

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, February 15, 2022
3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Melinda Smith, BOG Representative; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President; Jane Stewart, Agricultural Sciences; Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering; Sharon Anderson, Health and Human Sciences; Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Liberal Arts; Linda Meyer, Libraries; 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; Marie Legare, Chair Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty; Gwen Gorzelsky, Executive Director of TILT; Shawn Archibeque, Chair Committee on Teaching and Learning

Absent: Andrew Norton, Vice Chair (excused); Rob Mitchell, Business (excused); Mike Antolin, Natural Sciences (excused)

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

February 15, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Faculty Council Minutes – February 1, 2022

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

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

B. Executive Committee Minutes – February 8, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to this set of 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 February 22, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on March 1, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: Wanted to remind everyone about the Harry Rosenberg Award. We want to get nominations for people and acknowledge those who have given great service to Faculty Council and more broadly to the notion of faculty involvement in shared governance.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: We had the Academic Master Planning workshop last Friday, February 11th, which was well attended. We had almost 200 people attend. Will be excited to share some output from that workshop.

Provost Pedersen: We are moving forward with enrollment planning through this summer. We are doing some new modeling around our enrollment. We are looking at our numbers because we have had some decline in incoming classes that are continuing numbers. They are projected to be down for the next year. Because the continuing numbers are down, in order for us to grow, enrollment will need to take a larger incoming class. We are working on those numbers and want to make sure deans and department heads are aware of this so they are prepared.

Provost Pedersen: We are looking forward to providing an update later this semester on student success. We meet with our leadership team every other week. We are reviewing a few more proposals tomorrow, February 16th, and have been making good progress on supporting some strategic pilot programs. The Board of Governors are looking forward to a summary budget update by next week, so we will be working on that. We are moving forward with a lot of other initiatives. Happy to answer any questions members may have.

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

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: The reduction of students is something that has been known for a while. Wondering what contingency plans were created by the previous administration, since we knew this cliff would happen.

Provost Pedersen: Clarified that this reduction in students has nothing to do with the projected cliff. We had a demographer with us that shared good information. The declining continuing student number, the incoming classes, have gone down because of the pandemic. For our student success efforts, our number one focus is student retention. Even though our incoming classes were down a little bit, if we can retain more, we will have better numbers. Between freshman year and sophomore year, 15% of our students choose not to come back. That is an area we want to be focusing on. The student success team is looking very closely at that because that is where we lose most of our students and that is where we need to be trying to put our efforts.

Provost Pedersen: When it comes to declining numbers, this was discussed at the Academic Master Planning workshop this past Friday. We discussed looking at the future and recognizing that the type of students will be changing over time. For us to continue to increase, we need to be strategic, and we need to also focus on our access mission as a land-grant school. We have had many meetings with Vice President Yolanda Beville, who is focused on targeting the strategies as well as aligning marketing efforts with it. One of our goals is to bring this all together in a

coordinated way so that admissions, enrollment, and marketing along with the academic arm are working closely together.

Sharon Anderson: There was a comment about what future students would look like. Asked: How do we understand that and what are the projections suggesting?

Provost Pedersen: A good example is that our enrollment in Colorado residents has been slightly declining. One of our goals is to increase our Colorado residents, and along with that goal, is to make CSU to be the first choice for students. We also want to have a demographic profile that looks more like Colorado. In Colorado right now, in the age range of 18 to 22, 30% are students who identify as Hispanic and Latinx. As of now, we only enroll 16%, so we could double that. We are targeting that population in Colorado. When we say changing, we are looking at the student population and how it is projected into the future. The other issue is that there will be a much greater need to continuing and re-education of older adults, and that population will be growing dramatically. We are looking at how we can serve that population of students even more and if we want to continue to grow, our profile is going to have to shift a little.

Chair Doe: Asked: How are we connecting this to the rural initiatives and the objectives of broadening our base to meet the needs of Colorado and its residents?

Provost Pedersen: Rural students are another focus, and we are looking at strategies for how we can engage more rural students. Our numbers have been flat. We are looking at targeting financial aid and outreach and marketing strategies. This will involve working with the Office of Extension and partnering with them to figure out how to engage students starting at an earlier age. Have also had conversations with Vice President Bevill about building our high school partners program more. This program works with high schools that tend to be low-income and diverse. We have the opportunity to grow that program significantly and make a difference there. We are looking at not only the Colorado resident but the rural resident as well.

Chair Doe: With the promise of a mature (retirement age) student body, we might have an enormous opportunity to tap into this population. Colorado has long been a destination for retirement for many, and Colorado especially invites the active and engaged senior citizen. Thinks this may be underutilized and may be a window of opportunity.

