

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, February 8, 2022

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Andrew Norton, Vice Chair; Melinda Smith, BOG Representative; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Jane Stewart, Agricultural Sciences; 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; Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia, Chair Committee on University Programs

Absent: Rob Mitchell, Business (excused); Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President (excused)

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

February 8, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – January 25, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to these minutes from January 25th.

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 15, 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: At our March Faculty Council meeting, President Joyce McConnell will be attending and providing a briefing on Courageous Strategic Transformation.

Chair Doe: Wanted to remind members about the Harry Rosenberg Award. Encouraged members to think about people who may be suited and qualified for this award.

Chair Doe: Asked if anyone would be interested in serving on the search committee for the new Chief of CSU Police. They would like to have representatives from various parts of campus,

including the employee councils. They have contracted with the International Association of Chiefs of Police to complete the search. They are seeking two representatives from the Faculty Council as part of this virtual focus group meeting. It will be this coming Thursday and Friday, February 10th and February 11th. Encouraged members to reach out if interested or to contact Kathleen Kelley at CSU@theiacp.org for more information.

Chair Doe: Wanted to also take a moment to express condolences for President McConnell's loss of her mother last night. Wondering if Faculty Council would like to send her a note, possibly through the Executive Committee on behalf of Faculty Council. Expressed sadness over loss of Leslie Becker, who retired from CSU a couple of years ago. Was a Flannery O'Connor scholar, a fiction writer of international acclaim, and was dedicated to CSU.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Unable to attend – no report at this time.

Vice Provost Susan James: Do not have a formal report, but happy to answer any questions members may have.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Would like to have a follow-up conversation regarding the three GTAs that were part of Teaching English as a Foreign/Second Language (TEFL/TESL). Vice Provost Kathleen Fairfax explained the situation. Commented that those three GTAs predate the existence of INTO and they were already a part of the Intensive English program. To the TEFL/TESL program, this would be an enormous loss to lose these GTAs.

Chair Doe: As a previous Director of Composition, was involved in GTA selection. When you have 100 or more graduate students in a department, as we do in English, and have only 30 or so GTA lines, competition can be very fierce. The entire apparatus is focused towards creating balance across the entire English department so that there is GTA representation from each of the five concentrations of English, of which TEFL/TESL is one. The GTA lines in INTO, which is now PLACE, took some pressure off the English department in terms of being able to provide support for those GTAs. Now those graduate students who may have competed favorably for those particular GTA positions in INTO/PLACE are now back in the larger pool, so we add to the competition and reduce the overall possibility of GTA lines.

Vice Provost James: Was not even aware of this issue until it was brought up at the Faculty Council meeting, so appreciated this being brought up. Will follow up on this.

Pedros-Gascon: Understand completely the impact this may have on compensation and other issues, as well as the process in which students are selected. The problem is that students who are doing a Masters for TEFL/TESL are hired for Composition courses and end up basically teaching in one discipline while trying to get a Masters in a different one. Think this may be a collateral that was not considered in advance but hope there is a way to address the impact.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. To have these GTAs put back into the pool when there were designated spots could have a significant impact. Asked if there were other questions.

Andrew Norton: We heard from Provost Mary Pedersen at the last Faculty Council meeting that President McConnell was going to attend March's meeting along with Athletic Director Joe Parker. This may require some discussion in Executive Committee and how we want to do that.

Chair Doe: Thanked Norton. Have sent a separate invitation to Athletic Director Parker to come to our April Faculty Council meeting. This was for several reasons, including that we had already established a timeline for discussion items. Have also sent a note to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics to present alongside Athletic Director Parker. Expressed hope that they will be able to come to April. Feel that there may be enough questions for both President McConnell and Athletic Director Parker that we may end up doing a disservice to both by having them together. Provided a short list of items to Athletic Director Parker that people may be interested in hearing about.

Jennifer Peel: On the Provost's website, there is information posted about a recent presentation on promotion and tenure information. This workshop was for department heads and was focused on promotion and tenure issues and evaluations. Wondering if it might be helpful to have Vice Provost James talk about this to Faculty Council. Some faculty may not be aware of the changes that are taking place and the information that is on the website.

Vice Provost James: Thanked Peel. This was something aimed at chairs and heads, but also invited some Deans and Associate Deans. Would be happy to present. Wondering if it makes sense to do this at Faculty Council or to have a separate forum to not use up Faculty Council meeting time.

Chair Doe: Was at this meeting. What came through was how much people appreciated this presentation and talking about tenure and promotion and how processes may vary. Participants expressed gratefulness for the opportunity to chat across departments.

