

**MINUTES**  
Executive Committee  
**Tuesday, February 22, 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; 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; Mike Antolin, Natural Sciences; Jennifer Peel, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

**Guests:** Joyce McConnell, President; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Shawn Archibeque, Chair Committee on Teaching and Learning; Blake Naughton, Vice President for Extension

**Absent:** Rob Mitchell, Business (excused)

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

**February 22, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. Minutes to be Approved**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes – February 15, 2022**

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the minutes from February 15<sup>th</sup>.

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

**II. Items Pending/Discussion Items**

**A. *Announcements***

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on March 8, 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.
3. Outstanding Achievement Award Selection Committee

Chair Doe: We have been asked to participate in the Outstanding Achievement Award Selection Committee through the Classified Personnel Council. They greatly appreciate having a faculty representative. Asked members to contact herself or Amy Barkley if interested.

Chair Doe: Reminded members of the Harry Rosenberg Award. Encouraged members to nominate someone if they have individuals in mind. Reminded members that this award is in service for Faculty Council.

Melinda Smith: Asked if there were any nominations submitted yet.

Chair Doe: Not that we have seen yet. Encouraged members to give this some thought. There are many deserving people. This award is to help acknowledge that effort.

Chair Doe: Wanted to acknowledge the passing of Mary Ontiveros. Understand that arrangements are underway. Expressed that this was a tremendous loss. Lost a colleague recently, as well as the loss of President Joyce McConnell's mother. There has been quite a bit of loss recently and wanted to take a moment to acknowledge these losses.

### ***B. President's Report – President Joyce McConnell***

President Joyce McConnell: Wanted to express the incredible loss of Mary Ontiveros as well. She had extraordinary contributions to this campus, as well as her lifelong commitment to diversifying CSU and fighting for justice on our campus and beyond. She leaves a phenomenal legacy, and her spirit is embedded into CSU. We will be holding memorial services once her family is ready to do so.

President McConnell: Expressed appreciation for everyone's thoughts regarding loss of her mother. Hard to express how much all the kind words and thoughts meant during this difficult time. Having the support of the CSU community was huge.

President McConnell: Wanted to also acknowledge the loss of Joe Blake, who was committed to our Liberal Arts. We will miss Blake a lot. There has been a lot of loss in such a short period of time for our community.

President McConnell: A couple of scholarship and fellowship programs were started in Ontiveros' honor. From the President's Office, we have the Ontiveros Latinx Fellowship program, which is a program that pays for students to have unpaid internships.

President McConnell: Expressed appreciation for everything faculty and Faculty Council did for Courageous Strategic Transformation. We presented our plan at the February Board of Governors meeting. We thought the Board would take a vote on it then, but they are going to take the official vote in May. This is because of new Board members coming on. They will have three new Board members.

President McConnell: We will be launching the public presentation of Courageous Strategic Transformation on campus on March 1<sup>st</sup>. We will be holding in in-person in the Lory Student Center and will be streaming it for those who cannot make it in-person. One of the bonuses of waiting for the official vote in May is that the May Board of Governors meeting will be held in Fort Collins, so we will be able to present for the final presentation to the Board. Encouraged members to attend if they are able.

President McConnell: Wanted to give a shoutout to Smith for all her work as the Board of Governors Representative. Feels she is an incredible representative for faculty and our graduate students. This has been very meaningful and has a significant impact.

Smith: Thanked President McConnell for the kind words. Have learned a lot while serving on the Board and am glad to be doing a good job representing faculty.

President McConnell: On the legislative side of things, the governor put his budget in and there was not enough to support the changes the governor wanted to see in higher education. We are working through the legislative process to get full funding for higher education. Our legislative team and lobbyists are doing a good job.

President McConnell: In terms of Clark, many people have been following whether we will ever get approval from the legislature for Clark. We are positioned well in the Capital Development Committee on Clark. Believe we are in the top five for investments on capital improvement projects. Our lobbyists have been good about that.