Provost Pedersen: With the demographer, we focused a lot on the workforce for Colorado and the declining of the workforce and how we need to focus on that. It really does start with our education to support the workforce and Colorado. Part of the work is getting people here to educate and then keeping them here for the workforce. Think we may need stronger connections, but there is an opportunity there.

Anderson: In light of how we are trying to bring in different students, asked about what faculty will need to make this shift.

Provost Pedersen: Think this would be the next steps in the conversation for us and this will be faculty-driven. We need to decide who the target populations are that we want to educate, and which departments can meet those needs. This won't be a top-down, it will be a bottom-up. We

are trying to provide the lay of the landscape, with next conversations discussing who would like to step in to meet those needs. It will mean preparing, shifting, and developing programs, and the development piece will come out of the programs that departments feel would meet the needs of the students.

Chair Doe: Think the Biden administration is coming back around the idea of gainful employment regulations. This was initially to address the for-profit sector of high education which often makes promises to graduates that cannot be delivered upon. But more generally this connects to workforce concerns. Obviously, we want our graduates to have gained more than just the ability to get a job. This may be an impetus for thinking about our demographic in new ways and thinking about how to be mindful and responsible to student bodies, so they have a shot at making a living wage but not only a living wage.

Provost Pedersen: In California, it became onerous with the new programs at the graduate level. They required us to gather data on student employment to demonstrate that students were able to earn money using their graduate degree. If programs couldn't do that, they would essentially be shut down. At many institutions where the graduate programs are expensive, it's impossible for the students to make enough money and it puts them in debt. This is an important issue.

Jennifer Peel: Want to touch on the decision from CSU to continue the mask mandate. Was happy to see this decision and felt it was well-articulated and thought out. Wondering what feedback has been provided by the CSU community around this decision or if there are any thoughts on this moving forward.

Provost Pedersen: Was also pleased with where we ended up with that decision. Have not received a lot of feedback but may hear about any in the Pandemic Preparedness Team meeting later today. The proposal gives us time to prepare and look at the data. The fact that we will be revisiting this once a week, on Fridays, will buy us a week at a time as we're progressing through the pandemic. We are also watching the CDC's guidelines carefully, as they may change, which will change what we do as well.

Chair Doe: Noted that CU Boulder announced their plans around masks today, which is similar to ours. Posted link to the policy in the chat. Asked if there were any other questions.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions, thanked Provost Pedersen.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – February 4, 2022

Chair Doe: We have our University Curriculum Committee minutes from February 4th. Requested a motion to place these on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

Peel: Moved.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that no second is needed for items coming from standing committees. Requested members indicate their support in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

2. Proposed Revisions to Section E.5.3 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Marie Legare, Chair

Marie Legare: These changes were made due to concerns that many faculty are involved in mentoring of students and not necessarily advising. Sometimes this overlap, but not always. When you consider that a lot of programs have undergraduate advisors, the faculty may not technically academically advise but they do a lot of mentoring. We were asked to clarify and add some additional language so that mentoring would be recognized within these two sections of the Faculty Manual.

Chair Doe: Requested a motion for placing this on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

Linda Meyer: Moved.

Chair Doe: Thanked Meyer. Asked if there were questions about Section E.5.3.

Chair Doe: Have a comment. Responsibilities as a faculty member shifted dramatically when the employee group Academic Support Counselors was created. A lot of advising shifted over to them and the way this was articulated was that faculty would be more in the mentoring realm. Struggled with what this meant and what forms this would take. Wondering if the sense is that we have reached capacity in our units where we know what mentoring is now, because if we put it into the Manual, it is a guideline and would imply we know what it is.

Legare: The conversations we had now are around annual reviews and mid-tenure reviews. Mentoring and advising are being separated out. There are faculty who may not necessarily advise but they mentor, which is why this needs to be included in the Manual. In this section, faculty members are expected to make time for student conferences for advising and mentoring. If these are included in the faculty member's scope of duties, this makes it clearer for those faculty that mentor and advise so they get credit for what they do.

Chair Doe: Second question is whether the way this is written implies that you were doing both advising and mentoring as opposed to one or the other.

Legare: The way it is written is that faculty have to make time available for conferences for advising and mentoring, with the caveat that these are included in the faculty member's scope of duties. Don't necessarily think you need "or" here.

Anderson: Asked: How would that look like for load if it is parsed out? Wondering how faculty figure out their load in acknowledgement of this when going up for promotion and tenure.

Legare: Not sure. It is within our annual evaluation and scoped under teaching, advising, and mentoring. As a faculty member, some of what we are expected to do falls into a particular category for effort. This will differ from faculty to faculty. We didn't change that in here, just added some verbiage to help people who are submitting this. Everything we do in here is dependent on the department codes. The last line indicates "within the context of their disciplines." This is important because different disciplines will approach these entities differently.

