

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, March 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: Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Jonathan Zhang, Business (substituting for Rob Mitchell); Marie Legare, Chair Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty; Jennifer Martin, Vice Chair Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty; Anders Fremstad, College of Liberal Arts; Mary Van Buren, College of Liberal Arts

Absent: Rob Mitchell, Business (excused)

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

March 22, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Faculty Council Minutes – March 1, 2022

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

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

B. Executive Committee Minutes – March 8, 2022

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

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on March 29, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

- a. This will follow the Special Session for the Administrative Professional Council and Faculty Council to hear the Housing Task Force Report at 3:00pm

Chair Doe: Reminded members of the Special Session of the Administrative Professional Council and Faculty Council to hear from the Housing Task Force next week. The Housing Task Force has been working for some time to address the challenges around affordable living. They met with the Classified Personnel Council last week during Spring Break. We will hear from the Housing Task Force for the first hour and then move into our meeting. Reminded members that we will have an abbreviated amount of time to get our work completed next week.

2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on April 5, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: Final announcement is that we do have one nomination for the Harry Rosenberg Award. Andrew Norton will be putting that together for us. Asked Norton to speak to this.

Andrew Norton: Have received the materials from the nominee and will assemble that package. We have had previous award winners review the nominations. Currently we only have the one nomination.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: Coming back from Spring Break, we are trying to get things wrapped up for the year. We are working on the Academic Master Plan and will have two open forums to share the current status of the Academic Master Plan and next action steps. We will be getting feedback from everyone at those forums.

Provost Pedersen: Working with Chair Doe on next steps for our AUCC, both the task force and re-envisioning the 1C rollouts. We are working on communications and next steps on those efforts.

Provost Pedersen: It is also the season for evaluations, so we are working on those. We also have a lot of wonderful awards that we will be announcing soon. Vice Provost Susan James has been leading the effort on those. Right now, we just have a lot of loose ends that we are working on. No formal report today but happy to answer any questions.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Asked if an update could be provided pertaining to the evaluation of Administrative Professionals. We found out last year that some people were not following them. Asked: What has been put in place by your administration and how will this go forward into the future?

Vice Provost Susan James: Able to speak to this. Not sure where the timeline is, but Human Resources began working in December on one of the software systems to create a template for doing Administrative Professional reviews and putting together a database to communicate with supervisors of Administrative Professionals in the CSU community this spring to make sure the

annual evaluations have been done. They are trying to hire people who are performance management experts and compensation experts and have them onboard soon. They are going to try to improve the process more and have something like a mid-year check and then a final annual review. For now, they are trying to make sure, with the data they have in the system, to make sure they get evaluations for all Administrative Professionals this year.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked: Are the evaluations for faculty happening at the same time for faculty?

Vice Provost James: No, the timeline is a little later than for faculty. Most Administrative Professionals have already been evaluated, and many of them have been evaluated every year. Typically, it is later in the spring than for faculty, so they were trying to align with the timing with the units who were already doing a good job with this by not throwing out a completely different timeline.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked: Do we have an idea of how many units were not following the guidelines for evaluations for Administrative Professionals? Wondering if this is something we can know.

Vice Provost James: Do not have that information but can check. Think it is all about whether they have the data. Now that they have it, think they will be able to check back for the past couple years. Not sure whether these evaluations are somewhere in the system to make it easy to check on but can ask the question.

Norton: It isn't perfect data, but when the climate survey comes out in the next few weeks, believe there is a survey question that asks whether you received an annual evaluation. We should be able to get a survey-level response by unit on what proportion of people are saying no to that question.

Chair Doe: The state classified system is systematic with evaluations and how they are rolled out over the course of the year. That is obviously a highly bureaucratized system because it is all within the state, but it is all on a predictable calendar. Would be nice if we could develop something that was close to that.

Vice Provost James: They are trying to mimic that system and the process they use for state classified for the Administrative Professionals. They didn't think they could get the mid-point evaluation this year, so they just went for the final evaluation.

Chair Doe: Think if this happens in a consistent way, this would be a major improvement.

Pedros-Gascon: Wondering if there has been follow-up on the committee that Vice Provost James pertaining to inequities that we have discussed.

Vice Provost James: We had a meeting today with a group that is trying to get this going. Signed up Pedros-Gascon, Michael Antolin, and Jennifer Peel to be on the committee if still interested. We are seeking a member from Institutional Research. Members will be getting an email soon and we are talking about meeting every two weeks for an hour. Idea is to get started, and two of

us are 12-month employees so we can get some work done over the summer and really hit the ground running in the fall. The task force will be called the Faculty Workload Equity Task Force.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, thanked Provost Pedersen and Vice Provost James.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – March 4 & 11, 2022

Chair Doe: We have our University Curriculum Committee minutes from March 4th and March 11th. Asked if there were any concerns or objections to placing this on the Faculty Council agenda for April 5th?

