

**MINUTES**

Executive Committee

**Tuesday, January 18, 2022****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; 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:** Jonathan Zhang, Business (substituting for Rob Mitchell); Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

**Absent:** Jane Stewart, Agricultural Sciences (excused); Rob Mitchell, Business (excused)

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

Chair Doe: Welcomed everyone to the spring semester. Inquired how everyone's classes were going so far.

Mike Antolin: Indicated surprise that students preferred being online as opposed to in-person. Stated that students also expressed a dislike of the hybrid modality for courses and expressed preference for one method or the other, but not both. Classes are mainly made up of juniors and seniors.

Jennifer Peel: Stated that majority of students expressed a desire for in-person classes. Students expressed that if precautions were taken and we can do it, they prefer face-to-face.

Chair Doe: Thanked Antolin and Peel. Provost Mary Pedersen is on the call and likely listening keenly to the experiences of students so far. Had a student that extended their vacation and expressed that they assumed the material would be made available through some other method. Thought it was interesting that the assumption would be made that the face-to-face class material would be made available in some other way.

Provost Mary Pedersen: Do not believe that is what we are intending to do. Some of the conversations we had last weekend with students and parents was about whether faculty would continue to record lectures so they could go back and listen. They expressed how valuable this had been. Stated that there would be some faculty that would do that, but there is concern as well that faculty want to make sure the students show up for class and do not rely just on listening to the lectures. It is hard to strike the right balance, to have an engaging in-person experience while also having the lectures recorded for later review.

Chair Doe: Has the Echo360 in class, which many also have. Was never convinced that Echo360 would capture the workshop. Others may have this issue where it is not a lecture. Is doing class synchronously on Zoom, and thus do not feel the same need to record.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Feels it would make sense to have Echo360 in every room. Presume that the odds of being out due to COVID will be high. Would appreciate not needing to teach class one on one to the students who miss. Will be an issue this semester if we do not have this available for people teaching face-to-face.

Provost Pedersen: Would be interested to know which classrooms do not have Echo360. Was under the impression that almost 90 to 95% of the classrooms had been converted and heard that all classrooms would be converted.

Pedros-Gascon: Currently in Eddy 11.

Antolin: Our college in the department of biology bought a bunch of the Echo360 carts that we put into classrooms that are not general assignment. Able to do Echo360 in a relatively smaller room. University may want to think about mobile carts if there are funds, and people can move them from one classroom to another as they are needed and requested. Can use the support of college and department IT. They are adaptable, there is no hard wiring. It is all run through the networks, so if the room has internet, you should be able to do it.

Provost Pedersen: Thanked Antolin for the great suggestion.

Chair Doe: Noted that Eddy is notoriously bad as far as Wi-Fi is concerned. Has been an issue from the beginning, even after the renovation of the building. Would be interesting to see if this would be a good solution or not depending on the Wi-Fi.

Antolin: For a fraction of the cost of doing the full Echo360, as we have done in many of the general assignment rooms, this is reachable.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for this conversation.

## **January 18, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

### **I. Minutes to be Approved**

#### **A. Executive Committee Minutes – December 14, 2021**

Chair Doe: Asked if there were 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 January 25, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: Our next Executive Committee meeting will be next Tuesday at the same time and in the same place. This is the last Executive Committee meeting before our Faculty Council meeting in February.

2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on February 1, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: We were planning on having President Joyce McConnell present at our February Faculty Council. This meeting coincides with the Board of Governors meeting, and President McConnell will be traveling and unable to join us. We will hear from her at our March Faculty Council meeting instead.

### 3. University Grievance Officer Survey

Chair Doe: Our University Grievance Officer survey is about to go live. Thanked Linda Meyer for her work on this project over the last weeks and also last several years. In the past, we have asked the Provost's Office to distribute this and then have done the analysis ourselves. Happy to report that the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences (IRISS) will be doing the analysis for us this year, for a cost. Will be good for us to be aware that especially with open-ended questions in our surveys, that the analysis is not without cost. Will need to also have this same discussion with our Presidential Evaluation survey. Last year, Institutional Research covered the cost of that analysis. May be asking the Provost's Office for help with this. The University Grievance Officer survey and the President's Evaluation survey are both important for the University and for Faculty Council to absorb the cost may not be a sustainable approach. Asked if Meyer had anything additional to add about the University Grievance Officer survey. Thanked Meyer again for taking the lead on this survey.