President McConnell: In terms of what the federal earmark process. For years, Congress did not allow earmarks anymore, but just this year they opened the door to earmarks. We have done a good job of gathering submissions for earmarks. We have seven earmarks going forward. Believe we have a good chance of getting a research facility funded on the Foothills Campus and possibly an expansion of Power House too. We are working through the process. Congressman Neguse came to campus a couple of weeks ago to take a tour of the Power House and potential research on hydrogen hubs. He is enthusiastic about this and is supportive of all the work we are doing around sustainability and climate change.

President McConnell: Am on the President Steering Committee for the Alliance on Higher Education and Immigration. It is the leading entity in the country that has been working closely with senators and congressman and immigration services to try to get changes in the rules for international and undocumented students, as well as DACA students. There was some progress and guidelines were changed a couple of weeks ago for guidance on international students. The guidance that will be given to our international students now is that they will not be required to prove that they do not intend to stay in the United States. One of the big difficulties for our international students has been proving that they do not intend to stay. This will allow them to state that they are coming here for their education and have that be the end of it, which should help at the consulate level in terms of international students coming. The Alliance will be holding an annual summit at Swarthmore in March and each president is allowed to bring two people from campus.

President McConnell: As part of our commitment with Courageous Strategic Transformation, we are continuing to budget increase and the graduate student stipends. Aware that the University of Colorado voted to absorb their student fees, so we will keep pushing in that direction. It puts the financial burden on the institution rather than the students, which is not a bad thing. It is just a matter of figuring out how to pay for it. First, we want to increase the stipends and then next we will be trying to tackle the fees issue.

President McConnell: Have two other Courageous Strategic Transformation updates. As part of the Native American Advisory Council, Roe Bubar, while she was the interim Vice President for Diversity and Leslie Taylor, before her retirement as the Vice President for Enrollment and Access, advised the President's Office that it was important to have a tribal representative that would report directly to the President and would coordinate with our tribal connections and contacts. We are working on a job description for this position and intend to get it posted early. The Native American Advisory Council is assisting us in writing the job description.

President McConnell: Know everyone is thinking about the process of budget reform in terms of Courageous Strategic Transformation. This will depend on a new Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and Vice President for Operations, as Vice President Lynn Johnson intends to retire. We have posted the position and are using a search firm. The importance of this position is that this person will be helping us figure out some alternative budget models. Vice President Johnson has great people with her, so we have good foundations.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell. Asked: Can you explain why the CFO and Vice President for Operations is a combined job?

President McConnell: Have asked this as well. When Vice President Lynn Johnson announced her retirement, looked at job and considered splitting it since it is a huge job. Asked different experts outside the University and the overwhelming consensus was that these positions worked better together. The reason was to empower the CFO to have the kind of information and oversight that they need to see the big picture, both currently and in the future. It allows for strategic budget planning. The advice from one person was to have a deputy-type person underneath the CFO and Vice President for Operations that can focus on facilities and operations. We are working on that structure to see what would work best.

Mike Antolin: Expressed appreciation for addressing the decision by University of Colorado regarding student fees. Expressed hope that the Faculty Council resolution supporting graduate students is gaining some traction. Thinks that waiving the fees would be a considerably larger benefit to graduate students than a 2% or 3% increase.

President McConnell: Expressed appreciation for raising this point. Found out from the University of Colorado that student fees and how they are allocated in Colorado are regulatory from the Department Higher Education. The students through the Associated Students of CSU (ASCSU) have tremendous power and control over those fees and how they are allocated. Student fees go towards facilities, transportation, the Student Health Network. Think we need to discuss with ASCSU and their dependency on fees from the graduate students and figure out what we can absorb centrally, which we would then have to pass through ASCSU to cover the hole in their budget. Think we have to approach it differently than we have been.

Antolin: Was involved in trying to raise the facilities fee for the biology building. It was a learning experience meeting with ASCSU and seeing what they viewed as issues and where support came from. The students represent every college and program and would not necessarily see that there is a benefit to giving graduate students a break or helping them in any way. Takes a bit of strategizing and time to figure out how to package something like this.