Vice Provost James: With the Advance Grant, now that we have a program manager, we're going public and will start taking tours of the colleges. One of the things we want to do is training for people on tenure and promotion committees, so it's perfect timing for this.

Chair Doe: Asked: What would be the best mechanism for this? Wondering if others have ideas about this because the constraints of our meetings create a difficult challenge.

Mike Antolin: Thinks this might be worthwhile as a broader faculty forum. Feels everyone might find this informative. Anything that may demystify the process would be helpful.

Vice Provost James: Could offer a couple of sessions to be respectful of teaching schedules. Asked: Have we done things like this as faculty forums before?

Chair Doe: We do webinars on the pandemic. Think we could have webinars on topics like this.

Antolin: Suggested a webinar on topics like free speech. There are plenty of things we could use more general information on.

Chair Doe: Suggested a topical series. Asked if Antolin was interested in leading this effort.

Antolin: Would consider doing that if people like Vice Provost James were willing to make presentations. Think once or twice a semester, could be on burning topics that people might be interested in hearing more about.

Chair Doe: Could see if we can get something started and find relevant topics and get broader input. Will discuss this further.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, will move on to action items.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – January 21 & 28, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any questions about these University Curriculum Committee minutes? Brad Goetz is not here currently, but we can hold questions for later if needed.

Chair Doe: Hearing no questions, asked if there was any objection to placing these on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

Hearing no objections, motion approved.

2. 2022 CIOSU Biennial Reviews – Committee on University Programs – Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia, Chair

Chair Doe: Expressed appreciation for Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia's work with the Committee on University Programs. Suarez-Garcia stepped into chairmanship of the committee last year. There was a bit of a crisis, with many centers being recommended for discontinuation, some of which were rather important. This was due to center directors not being responsive. Suarez-Garcia, along with Dinaida Egan, did a lot of work to pull things together.

Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia: Thanked Chair Doe. We do a biennial report every year, evaluating half the centers on campus. This year, we evaluated 36 centers.

Suarez-Garcia: This year, we were working over winter break and using the new digital tool. Egan was working with all the applications. One of the issues we had in the past was that applications were not complete and had missing information. This year, we made sure that the applications had all the information we needed to evaluate them, so no applications were evaluated negatively due to missing information.

Suarez-Garcia: Of the 36 centers we evaluated, we are recommending 34 for continuation. There are still some issues with some, but more discussions will be held regarding those. There are two

centers not recommended for continuation, and this is due to the directors requesting termination. With a director request for termination, there is nothing we can do.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. Asked if there were any questions. Wondering about the termination of the center from the Warner College of Natural Resources, the Western Forest Fire Research Center. Wondering if the Dean was in favor of this center continuing.

Suarez-Garcia: According to the report, the Dean did approve this. Commented that sometimes the Responsible Administrator is someone different, even at the Provost's Office level, and it doesn't have to be a Dean. It is possible that the director of this center did not communicate with the Dean with the intention of terminating.

Chair Doe: Asked if directors for centers being recommended for termination have been notified.

Suarez-Garcia: We have not contacted them. One of the applications wasn't even completed because they were requesting termination. The other turned in all the correct paperwork and completed the process, but still recommended termination. When we complete this process and go through Faculty Council, that would be the time to let them know we have accepted their recommendation for termination.

William Sanford: Not familiar with this center. Wondering if Chad Hoffman has been notified of this or whether he requested it.

Suarez-Garcia: Can check on that before it goes to Faculty Council. Commented that each center was evaluated by at least three members of the Committee on University Programs. Each group had about ten centers. Each center was evaluated by these three committee members and then we evaluated the entire pool of applicants to ensure everyone was on the same page. This report has the support of the Committee on University Programs.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. Understanding is that it is not necessary to do any further communication with these centers, but rather just approve this to go to Faculty Council. Could check on things and come back next week to this.

Suarez-Garcia: Feels this can just go to Faculty Council. These have all been verified by our system and Egan, so it is not necessary to wait.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. Asked if there was any additional discussion. Hearing none, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1st.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that no second is needed. Requested a vote in the chat.

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

3. CIOSU Proposal Recommendations – Committee on University Programs – Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia

Suarez-Garcia: This is two proposals for new centers. The first application is from Michael Carolan for the Food Systems Institute for Research, Engagement and Learning. The Committee on University Programs was in favor of accepting this application. It had complete information.