Linda Meyer: Our target date for this to go live is a day or two after the Faculty Council meeting in February. Believe that Richard Eykholt will be giving his annual report at that meeting and then hopefully on the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> of February we can get the survey sent out. Suggested we announce at the Faculty Council meeting that the survey will be sent out after hearing Eykholt's report. We will give everyone a week to respond. Survey will be sent by Vice Provost Susan James' office. Waiting to hear back from those creating the survey, and they will give us a chance to test it before it goes live.

Chair Doe: Thanked Meyer. Clarified that Institutional Research will be doing the distribution of the survey and then the Institution for Research in the Social Sciences will be doing the analysis of the open-ended questions. This will be accompanied by an email that has historically come from the Provost's Office. Thanked Meyer again for her work. She helped launched this a few years ago and has gone through many revisions to get the survey to the point where it is today.

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

Provost Pedersen: Want to update everyone on the start of the semester. We are meeting frequently, as well as meeting with all the Deans every morning to touch base. We are updating them on numbers and have developed a set of guidelines for department heads and chairs on how

to navigate through the Omicron variant and how to support faculty in the classrooms and be flexible. We are looking for various ways to support, so the idea about the Echo360 carts is good, and will look into that right away. We are also looking for other ways that faculty need support.

Provost Pedersen: The Pandemic Team is meeting with Larimer County Public Health officials every day. We received an update that numbers in the county are starting to plateau. We are hoping they will start to come down. We had over 3,000 saliva tests administered yesterday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, to the new students moving back into residence halls and coming on campus. We will be reporting on those results in probably a day and a half. We anticipate those levels to be around 5 to 5.5% positivity and then anticipate them coming down. We will keep everyone updated.

Provost Pedersen: One of the things we have heard about and are focusing on is communication and sharing information. We are trying to stay in close communication and contact to be able to respond to any situation as it arises. Expressed appreciation for the hard work everyone is doing in dealing with the unknown. We are hoping to get through this quickly. The data on the East Coast is encouraging as numbers are already starting to come down. We are sharing all this information with the Deans, and our communication strategy is for Deans to then be sharing it through the college level. Encourage department chairs and heads to get the support they need through their Deans.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Asked if there were any questions.

William Sanford: We are having two searches in our department this semester. Asked: Is there any guidance on how we bring them to campus or what happens if things go south between interviews?

Provost Pedersen: Will share how we are doing this with our Dean's searches. We have two Dean searches underway right now. Our plan is to do the initial interviews remotely and then to bring all the finalists on campus in the spring. We cannot ask if individuals are vaccinated, but we can reinforce to individuals coming onto campus that being vaccinated will give them the most protections. We will probably continue our mask requirements indoors and the data showing that N95 and KN90 masks are better than cloth masks is something else we will encourage and reinforce. The Pandemic Team has purchased a large supply of these masks. Colleges and departments can reach out and we are providing them at cost, which is about a dollar apiece. Would say we are probably in good shape to have in-person interviews. Asked Sanford when they were planning on having these interviews.

Sanford: Probably closer to March.

Provost Pedersen: That would be a good time.

Antolin: Want to verify that the county and state are not giving us levels under which we would have to change how we operate, in the sense of positivity levels or number of cases.

Provost Pedersen: Their focus right now is on hospitalization rates, ICU rates and death rates. The rates of hospitalizations and ICU's have plateaued. They are still high, but they have plateaued, so they are watching those carefully and using those as the metrics.

Antolin: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Clarified that it is up to us, and that they are not dictating what we can do at certain levels. Asked: Is that correct?

Provost Pedersen: Correct, they are not doing that at this point.

Pedros-Gascon: Commented in the chat. Expressed hope that Provost Pedersen will be able to find out for the next Faculty Council meeting where the money we use to pay parachute contracts for athletic coaches come from. Was not able to answer this question at our last Faculty Council meeting. Asked what it would cost CSU to put all departments at 100% salary when compared to peers. Believe Provost Pedersen was asking for 95%.

Provost Pedersen: Thanked Pedros-Gascon for the question. Regarding the questions related to Athletics, do not have answer for these questions. Will certainly pass them along.

Provost Pedersen: For the second question regarding cost to put CSU departments at 100% salary when compared to peers, we are doing an analysis with Vice Provost James to look at what our entire costs are across our whole faculty. We are doing this for faculty and for administrative professionals as well. Can potentially give an update later this semester on the progress of this project. A report on this would likely help address this question.

Pedros-Gascon: Believe that it was asked to put us at 95%, which would still place us below our peers.