President McConnell: Many students paying fees are undergraduates, which is different because their financial aid packaging is different. Going through that education process with ASCSU, which is essentially undergraduate run, will give us some strategy and education to engage in a way that is helpful. Think it would be great to have Faculty Council's involvement and helping us untangle this and figure out what we can accomplish. ASCSU has quite a bit of money. Have not worked with student bodies that had as much money to spend as ASCSU does, and they have done wonderful things with it. It is important for us to understand better what their priorities are.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Want to bring back to the forefront a concern that affects his college, and that is the inherent inequities of departments teaching 3/2. Would like to know if a view has been taken on this and when equity may be provided to those units.

President McConnell: Thanked Pedros-Gascon for raising this, it is an important issue. Know this is something Provost Mary Pedersen and Vice Provost Susan James have on their radar as well. Understanding that this is something we want to address as part of the Academic Master Plan, looking at both curriculum and issues around distribution of courses and teaching loads.

Vice Provost Susan James: Have not yet gotten the group together, so have not had a chance to communicate, but the Committee on Gender Equity in the faculty reached out because they wanted to do a service load audit of all faculty because there are inequities there as well. Told them that we were thinking about a complete workload audit for faculty that would include all of the things faculty do, not just service, because there are inequities in all the areas of what we do. This is part of why we had Adrianna Kezar come and give us some tools from the literature from other universities to do these types of audits and create dashboards and transparencies. We would want Faculty Council and the Advance team to be involved in this. Thinks Pedros-Gascon would be a good person to be involved in this conversation.

Pedros-Gascon: Happy to engage in any of these discussions. Expressed concern that the wheel of administration turns slowly and would like some resolution of this issue. Have been hearing about this issue for years, and it has an impact on our teaching, service, and personal lives.

President McConnell: Asked if these units being referred to are in Liberal Arts.

Pedros-Gascon: Confirmed.

Smith: We met early in January to discuss the fees issue. Had asked Colleen Webb about whether we could go back to ASCSU and negotiate with them and got the sense that this was a no go. Expressed appreciation for President McConnell's support for this kind of approach. Feel it is the best approach to start with and then we can consider other models. Feels it would be helpful to have this idea communicated that we should be negotiating directly with ASCSU.

Smith: Wanted to also comment on the new CFO and idea that this person is key for new alternative budget models. Was curious about operational models too. Wondering if there is thinking about some of the bumps in progress with places like purchasing, Human Resources, and even facilities.

President McConnell: This is an important point. Something we have focused on in Courageous Strategic Transformation with new leadership and Human Resources. We have a much better sense of what is missing from Human Resources. That unit is very small for a university our size. Have authorized hiring in both Human Resources and procurement, which was built into the budget. Not a person to say that more people will necessarily make things better, but it really takes a reframing of how we get work done and what our responsibility is to our entire University to make things run smoothly.

Andrew Norton: Encouraged that we want to go to ASCSU around the fee issue. Wondering if the President's Office knows whether the rate of increase in fees has exceeded the increased rate of tuition, or whether it is matched. It seems that the fee rate is increasing more rapidly than tuition. Wondering if there has been an audit or investigation around whether graduate students benefit from these fee increases. Some fees may go to campus buildings, but others like ticket fees or things like that may not necessarily benefit graduate students.

President McConnell: This is a good point. A lot of the student fee money does go to things like transportation, the Health Network, the new food pantry, some of the operations for basic student services. You are right; to be able to do a deep dive of where the money goes can show us where it maybe does not go to good places. Can ask what we are asking graduate students to pay versus what they are getting. Part of this is the ability of the university too, which is why the new budget models will be so important to figure out what the student body needs and what our needs are as well. Asked: How do we make critical decisions about where the money goes?

President McConnell: We are going to continue to have some challenging budget times coming out of the pandemic. The national demographics show attitudes toward higher education are discouraging in terms of enrollment. We are making critical choices about where we need to spend money and what is more important. As President, have an important role and can be forthright with Faculty Council about the choices we have to make. By having these conversations about budget items, we can get a better read on what our campus priorities are for our students.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell. The Executive Committee and Faculty Council have tended to make the case for graduate students, but more questions could be asked about faculty and staff pay increases. This group is asking about students and prioritizing their needs. This is not to say that people do not care about their own compensation, but this is the organic outcome of a group that really do care about their students, and in this case, specifically graduate students.