Chair Doe: Asked if the Provost's office would incorporate new language that would reflect this.

Vice Provost Susan James: We will be revamping those forms anyway as we adopt a new interfolio process for tenure and promotion for annual reviews. This would be a good opportunity to update it.

Chair Doe: Asked: Are people documenting their mentoring enough in effective or varied ways?

Vice Provost James: Yes, some, but it is not consistent.

Legare: Some of the members in the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty have noted that in their colleges it is encouraged. Think because it is new it may be difficult to evaluate and determine how we know it is effective. It will be good for faculty who are doing these sorts of things, and right now, they aren't putting them down in their evaluations and they are not getting credit for what they are doing.

Vice Provost James: Think we will have to be careful. If we put it on the annual evaluation form or on forms for tenure and promotion, people read it as a mandate. We will need to make sure we are aligned and making clear what is mandated and what is optional.

Legare: In coming up with this language, this was suggested by the subcommittee within the Graduate School who wanted to see these changes in the Manual and have these better defined.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, we have a motion on the floor. Requested a vote to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

3. Proposed Revisions to Section E.12.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Marie Legare, Chair

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any further discussion around this section. Hearing none, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

Meyer: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Want to go back to the Academic Master Planning forum mentioned by Provost Pedersen. Was able to attend and participate in the event. The demographic pieces of information were of great interest. Think it may be time for us to consider what it means to be a faculty member going into this next decade or so. The demographic changes signal that we need to make some changes. Do not think this is any cause for concern. We have already been in a steady state of shifting our approach in the classroom and the laboratory for the various circumstances we have been presented with, including the pandemic. Think we can become an institution that is responsive to new demographics.

Chair Doe: Our calendar is rolling out in terms of spring visitors. President Joyce McConnell will be joining us for our March Faculty Council meeting. She is at the top of the agenda, so we will launch straight into her presentation. President's Office was in touch today about timing and ensuring we have enough time for presentation as well as conversation. There are a number of items that follow the President's presentation, and we may have a discussion item from Vice President Blake Naughton about Extension. This will be an important discussion item and we want to be attentive. Have not yet confirmed, but we may be hearing from him during Executive Committee next week.

Chair Doe: In April, we have confirmed that Athletic Director Joe Parker will be joining us, as well as Shane Kanatous, chair of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. We have Vice President Kauline Cipriani confirmed for our May Faculty Council meeting. Wondering how members feel about including a conversation around the campus climate survey at that time. Expressed concern for doing too much at one meeting. Some preliminary work is being done on the campus climate survey by Shannon Archibeque-Engle and at some point, there may be a desire to share this with Faculty Council. We could wait until fall, as it may be too much to do that as well as Vice President Cipriani. Asked members to provide feedback on that. Inclination is to wait to allow the campus climate survey more time.

Chair Doe: There is some conversation going on around course syllabi and about whether having the necessity or obligation of a syllabi in the Faculty Manual. It currently is not in there. It is alluded to, with some references in the Manual, but nowhere does it specify that a course syllabus is required. This is a matter of some interest and concern. Think we may be hearing more about this in the future. Am listening to leadership from the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty about reasons we may not want to put this in the Manual. Interested in thinking about the broader discussion around academic policies and where they are housed. Wanted to let members know that this conversation is going on.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

No report at this time.

F. Discussion Items

1. Course Surveys – Gwen Gorzelsky, Executive Director of TILT

Gwen Gorzelsky: There are concerns around response rate and logistics around implementing the survey. There are also bigger conceptual concerns about the nature of the questions and whether they are providing the desired results. The response rate is low, which may likely be due to the pandemic. The response rate is typically around 21%.

Gorzelsky: Will start with the logistical issues. Anticipate that if all are in agreement, can update Faculty Council in March. The logistical issue of this is that each instructor has to activate the survey for each of their courses. This approach was implemented because former Chair of Faculty Council Tim Gallagher was approached by some faculty that wanted to control the open and close dates. The challenge is that the system we are using does not have the capacity to provide a default set of open and close dates or allow customization for instructors to control their open and close dates. It can do one or the other, but not both.

Gorzelsky: The other thing to know about the response rate is the activation rate of the course surveys. Last fall, the course survey was not activated by the instructor in 46% of the sections. The person from the Institute of Learning and Teaching who oversees this got emails from students that they were not able to complete their course surveys and realize that the instructor had not activated the survey. People only use it once a semester, so while it isn't a difficult process, it is maybe not as intuitive as it could be. Impression is that more people would prefer to have default open and close dates. For eight-week courses, we would provide the set of open and close dates specific to those courses. If this group agrees, we can update Faculty Council in March and then send campus messaging shortly after that to let people know. Asked if members had questions or feedback about this approach.