Provost Pedersen: We can calculate 95% and then look at what it would take to get us to 100%. We can look at different levels and determine the best way to do it. Will ask Vice Provost James about this getting back to the Executive Committee on this as it is a high priority.

### ***C. Old Business***

### ***D. Action Items***

#### 1. UCC Minutes – December 10, 2021

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any concerns or questions regarding these minutes. Brad Goetz is unable to be with us due to a regular conflict, but we can ask him about these if there are questions.

Chair Doe: Hearing no questions, requested a motion to place these on the Faculty Council agenda for February.

Melinda Smith: Moved.

Chair Doe: To clarify: We do not need a second. Asked if there were any objections to placing this on the agenda for the February Faculty Council meeting.

Motion approved. Will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for February 1<sup>st</sup>.

2. Election – Faculty Representative to Committee on Scholastic Standards – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Doe: This is an academic faculty nomination for the Committee on Scholastic Standards. Karen Barrett retired in December, and Tobin Lopes has been nominated to replace her for the College of Health and Human Sciences. Requested a motion to place this ballot on the agenda for the February Faculty Council meeting.

Sharon Anderson: Moved.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any objections.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for February 1<sup>st</sup>.

### ***E. Reports***

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: The AUCC 1C task force is off and running. We had a 3-hour retreat last week to work together on initial planning. Becky Atadero from Engineering is chairing and am assisting her until we have someone to co-chair with her. This is a substantial undertaking. Feeling confident about the efforts moving forward.

Chair Doe: Andrew Norton has launched the Core Curriculum Task Force. The membership of that committee has been finalized and they are getting underway. The idea of the task force is for them to examine what is needed, if anything, to move ourselves forward and address more fully the needs of our core curriculum. This is not in any way to diminish the work of the University Curriculum Committee. There are larger questions around curriculum that may need additional help, particularly since the University Curriculum Committee already has so many responsibilities and is an extremely hard-working standing committee. How best to handle broad questions about curriculum is what this task force will be examining, at least initially. More ideas may form as their work moves forward.

Chair Doe: The Faculty Council office has moved to the third floor of Administration. This is due to the Office of General Counsel offices expanding in the basement.

Chair Doe: Have been attending the Teaching Continuity and Recovery Team. Over the past couple weeks, their work has been sustained and intense as we all prepared for the semester in the context of the Omicron variant. The Teaching Continuity and Recovery Team worked to come up with the FAQ document that everyone saw last week, and they have been attempting to

stay on top of the pandemic issues as those have evolved. The work of the Teaching Continuity and Recovery Team is ongoing and will continue.

Chair Doe: Am in contact with Vice Provost James, and together we are in contact with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty and the Committee on Faculty Governance around the Field School, which is being proposed by Vice President Blake Naughton. We can look forward to seeing some things about this in the spring.

## 2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Smith: The next Board of Governors meeting is February 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>. Will be reporting on this meeting when we meet next.

Chair Doe: Asked: Will the faculty be bringing anything to this meeting?

Smith: Not necessarily. The main thing we will continue to push is the graduate student stipend issue, but other than that, there is nothing specific.

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

Provost Pedersen: At the February meeting, President McConnell will be presenting the Courageous Strategic Transformation plan, so that will be a major focus of the meeting. Encouraged members that are interested in listening to the presentation to do so. That will probably be the most significant agenda item.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith and Provost Pedersen.

### *F. Discussion Items*

Chair Doe: Want to start with list of potential presenters for spring. Pulled up list of potential visitors to Executive Committee and Faculty Council for the spring semester. We will have Eykholt give the University Grievance Officer annual report in February. We have also reached out to the Faculty Ombuds, who are interested in coming to Faculty Council. Have also posed the question to Athletic Director Joe Parker about coming to Faculty Council and will need to follow up. Asked members if there were groups or individuals we were missing.

Smith: Not sure if this has been mentioned. Suggested bringing the Commitment to Campus group to Faculty Council so they can talk about the program.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed hope that Athletic Director Parker will come, because there is information that we are asking for that Provost Pedersen is unable to answer. Otherwise, we will need to ask President McConnell.

Chair Doe: Suggested that questions be formulated beforehand, so we know what we are aiming to understand and ask a bit better. Asked if Pedros-Gascon could take this up and help us organize our thoughts.

Andrew Norton: Asked about the Office of Inclusive Excellence. Would still like to hear from Vice President Kauline Cipriani, especially since she is new to the position.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for their contributions. Encouraged members to reach out with other suggestions.