President McConnell: What is striking about these conversations in Faculty Council is that it is helping the Board to understand that in the end, it really is about our students. As we are doing more of this work on marketing and communications and understanding the values of our community, one of the things that comes up consistently is that it is all about our students. Smith also does a good job of connecting this to our faculty. Being all about our students has to be about our faculty too, because if we do not support our faculty adequately, we cannot support our students. Being able to tie those two together is critical.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith for doing this and President McConnell for this conversation. Expressed appreciation for her being here today. We look forward to seeing you at the Faculty Council meeting in a week.

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

Provost Mary Pedersen: Thanked everyone who participated in the Academic Master Planning workshop on February 11<sup>th</sup>. It was very well attended. We will have some follow-up information from the documents from each of the table groups and will be summarizing those and pulling them together to create some action items.

Provost Pedersen: Have put together a task force that is charged with establishing a clear and consistent guidelines policy around the B.A. versus B.S. degree. This is important because it will be coming to Faculty Council for approval and a vote. Michael Palmquist and Simon Tavener have both agreed to co-chair the task force. Andrew Duffy will be supporting the team. Mica Glantz from the department of Anthropology, Matt Hickey from the department of Health and Human Sciences, and Susan De Long from Civil and Environmental Engineering are also members of the task force. They will work on developing a clear, consistent campus policy to define the basic core elements between the B.A. and B.S. degree.

Provost Pedersen: We are looking at our enrollment numbers in terms of new students. Things are looking good, but we do need to focus on our continuing students, as those numbers are coming down a little. It does not have to do with more students not being retained. It reflects our incoming recent cohorts being less. We will have about 200 students less than we are expecting. We will be trying to work on enrollment strategy to increase our incoming transfer students and first-time students by similar numbers. As everyone knows, our enrollment numbers are critical for our budget, so this is something we will be keeping our eye on.

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

Smith: Wondering about the task force. Asked: Why is there a need for clarification on the B.A. and B.S. degrees?

Provost Pedersen: The reason we need a clarification is because the University Curriculum Committee has been struggling with this for several years. There are proposals that have come forward for B.A. versus B.S. and they have been held up. This is a historical issue, some campuses have guidelines and others do not. Did research at previous institution and ended up coming up with some general guidelines. This task force will come up with recommendations that will come to Faculty Council.

Smith: Have a B.A. in biology and took something like twelve credits in humanities. Asked if the underlying thought was helping students make decisions about the programs or if it also makes one program more competitive than another if it were a B.A. versus a B.S.

Provost Pedersen: That is a good question. One of the reasons we asked Glantz to serve on this task force is because she has developed a B.A. as well as a B.S. in geography. Right now the

major driving force is to help the University Curriculum Committee make decisions about whether a degree is appropriate as a B.A. or a B.S. The issue is there are some degrees coming forward right now that we already have as a B.S. on campus, and they are requesting a B.A. degree, and the issue is we need to know the difference and how we compare on to the other. There is no policy or guidelines to go on, so it is creating a hold up for these degrees to move forward.

Pedros-Gascon: Would like to know if any decision has been made regarding the three GTAs from the TESL/TEFL program. We had asked about this situation with Vice Provost Kathleen Fairfax, and it was not clear what the situation was. Would like to know if there has been any follow-up on this.

Provost Pedersen: Requested clarification on this program.

Pedros-Gascon: The graduate program is called TESL/TEFL, which had three total GTA positions. Understanding is that the previous Provost moved them out to reallocate those positions differently. The problem now is that these positions have been moved to PLACE and means that English is losing three GTAs, which is a huge impact. Had asked Vice Provost Fairfax about this and the response was that she had submitted a request with the Dean of Liberal Arts for a different solution.

Vice Provost James: Can speak to this. The intention is to hold English harmless in the creation of PLACE. We are working out the details. We will have those three GTAs; it is just a matter of logistics. We will hopefully have an answer about this by next week.