Suarez-Garcia: The second proposal is from the Art department, and most members on the Committee on University Programs did not support this application. One of the main issues with this application is that it did not follow the guidelines, where members need to be from more than one unit. There were also some issues with the budget. Communicated with the Director of the Center and suggested some changes to take a different approach with this application. Think they were pleased that they could continue to operate under the Art department umbrella. In the Manual, it states that if criteria aren't met to become a CIOSU, you can still operate as a department center. They did not respond to suggestions for changes.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any further discussion on this item. Hearing none, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda.

Norton: 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: The AUCC 1C Task Force is working assiduously. Think we are very close to having something to share with Provost Pedersen. This is not to say that this will be a done deal, but the group is working hard and am impressed with work they are doing to solve a difficult problem.

Chair Doe: Norton and the AUCC Task Force is also up and running. Asked if Norton wanted to speak to this group.

Norton: We are just getting started, and it is a great group we have put together.

Chair Doe: Mentioned earlier than an invitation has been extended to Athletic Director Parker to our April Faculty Council meeting, so hopefully we will hear back. Have also sent a note to Vice President for Inclusive Excellence Kauline Cipriani to join us for our May meeting. We will have President McConnell at our March meeting. It is also possible that we may be hearing from Vice President Blake Naughton at our March meeting as well.

Chair Doe: Would like to hear from this group if we possibly need a broader conversation about faculty reaction to the lifting of the mask mandate on campus as well as in the county. Would

like to be able to report back to the Teaching Continuity and Recovery Committee about how faculty are feeling about this.

Chair Doe: Encouraged members to read draft of the Courageous Strategic Transformation plan.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Melinda Smith: We had our Board of Governors meeting virtually on February 3rd. The meeting started with Chancellor Tony Frank giving an overview and setting the stage. They plan to dig into their strategic planning at their August retreat. It will be interesting to see what they envision as their next steps in their strategic plan and visions for the future.

Smith: There was also a report on SPUR from Jocelyn Hittle. They opened Vida in January, alongside the Western Stock Show. Hittle stated they had around 8,700 visitors, and 1,700 on CSU Day. They performed around 150 surgeries that were open for people to view. It was a big success. In June, they have the Terra project slated for opening and they plan to have Hydro open and online in time for next year's Stock Show.

Smith: There were also reports from CSU, and during Board of Governors Representative report, brought up the Presidential survey and asked if this was of value to the Board of Governors. They did state that they value this input and feedback. During meeting, received an email that the Provost's Office would be willing to fund this survey. A summary of this evaluation was requested, detailing what the survey entails and what its goals are.

Antolin: Part of the group that volunteered to take this on this year. One of the things we should do is review the evaluation and work on this summary as something we can send out first to have an explanation of what we are doing and why we are doing it. We can use this broadly to inform our community and the Board of Governors of the what, why, and how.

Chair Doe: Thanked Antolin. We could incorporate that information into the introduction when the survey is distributed. That may help a lot.

Chair Doe: There was a lot of effort in this last year and the group came up with a great instrument for this. We brought in the President's Office to review the questions and offer up one of their own. We could talk about some sort of executive summary around the process. Will share the information from last year with those interested in taking this on this year.

Chair Doe: Reported that the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences has assured they can fit the Presidential survey into their schedule. They have given us a quote on price, which will be like the University Grievance Officer survey. We may need to have some conversations around this. Last year, Institutional Research took on the quantitative analysis under their own sponsorship and contracted the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences for the qualitative analysis. We do not have a quote for the quantitative analysis, which may up the cost. Might want to think about that as a group.

Smith: Think we will want to communicate with the Provost's Office with a draft of the executive summary and get their feedback. Wondering if we should also contact the Board of Governors and see if they have specific things they would appreciate.

Pedros-Gascon: Commented that there was some pushback last year over the suggestion of enhancing the narrative. Think it is something to consider and we should come to an agreement about this kind of thing.

Norton: Looking at report from last year, and the executive summary was well done. It is a few pages long, so it is possible that the Board did not recall we did that. Thanked Pedros-Gascon for the work done on the survey last year, did an outstanding job.

Sharon Anderson: Wondering if we are using the same instrument we used last year.

Chair Doe: Confirmed. The value of this survey, as told to us by Institutional Research, was that it becomes something that can be repeated. Might be premature to do too many revisions. We can use the same form this year, with possibly some adjustments to the executive summary where we focus on the process and history. Once changes are made, just a matter of getting it out in coordination with Institutional Research and the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences.

Antolin: Asked if would be best if we meet soon to discuss this and review the survey. One of our first actions can be to look at the executive summary and bring those back to an Executive Committee meeting before we launch the survey.