1. Items for Executive Committee consideration in Spring 2022
  - a. Networked Faculty Support

Chair Doe: Read through list of suggestions provided from prior meetings and members. Something we will need to pay attention to is the President's Evaluation, which will need Executive Committee leadership. Pedros-Gascon and Yolanda Sarason led the way on that last year by creating a task force to create the survey instrument. We will need to discuss timeline to give feedback to the Board of Governors.

Chair Doe: Under governance, we have Engagement and Extension personnel who are currently Administrative Professionals, so we will be considering how to represent them if they are converted to CCAF, as the Extension leadership is seeking.

Chair Doe: We also want to look at leadership of standing committees, as well as priority items regarding representation of non-tenure track faculty who do not have an academic home. In terms of Extension, want to ask how the academic home is to be defined for those CCAF who do not have a traditional department they belong to. We are in conversation with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty around this, as well as the Committee on Faculty Governance.

Chair Doe: Other items we want to look at our Section J changes from the Intellectual Property Task Force, as well as looking at the University Policy Review Committee, the Campus Safety Committee, and other items such as continued recording of meetings, how to handle extension of meetings, and how items are brought to Faculty Council from administrators. Will also hopefully have an update on the Academic Master Plan following the forum in February. Asked members for their thoughts on this list and if there was anything else that should be added.

Norton: Feel the Field School proposal should be a priority. Suspect it is a very complicated thing and would like to make sure we give it due diligence.

Vice Provost Susan James: Believe Vice President Naughton might be proposing a specialized committee to represent these faculty but will need to look at proposal for more details.

Chair Doe: One of the challenges is that non-tenure track faculty are now able to serve on standing committees and we have gotten rid of the specialized standing committee. We do not have the structure for that anymore in the Manual, so we might need to create or recreate something to ensure representation of this group.

Vice Provost James: Feels this should be discussed on the floor of Faculty Council. It is a lot of people that we are talking about.

Pedros-Gascon: Suggested bringing Vice President Kathleen Fairfax to discuss the transition of INTO into PLACE. Would like to understand what is going on with that situation. Would also like to hear from Semester at Sea and how they are dealing with COVID and the impact of COVID on what they are doing.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Asked if it would also make sense to hear about Todos Santos as part of this. There is a substantial new approach with Todos Santos that may of interest.

Smith: Asked if Rick Miranda would come speak about this.

Chair Doe: Yes, and possibly Paul Doherty. Doherty has been a leader with Todos Santos and has ideas about how well this new idea might work.

Anderson: Commented that this list is extensive. They all sound important. Wondering how we would go about rank ordering these.

Chair Doe: Suggested that we may not need to rank order these items. We could determine some pieces that could be investigated by a subcommittee of Executive Committee with information brought back. We wouldn't need to have every item as their own unique thing to appear on an agenda. Some of them we could determine are more informational. Asked if it would be helpful to have a group investigate these items.

Smith: Seems like there would be instances where a presentation could be given, whereas others could just be a report. Thinks it is worth having a subset of this group go through this and figure out what would be worth doing in person and what we could just get an overview of.

Chair Doe: Asked for volunteers to take this on.

Anderson: Volunteered if others will join her and have a cohort look at this information.

Chair Doe: Thanked Anderson. Will start working on this and see if others volunteer.

## 2. Presidential Evaluation

Chair Doe: Asked for volunteers to take the lead on this. Would probably be deployed in April and will eventually become a letter that comes from the Executive Committee and goes to the Board of Governors.

Norton: Will probably have room for this one. Recollection is that the survey is pretty much done and won't require much change. It will be coming up with the resources for the analysis that will be challenging.

Antolin and Anderson also volunteered to assist.

Smith: Asked Norton: What do you mean by coming up with the resources for the analysis?

Norton: Last year, Institutional Research had some graduate students and COVID funding to help analyze the survey, so they did the qualitative analysis. This is similar to what we were discussing about the University Grievance Officer survey. We don't have that expertise in-house, so figuring out how to analyze these responses can be challenging without the resources. Will maybe have to go back to Institutional Research to see if they can do it again.

Chair Doe: Reported that Institutional Research will not be able to do it. They are happy to help with the quantitative, but they are not able to do the analysis this time. They have undergone a change in leadership. We could ask the Provost's Office to assist with this.

Vice Provost James: It should be something we can figure out. Asked: If Institutional Research doesn't have the people power to do this, even with the money, what would we want to do?