Chair Doe: That is excellent news. Thanked Vice Provost James. Asked if there were any other questions for Provost Pedersen. Hearing none, thanked her for being here.

#### ***D. Old Business***

#### ***E. Action Items***

1. UCC Minutes – February 11, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any questions or concerns about these minutes.

Hearing no concerns, University Curriculum Committee minutes approved for placement on the Faculty Council agenda for March 1<sup>st</sup>.

2. Motion Regarding Repeat/Delete Policy – Committee on Teaching and Learning – Shawn Archibeque, Chair

Shawn Archibeque: This proposal is to change the name of the student academic policy of Repeat/Delete to Repeat/Repair. This was a topic brought to us by several Academic Success Coordinators around campus. Students have some confusion with the program as it is currently named and are under the impression that if they sign up for Repeat/Delete, it will disappear and

not be on their transcript, which is not true. If a student fails a class, it will still be present on all their transcripts, it's only going to be affecting the GPA. We are not requesting to change the policy, just the name of the policy to minimize the confusion students are having.

Antolin: Asked: Is it true that the grade is still on the transcripts, if it is an F for example, will appear as "RF"?

Archibeque: Yes, and that is where the students are getting upset. They are under the impression that because it says "delete", it will not be present on their transcript anymore.

Antolin: Asked: So this just makes the language say it is going to be repaired, but not going away?

Archibeque: Confirmed.

Chair Doe: Wondering if this should be accompanied by an explanation of what the Repeat/Delete currently looks like when students sign up. Asked: Is there language that goes with this to help students understand this better, or would the name change be all that happens?

Archibeque: The name change would be all that would happen. The language as it is written clarifies the changes of "F" to "RF" and it's dropped out of the calculation of the GPA. The language of the policy will stay the same. The name change is to hopefully alleviate confusion and be one less problem for Academic Success Coordinators to deal with.

Antolin: If this came from the Academic Success Coordinators, trust them to know what is going on and would be in favor of this. If it will make their lives easier to explain this to students through a simple word change, then this sounds like a great idea.

Norton: Thanked Archibeque for bringing this forward. Suggested adding an additional sentence to clarify that this is coming from the Academic Success Coordinators. Can be easily explained in front of Faculty Council, so not necessarily essential.

Smith: Feels it helps to have as much rationale as possible to help with questions.

Chair Doe: Asked if Archibeque could add an additional sentence regarding the Academic Success Coordinators.

Archibeque: Will do that and send to you and Barkley.

Chair Doe: Requested a show of hands to place this on the Faculty Council agenda.

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

3. Motion Regarding Student Course Surveys – Committee on Teaching and Learning – Shawn Archibeque, Chair

Archibeque: We have had a charge to take a deeper dive into the student course survey. One of the main issues and concerns that has been brought forward are the low return rates. Under the current system, we have two options. We can have every individual professor or instructor on campus activate their own course survey or we can standardize the open and close dates for the survey. In the interest of serving the many versus the few, as part of our debates, we came down on the side of standardization would probably enhance return rates on the student course survey.

Archibeque: As we move forward, if we move to a standardize single time it is turned on, we propose it would be for the final two weeks of the semester, as well as the additional third week during finals, and closing on that Friday. The committee felt it was important to have it closed before grades were turned in the following Tuesday, so concerns from faculty that grades would influence the reaction or response would be alleviated.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. This is a continuation of the conversation we had with Gwen Gorzelsky about the low return rate. The observation from many of our non-tenure track faculty is they feel they are especially impacted by this. They want to be able to integrate comments from students into their annual review and their promotion review, and they are frequently not getting enough responses to be able to offer much in that regard.

Norton: Asked: Would it be possible with this new program for a faculty member to just turn it off?

Archibeque: Information that we have gotten is that it is either all on or off at the same time, or everyone has to handle it themselves. Those are the only two options with the current framework of the website that we are using.

Norton: Asked: In this scenario, might graduate students, for research credits, give feedback as well?

Archibeque: Yes. You could tell them not to fill it out for certain classes.