Chair Doe: Thanked Gorzelsky. As faculty manage this process, there have been comments about having to re-learn this each semester, and that the system does not notify us when the survey is open and whether we have successfully done that. They have to query their students to determine if it's open. Was serving on a promotion committee for non-tenure track faculty for the College of Liberal Arts. Many of the people putting in for promotion indicated that they would have liked to put in more feedback from students but couldn't because they didn't have it due to the course survey problems. Eager to hear the thoughts of others.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern over the inherent inequities that the lack of evaluations provide when you are evaluating faculty. When you are evaluating faculty who are providing evaluations from students, some of them are not candid. Feels we should either make sure everyone is providing evaluations, otherwise it is unfair to those who are punished for student comments while others are not. Would also like to know if it is possible to know if someone

activated the survey and for how long. We are supposed to be valuing the input from students, and that cannot happen if the surveys aren't being opened.

Gorzelsky: There is a way we can check whether the survey was activated. Not sure if we can check the length of time, would have to inquire. Will say that we are not staffed in a way to provide a report every semester.

Peel: Have not heard from faculty that they love the current system. There is some confusion about how to activate the survey. Wondering if we can hear from Vice Provost James around the issue of including student evaluations in promotion and tenure. Understanding was that faculty don't have to include student evaluations, especially for the purposes of evaluating teaching effectiveness. By definition, student evaluations do not evaluate teaching effectiveness and shouldn't be used in that manner. There could be reasons for faculty to include student evaluations.

Vice Provost James: It is spelled out in the Manual that course evaluations are not meant to be evaluations of teaching effectiveness. There are clear guidelines in the Manual about how and when student evaluations, whether through course evaluations or through other feedback methods, can be used in annual evaluation and tenure and promotion documentation. It would need to be okayed by the faculty member.

Amy Barkley: Posted link to Section E.12.1 of the Manual in the chat.

Shawn Archibeque: There will be a motion from the Committee on Teaching and Learning that will recommend that the student course survey be opened and closed on a standardized timeline. From our research, it has been a small group that wants the specialized timing of opening it up. To alleviate the pain of trying to figure out how to turn it on, everything we are recommending will have it be for the last two weeks of the semester and closing at the end of finals week, so we do not conflict with when grades need to be turned in the following week.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. Asked if there were other questions around the procedural piece of this discussion.

Chair Doe: Believe there is the other piece about the bigger questions around the course survey instrument. There was significant effort around putting this together. The Committee on Teaching and Learning, among others, put it a lot of effort in creating a better model and making it an ethical approach.

Gorzelsky: There are several concerns that are being regularly shared. One of them is that faculty and chairs thing that often students do not understand the questions. They also think that the length of the survey and how much thought is required for the questions deters some students from completing it, which may be tampering down those response rates. It has also been mentioned that even when students do answer, faculty and sometimes chairs and heads are not sure how to interpret what students meant, so it is hard to use the feedback to improve instruction. Other times, they may know what the students meant, but it isn't helpful information.

Gorzelsky: There is a substantial amount of work that went into the survey. The process of building the survey has involved extensive consultation with many representatives from the key stakeholder groups, including student groups, faculty groups, heads, and chairs. Some of the questions are held up as examples of questions that the students don't understand, and some of them were developed by representatives from the student government who were participating at the time. They felt this information was going to be helpful for their peers, but unsure of the context of the conversations they had made it into the final version of the survey. When drafting a document by committee, sometimes you end up with a document that has something that everybody wanted but maybe not the coherence or clarity that was ultimately desired.

Gorzelsky: The proposal was for the Committee on Teaching and Learning and the Institute for Learning and Teaching to develop a survey of faculty and maybe students as well about the survey and what they are experiencing with the current survey.

Archibeque: We knew the student course survey is not perfect, but the idea was to get an instrument with some research behind it using best practices. Building by committee did create some issues. Before we go back in to revamp the survey, we felt it was important to make sure we reached out and got adequate feedback from not only faculty but students as well about what issues they are seeing with the student course survey. We want to make sure we are doing it in the most informed way we can this time. We just started this process.

Chair Doe: Thinks some evaluation of where we are now and what can be tweaked rather than a full overhaul seems like a good idea. Expressed appreciation for the Committee on Teaching and Learning's willingness to look at this again.

Archibeque: Clarified that the Committee on Teaching and Learning has already charged The Institute of Learning and Teaching to work with us to do the survey. The motion coming from the Committee on Teaching and Learning will be to standardize the release and closing of the course survey.

Chair Doe: We will look forward to getting that motion. Expressed appreciation for the work behind the scenes around the broader issues and bigger questions.

Archibeque: We may need to have a discussion at some point with Faculty Council so they have their voices heard on this.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. Asked if there were any other discussion items or questions.

Hearing no further questions or business, meeting adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

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