Chair Doe: Clarified that the Institute of Research in the Social Sciences did the analysis last year, with funds from Institutional Research that they were able to direct to the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences. The Institute for Research in the Social Sciences has the apparatus for doing this, but they are charging us about \$3,500 for the analysis of the University Grievance Officer survey. It would be about the same for the President's Evaluation survey. Faculty Council has said we can pay for the University Grievance Officer survey analysis, which we checked through accounting, but we can't do it twice without assistance.

Vice Provost James: Will ask Provost Pedersen about this. Will use the number \$3,500 for planning purposes.

Pedros-Gascon: Thinks it is important to have this assistance. If we don't have this assistance, doesn't feel there is a point in doing an evaluation.

Smith: Clarified that the evaluation goes to both the Board of Governors and the President. Asked if we should be asking either the President's Office or the Board of Governors for the money to provide this evaluation for them. Feels this should be hard wired into the budget if we are expected to provide this kind of evaluation.

Pedros-Gascon: Would say that asking the President to pay for their evaluation would be a conflict of interest. If anything, we should ask the Board of Governors.

Vice Provost James: Think the key here is to get this as part of the planned budget as opposed to ad hoc every year. Think what we should do is get the money added to the Faculty Council budget. That might be the cleanest way to do it.

Pedros-Gascon: Believe we also discussed having this shared publicly with the faculty last year. Not sure if that is something we want to do.

Chair Doe: We did discuss this and ultimately decided not to. Will have to check notes but believe there were strong reasons for not doing so.

Vice Provost James: Believe it involves some personnel confidentiality issues. It is just like how we do not share anyone else's performance evaluations.

Vice Provost James: Want to confirm that the President's Evaluation and the University Grievance Officer survey are the only two evaluations that Faculty Council is responsible for. Should make it around \$7,000 to cover both.

Chair Doe: One of the challenges around the President's Evaluation is that it had been so informal in the past because nobody really asks us for this. We sort of insist upon it with the Board of Governors and think that faculty should be offering some feedback on the President's annual evaluation. The Board of Governors does not invite this, and they are not obligated to pay attention to this. This kind of goes into the deeper issues around faculty input. With this, it would be more than a courtesy. If it was just a courtesy, would have to ask if we really wanted to spend the \$3,500 for what might be an empty exercise. Would want to make sure it is heard.

Norton: Think asking the Board of Governors for \$3,500 would be a good indication of whether they want this. Does bring up the question of whether doing all this analysis is worth our time if only the Executive Committee, and possibly the President, decide to read it. The Board of Governors may decide not to really do anything, and this would be a lot of work. It would be useful to know if the Board of Governors wants our input. Not releasing the personnel review also makes sense but seems like this information would be of great use to the University community.

Smith: Expressed agreement with Norton. We need to find out whether the Board of Governors is committed to this and ask them to fund this. Can bring this up as a topic at the next meeting and indicate our timeline is in April. Would give them enough time to get back to us with an answer. Know there is an HR issue with releasing personnel reviews but feels there should be a way we could provide a summary of the evaluation. Wouldn't get into the comments but maybe a general indication of the evaluation and how faculty feel about the President.

Pedros-Gascon: Even if the Board of Governors does not value this, feels the faculty value this exercise. Believe the evaluation can be helpful for the President to see what perceptions are and how people are feeling. Feels it is important for us to try to continue doing this.

Chair Doe: Asked Smith if it would be possible to have this as part of report on the agenda, so that it is on public record that you made a transmittal of the evaluation to the Board of Governors. Wondered if this would be a good mechanism.

Smith: Could work as a mechanism. Did this last year, gave an overview of what the report told us. Believe we have to get it on the agenda to make it more official but think that is possible. We can try do that.

Peel: Another way to potentially approach this might be through mid-semester evaluations, like the ones we do for classes. We report back to the classes and have a conversation about what we learned. Asked: Could it potentially be a conversation with the President's Office about areas we recognized or what to highlight?

Chair Doe: Really like this idea of mid-semester feedback. It is an invitational approach that makes it more about conversation. Would be an interesting exercise to undertake with the President's Office to have this kind of feedback session.

Norton: With the course evaluation analogy from Peel, wondering if course evaluations are public record. Not the comments, but just the scores.

Vice Provost James: Know the comments aren't but think this changed a while ago and not sure if the scores are available.

Chair Doe: Can probably find that out. It seemed that students did Rate My Professor based on those scores.

Vice Provost James: Will look into this.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for the conversation. We have some people willing to look into things and group them. This gives us a great start. Asked if there was any other business.

Hearing none, meeting considered adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

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