Chair Doe: That is an interesting feature of this. The vendor that manages this program is either unable or unwilling to set it up so there is an option, so it's one or the other. It is a matter of scale for them. We are the only institution that has had the approach of faculty doing it themselves. They can't make a good argument for offering this, because it would involve significant programming for them to do that.

Norton: There is a good explanation for this from the minutes from last week. This explanation might be added as well, and it may explain things better for Faculty Council. Approved moving this forward.

Chair Doe: A little more rationale would be helpful here as well.

Smith: Was going to suggest more rationale as well, because that will get a better response. It does seem weird that we cannot turn it off and cannot have it just for regular courses. Assume that would require coding, and they are not willing to do that.

Archibeque: That is the understanding.

Chair Doe: We have asked for many years, and it is a customization that they are not willing to make because it is a cost to them that does not make sense.

Pedros-Gascon: The reality is that people are being holistically evaluated by their chairs, sometimes with zero input from students, while others are evaluated by all their classes. This is a big source of inequities.

Norton: There may be questions at the Faculty Council meeting about whether departments heads are allowed to see the written comments from students or if the instructor has to provide access to that information.

Archibeque: Understanding is that the instructor has to provide this to the department head.

Vice Provost James: The other question is always about how they can be used in faculty performance review. The Manual has clear language about that as well.

Chair Doe: Suggested that having members from the Committee on Teaching and Learning and Gorzelsky who know the processes in getting the survey to where it is present at the Faculty Council meeting. Can anticipate that there will be a few questions about the course survey that may have nothing to do with the motion.

Archibeque: Can state in the preface that the Committee on Teaching and Learning has been charged with taking a deeper dive on the student course survey and the myriad of issues being seen around campus. This is just one of the first steps and it will likely be several years of work.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. Requested a show of support for putting this on the Faculty Council agenda.

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

## ***F. Reports***

### 1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: The Institution for Research in the Social Sciences is doing the analysis for the University Grievance Officer survey. They have also agreed to do the qualitative analysis for the Presidential survey. We are working on a timeline for that survey. Thanked Anderson, Antolin, Norton, and Smith for being willing to serve on the Presidential Survey Subcommittee. We have now gotten assurance from Institutional Research that they will do the quantitative part of the Presidential survey without charge. May need to go back and check with them about the University Grievance Officer survey to see if they can do the same.

Chair Doe: Have been in touch with Vice President for Human Resources Robyn Fergus and have invited her to our Executive Committee meeting on March 8<sup>th</sup>. Have asked her to discuss

with us about the implications of what we do with the results of our surveys, particularly our Presidential survey. Wondering where that information can go and how we should handle it. Vice President Fergus has encouraged us to share the results of the University Grievance Officer survey with Richard Eykholt. Stated we should also discuss this with Eykholt as far as how else we want to get that information out. We will hear more from her on March 8<sup>th</sup>. Will know more what we can do with this important data. We had discussed about this being a substantial investment and we want to make sure there is a return on investment and the information gets to the right people and helps in the formulation of planning.

Antolin: Want to clarify that the discussion with the head of Human Resources will be about how broadly the results and survey will be shared. Some of the questions are at what level is it appropriate or even legal to share to the broader community.

Chair Doe: Confirmed. We do not want to make a mistake here, but we also do not want to fail to share information that can be shared. Think it is essential to hear from Human Resources about how best to handle this.

Antolin: Asked: This means we will not be launching this survey until after we have this discussion, correct? Means we will not be sending it would for two weeks.

Chair Doe: Think that is correct. Traditionally we have waited as long as possible because you want as much of the year to go by before you survey people how you feel. If you wait too long, however, it doesn't get into the hands of the Board of Governors. Tricky in terms of timing.

Norton: Last year, we sent it out on March 15<sup>th</sup>, which is the target date we are considering this year. Have asked the President and her staff to provide her question by March 1<sup>st</sup>.

## 2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

No report at this time.

### ***G. Discussion Items***

#### 1. Extension Proposal – Vice President for Extension Blake Naughton

Vice President Blake Naughton: We have been working diligently through the many steps to get this to where it is. This will encompass two things, but only one would be the subject discussed at next week's Faculty Council meeting. This will be the genesis of six years' worth of discussion with Faculty Council and others around moving to faculty status for certain Extension professionals in the field around the state or agents and regional specialists. Propose to discuss the rationale behind that.

