum over the last few years and increasing clarity around the items that need to be brought to Faculty Council. Have invited the committee to talk about concerns and what is being discussed. The importance of this committee cannot be overstated, and we may be hearing of some initiatives in the coming months.

Bolivar Senior: The University Benefits Committee is important for everyone, and the retirement side is very important. One of the many things we have tried to do is to find commonalities with Faculty Council in terms of what we can do. Wanted to present an example today with Oren Anderson, who is the retiree representative on the committee. In this situation, all retirees and Emeriti would be cut off from Office 365 beginning December 31st, without any warning or consideration. The issue has been present from the beginning of October. The University did not do a good job of explaining the situation and there was some concern over the supposed cost to keep affiliates and Emeriti on the license. Noted that Office 365 costs about \$75 per person per year, and the University stated it would cost upwards of \$200 per license per year. There were some messages of support for keeping Emeriti on the license, and we were able to get an extension of three years to keep Emeriti on the license. We would like Faculty Council to be aware of what is going on and be involved in whatever follows in this process.

Vice Provost Susan James: Was just in a meeting to discuss how to communicate this to all affiliates, Emeriti included. Microsoft is not telling us who are affiliate or not affiliate. Microsoft just changed their license terms for all universities, excluding all affiliates, which does include emeritus faculty. Emeriti are a small part of that group. The costs went up, not sure of exact numbers. Had then reached out to Provost Pedersen to discuss extending this, particularly for emeritus faculty. We are entering an additional contract with Microsoft to cover the emeritus faculty for three years. There is maybe an opportunity over the next three years to make progress on this. Sounds like an industry trend that we all need to push back on. Can get together and figure out how to increase our bargaining power with companies like Microsoft.

Oren Anderson: Thanked Provost Pedersen and Vice Provost James for their work to find a solution once they realized the nature of the problem. Their quick action is commendable and important.

O. Anderson: For some history on this item, this goes back to the days when CSU was first getting into the mainframe computing business with terminals. At that time, there was a commitment being made that has turned into a very significant benefit for retirees, which is that faculty in their retirement would continue to have access to the mainframe computing facilities

of the University. Being able to retain the colostate.edu email address is no trivial thing after working for the University.

O. Anderson: The intent of the University Benefits Committee is that we should step into this and figure out all we can about what is coming down the line. This is going to be an ongoing concern, and could be in greater magnitude next time, as we have no idea how the industry is going to move. The University Benefits Committee is inviting both Vice Provost James and Vice President Brandon Bernier to meet and discuss this situation so we can feel confident moving forward with a plan. Think the University Benefits Committee is well-positioned to make contributions here.

O. Anderson: Directed another concern to Vice Provost James. Stated he does not just represent emeritus faculty on the University Benefits Committee. Also represents retirees on the administrative professional side, as the University Benefits Committee is a University committee. There are some strong scholars who have risen to the rank of senior research scientist who will be impacted by this change in policy. Perhaps this is a good time to raise that concern and figure out how they can be included in this arrangement with Microsoft for the next three years. Trying to come up with more data around the impacts of this.

Norton: Not a lawyer, but if Microsoft is telling the University that emeritus faculty must be excluded, that seems like it is close to age discrimination. Might be something to look at.

Vice Provost James: Clarified that Microsoft is saying affiliates, which includes alumni and all retired individuals from CSU. The emeritus faculty are a small portion of that group.

Norton: Might still be interesting to look at this from that angle, as it does seem discriminatory in the way it is being applied here.

Chair Doe: Have a question about the affiliates. Questions whether alumni, though considered a subset of a large group called "affiliates," have traditionally had access to Microsoft 365. Is aware that some graduate students get about a year with their colostate.edu email address. Not more.

Vice Provost James: Understanding was that it was all affiliates, but not an expert on this.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. Asked if there were any other questions or thoughts about this.

O. Anderson: Wanted to add one other thing. As many approach retirement, some decide to take advantage of the University's offer of a period of transitional service. In the transitional service period, a person is considered a retiree in the University's eyes and is not protected as an emeritus faculty member. You have transitional faculty that are already being considered as retirees, which is another area that is a little funky and should be fixed. Expressed appreciation for the extension that will cover people in transition as well as emeritus faculty.

Chair Doe: Thanked O. Anderson for this insight. There are many components of transitional status that are a mystery to most faculty until they find themselves there. Asked if there were any other questions from Executive Committee members.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions, thanked the University Benefits Committee. There are many issues to entertain, and this is a great example of an important policy that has tremendous implications for important members of the CSU community. Encouraged members of the University Benefits Committee to reach out if there is ever an issue that needs to be discussed.

3. Items for Executive Committee Consideration in Spring 2022

Chair Doe: Have created a Google Doc that indicates items from past meetings that we want to work on in the spring. Will send this link over email. Requested members use the link to weigh in on items they want to see discussed in the spring semester.

4. Evaluation of Faculty Council Chair – Andrew Norton, Vice Chair

Recording was stopped for Executive Session. Members were reminded not to use the chat, as it is public to anyone invited to the meeting.

Norton welcomed members into Executive Session. Chair Doe, Barkley, and all guests left meeting.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Executive Session adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

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