Smith: Can reach out to the Board to ask if they would be satisfied with the executive summary accompanying the actual evaluation, or if they would prefer to have it prior to that. Was not clear on the timing of the executive summary and what they would prefer.

Antolin: Asked if Smith would prefer to sit in on first meeting to discuss the executive summary.

Smith: Confirmed, would be happy to do that.

Smith: Have a few more things about the Board of Governors meeting. One of the key things during the meeting was the presentation of the Courageous Strategic Transformation plan by President McConnell. The Board did not appear ready to act on this. Does not mean that they were not supportive of the plan, but there did not appear to be a lot of detail in the overview presentation. There were questions about how it would be deployed and metrics to be used. Might be worth having this committee review the Courageous Strategic Transformation materials and providing feedback.

Vice Provost James: There was quite a bit of detail in the materials, including the measurable things. It just didn't come across in the presentation. President McConnell also presented in front of a changing Board. Not sure if they are looking for a vote in approval, they just want an endorsement by the Board.

Smith: Don't think there is a chance for disapproval from the Board, but endorsement seems important. For the next meeting, President McConnell may come up with more substance for the presentation.

Smith: Last thing they discussed at the Board of Governors meeting was the budget presentations. The President is budgeting for a 1% increase in faculty salaries, and there will be a 3% increase for state classified and GTA stipends. They presented four scenarios. In the fourth scenario, it does provide a budget windfall. The third and fourth scenarios include tuition increases. It is not clear if that will be approved at the state level. President McConnell has written a letter to the governor requesting more funding. A lot is still murky and depends on a lot of things coming to place and what state funding looks like.

Pedros-Gascon: Wanted to pose this question again about how much it cost to run the administration when President McConnell entered and how much it costs to run now. There have been a number of Vice President, Assistant Vice President, Associate Provost, and Provost positions created, while faculty are only looking at a 1% raise. Requested to have that information provided to us when they have a budget update in April.

Chair Doe: Believe we can still get public records around salary and position. We could access that website and get the exploration of costs.

Antolin: To give some perspective, believe that a 1% raise for faculty would be around \$5 million. When we talk about how much it costs to run a university, this is a number we should be aware of in terms of how much money is going where.

Vice Provost James: Believe the 1% raise for faculty and administrative professionals is about \$4 million. Suggested that we let the budget people to give us the numbers we are requesting to ensure it is accurate.

Vice Provost James: To answer one of Pedros-Gascon's questions that has been asked before, it would cost between \$13 and \$14 million to bring our faculty up to 100% of our peers. To fix our administrative professional salaries to be competitive, it would be more like \$20 million. Still waiting on that study to be completed, so not firm. In total, it would be about \$34 million, which is a lot of money. Provost Pedersen is focused on this question. Need to also keep in mind that our state classified colleagues, because they are covered by Colorado WINS.

Norton: Like the idea of saving the money up to address equity issues. Feels there are some equity issues that have no been resolved.

Vice Provost James: Want to make sure we are using the same terminology here. When we think of equity, we think of internally between employees as opposed to market competitiveness. We have issues on both sides, but we can do the equity analysis for all employees now. Part of the thinking is also on the competitiveness side and on the living wage side. We have not yet agreed on how the prioritization will work. Human Resources will help with that but starting with the lowest-paid individuals and the place where competitiveness is low makes the most sense.

Smith: Something that was mentioned in the Board of Governors meeting was how if we do not do a tuition increase this year, we would get behind. You can't make up for that time, you can't do a 6% increase the following year. Seems this would be related to faculty salaries as well. If you don't do the increases, it is hard to catch up.

Sybil Sharvelle: Hard to comprehend that we are talking about a 1% raise with 7% inflation rates right now. Not sure how to reconcile this with the budget. Not sure how to think about whether to take the 1% or have it go into a fund for equity issues.

Smith: From sitting on these budget discussions, CSU's operating budget is large, and we are not getting the amount of income in that we need, so we end up with a deficit. They either have to raise the tuition or get more infusion from the System. Think it would be good if the Board viewed this as an investment rather than a deficit and the payoff will be worth it down the line. It will cost money now, but we can continue to attract high quality faculty and be high ranking.

Sanford: Would say this is kind of a dire situation. Get a lot of people talking about wage compression. We are hiring two new people, and their salary could be \$8,000 different than someone who has been here for 15-20 years.

Pedros-Gascon: Think it is a matter of having priorities stated. This is something that could be addressed with a clear reassessment of allocations. Salary, salary compression, and equities are vital to any institution.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for this conversation.

F. Discussion Items

Mike Antolin moved to go into Executive Session. Guests and Executive Assistant left meeting.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Executive Session adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

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