Vice President Naughton: We are the only state in the western part of the United States and one of only a few in the United States where they are not faculty. There is a critical competitive disadvantage that we have. This is something our Extension professionals voted on and

supported through our advisory committee. The data process has been going on for several years. This is one part that ties into a broader proposal that goes together with the renaming of an academic unit we have now, changing the Division of Continuing Education to the Field School, and broaden its purpose to include Extension.

Vice President Naughton: The bottom line is that this proposal is three different ways to support faculty or field staff around the state as faculty in their roles. This would support our Extension professionals or faculty on campus or faculty with digital appointments and bring them together. It also gives us a different outward facing lens to think about all the educational programs that CSU provides, whether they are on campus or not.

Vice President Naughton: We have had many great conversations with the Deans as part of this process. We got endorsement of the Council of Deans and they are endorsing the proposal for faculty status for our Extension professionals. They do want to continue the conversation about the Field School.

Vice President Naughton: We are looking at moving this forward in two stages. We will do this again with Executive Committee in the fall. We have been working with Steve Reising and the Committee on Faculty Governance on a minor code change to rename the Division of Continuing Education and add a sentence to expand its purpose. We have also been in discussions about a new standing committee of the Faculty Council related to continuing education, extension, engaged scholarship, and other areas that are not well represented in the current standing committee structure. Have proposed involving faculty governance and issues related to the way we do that. We have tabled these proposals for now, and we are not asking the Committee on Faculty Governance to take these up until we move further with the Deans.

Vice President Naughton: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty working with us in crafting the language of the proposal that we want to move forward, which is establishing a new type of faculty appointment for Extension faculty. This would not be under current faculty types but would be a new type. The Deans have given their endorsement to this part of the proposal. Have contacted Marie Legare and the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty to take this up as a formal vote, which they may do by the March 1<sup>st</sup> Faculty Council meeting.

Vice President Naughton: Propose having this as a discussion about this and explaining it in greater detail at the March Faculty Council meeting and gathering any feedback or concerns. Then at the April meeting, we can take it up for a vote. The Administrative Professional Council is discussing this at their March meeting as well with a plan to have it up for a vote in April.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice President Naughton. Believe this clarifies the narrowed focus sufficiently so we know what to expect next week to help us frame the broader conversation. Clarified that we will not be hearing motions next week, simply having a discussion item.

Vice President Naughton: Think this is important because this class of professionals are not represented right now. Will take the opportunity to explain faculty work in the Extension context.

Antolin: Asked: Could we get a copy of the proposal?

Vice President Naughton uploaded copy of the proposal to the chat.

Vice Provost James: Have a comment about the text about the changes under Section E.2.2. The discussion at the Deans level was about using these titles that are modified with the word Extension, such as “Extension Instructor” or “Extension Assistant Professor”. In the Deans view, they thought it made sense to use the Professor series of titles.

Vice President Naughton: That is not in the proposal, so it could be up to Faculty Council to require that proposal. That is something that units delineate in their codes with the Provost’s guidance and final approval of our unit code. Can speak to this process in the larger discussion with Faculty Council.

Norton: Realize this is complicated, thanked Vice President Naughton for all the work on this. In reading the proposal, it appears that Extension professionals can become faculty and will be housed within CSU Extension. This will be their home unit for hiring and promotion.

Vice President Naughton: This would be just for those that are currently within CSU Extension. Will note that this is not just off-campus people. We have a small number of specialists on campus, primarily in 4-H who are not in an academic department. This does not affect our campus faculty with Extension appointments. Those are still in their departments and evaluated there and following code procedures on that. This is only for Administrative Professionals who have CSU Extension as their appointment home.

Norton: So at some point CSU Extension is going to have the equivalent of a department or college code that will outline promotion and tenure. Taking this step by step, with first step being conversion from Administrative Professional to faculty.

Vice President Naughton: Yes. Presuming this goes through and they are converted, then they should be ready to go with a code to get the Provost’s Office approval. They have been drafting their criteria based on best practices of our peer institutions.

Norton: In department, those that are in the instructor class of faculty or on the non-tenure track participate in only two areas, research and teaching or research and service or teaching and service. Asked: Would that be the same here?

Vice President Naughton: Would not be a three-way with research, although we do have some regional specialists who have AG Experiment Station split appointments, part of them with research appointments. There is a scholarship of engagement and a scholarship of extension that would be part of their work but would not be under a traditional research appointment. Under the core duties of Extension of educate, create, and connect, meaning they are out there teaching classes and providing technical assistance. They create curriculum, educational opportunities and they apply research. A key part of their duties is the connection and engagement with community members and working in their sector.

Pedros-Gascon: Not familiar with Extension. Trying to understand if there will not be a loophole later. Proposal indicates that these faculty will have rights within CSU Extension.

Vice President Naughton: Can provide some history on this clause. The way the campus code is written now is that tenured and tenure-line faculty immediately have votes and through codes bestow votes on others. This will be a unit without any tenure-line faculty because we cannot tenure them. We would start out with no one having a vote. This is the conversation we have been having with the Committee on Faculty Governance and if they choose to contemplate a different level of representation in Faculty Council in the future. We can have that conversation about having some level of representation, whether Faculty Council or sitting on certain committees relevant to their work.

Pedros-Gascon: Understanding is that people would have full voting rights the moment they entered Extension.

Vice President Naughton: That's correct. With a faculty appointment, they would have full voting rights.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were additional questions.

Norton: In the College of Agriculture, we interact with Extension quite a bit. Describing the activities and duties of current Extension personnel would be helpful to faculty. Feel that many do not understand what Extension professionals do in the state.

Vice President Naughton: Would be happy to explain this more.

Antolin: Had commented that the Council of Deans asked for a stipulation that faculty within the Professor series have terminal degrees in their area of expertise. Asked: Is this something that will be specifically added to this, or where does that come in? Wondering if it might be incorporated into the Manual language.

Vice Provost James: Don't think it is in the Manual about all the other faculty in the use of these ranks. If you look at CCA faculty, and the instructor track versus the professor track, the Manual is silent on whether you have to have a terminal degree. Understanding from talking with the Deans is that almost all the colleges at the department code level have that requirement, but it's not in the Manual. Feeling that we may go parallel to the Manual.

Vice President Naughton: Would be happy to open up a broader campus conversation about this if needed. Our peer institutions nationally do this in very different ways. Trying to fit this in with how the CSU codes are written now and telling them which ranks are available and then working within our code on criteria. This is something our faculty will work through with the Provost's Office.

Antolin: In the College of Natural Sciences, there was a series of criteria made clear. Feels this should be mentioned as something that will be worked out. Will be part of the code writing process that will happen in the future. May smooth out the rails if mentioned first.

Chair Doe: Would make sense to be prepared for questions that may come from the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty asking about implications of adding another sector of faculty that are not eligible for tenure and the associated pieces around representation. That committee has worked hard to improve the participation of CCA faculty in governance. Know that it has been stated that Extension faculty may not be necessarily looking for representation because they are not on campus. Reasonable to expect that there may be questions around this because it is an important issue and there are segments on our campus that still don't really properly represent CCA faculty. The Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty are working hard to make sure that proper representation occurs. Being able to respond in way that shows an understanding of the necessity of representation and why this would be different seems important.

Vice President Naughton: In the proposal, we added a requirement that there is an elected assembly of some sort so they have their own representative body. We have something now called the Director's Advisory Council. We want to show a commitment and continue conversations about the right way to have representation. While this is an additional category of faculty, our parent institutions can easily separate this faculty out. Working with the Provost's Office and Institutional Research to work out how we separate this faculty out so it isn't confused with the narrative around the importance of the composition of our faculty on campus.

Vice Provost James: Think this is why it is important to have this in Section E.2.2, because that section also has the other various faculty types that are not represented by Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, thanked Vice President Naughton. We have completed our business and consider this meeting adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

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