Chair Doe: Hearing none, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda.

Linda Meyer: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for April 5th.

2. Election -- Faculty Representatives to Committee on Information Technology – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Doe: We have two nominees for our newest standing committee, the Committee on Information Technology. We want to get this committee formulated as soon as possible so they can begin to weigh in on questions in Information Technology. We have Ryan Brooks from the College of Agricultural Sciences and Robert Paton from the College of Natural Sciences. Asked if there were any concerns or objections to placing this ballot on the Faculty Council agenda for April 5th.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda.

Sharon Anderson: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for April 5th.

3. Resubmission of Proposed Revisions to Section E.2.2 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual –

Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty
– Marie Legare, Chair and Jennifer Martin, Vice Chair

Marie Legare: Most of the questions from last time were about expanding on the rationale. We expanded the rationale hoping that it would address some of the questions that arose last time. There were no changes made to any other sections other than a typo. This is just including more explanation in the rationale.

Chair Doe: Think one of the questions was around item E. There is reference to this in the rationale, the reference to tenured faculty and that they will have annual reviews in the same manner as tenured faculty.

Legare: The question was whether all faculty get annual reviews, and the answer is no, which is why it needs to be stated as it is here. In item 3 of the rationale, we address that we used parallel language from what was written for the CCAF categories. This is important because when language deviates, there are some potential legal issues that can arise. We wanted to make sure the language was parallel.

Chair Doe: Asked: Is item E parallel to the CCAF language?

Legare: It is stated somewhere when we wrote up the CCAF sections, but also the way this is laid out as far as promotions. It also states that these positions are not eligible for tenure. This is just a parallel statement of facts that are applicable to Extension.

Jennifer Peel: Still on item E. Asked: Is it intentionally written as tenured faculty instead of tenure track faculty? Not sure if there is a difference between annual reviews for tenured versus tenure track faculty.

Legare: This is the way it is written throughout the Manual, so we left it this way. It refers to everyone on the tenure track as well as tenured faculty. We could go through and make a blanket change within the Manual. Think originally there was only the one kind of faculty and now we have all these different ones, so the language is just historical.

Michael Antolin: Requested clarification on titles. Asked: Would these appointments be labeled as “Extension Assistant Professor” or “Extension Associate Professor” and so on?

Legare: Confirmed. This will define them separately from those on the traditional track.

Antolin: Think this will help people understand that this is a separate deal. Recommended that this be made clear at the Faculty Council meeting.

William Sanford: Asked: Who does the evaluations?

Legare: The evaluations will be done through Extension. They are setting up a committee through Extension, similar to what we have in departments.

Sanford: Noted a typo in the top section of the memo.

Chair Doe: We can consider that a friendly amendment. Requested Amy Barkley correct this. Asked if there were any additional questions.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for April 5th.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for April 5th.

4. Resolution on Academic Freedom – Anders Fremstad, College of Liberal Arts

Anders Fremstad: The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) at CSU have been thinking about this a lot over the past year. The AAUP is currently tracking 101 bills across many states that restrict academic freedom in K-12 schools or public universities. We don't have this threat in Colorado yet, but HB 22-1206 would limit discussions on racism and sexism in Colorado's K-12 schools.

Fremstad: We have 18 co-sponsors on the resolution. They represent 15 departments and six colleges. Everyone is happy to work with Executive Committee on what makes sense for this resolution to go through Faculty Council. This resolution is modeled off a resolution being considered by the Board of Regents at CU Boulder. Open to suggestions for making it better.

Chair Doe: Thanked Fremstad for bringing this forward to Executive Committee.

Fremstad: Some of the language is directly from our faculty code, so some of this is highlighting principles that we have endorsed before. Think it is an important time for us to reaffirm this. The vote at CU Boulder prevented a measure that would have prevented faculty from addressing issues that may make people uncomfortable on basis of their race or ethnicity or gender. Do not think it is the role of administrators, legislators, or the Board of Governors to tell us what kind of conversations we should be having in our classes.

Pedros-Gascon: Spoke in support of the resolution. Wondering if the CSU Board of Governors is moving towards something similar to what the Board of Regents at CU Boulder were considering.

Vice Provost James: Don't think so. Asked Melinda Smith if there was something in the works.

Melinda Smith: Have not heard anything, but this would be timely since the Regents at CU took this up. Can't imagine that Chancellor Tony Frank would let something like that happen here. Do not see this coming forward, but good to be proactive.

Vice Provost James: There are people on this campus who do not fit into the faculty category that are teaching on campus right now. Some of them are graduate students or administrative professionals. We discussed administrative professionals on the CCAF Task Force, and General Counsel assured us that the academic freedom policy quoted here applies to everyone who does instruction on this campus. Think we want to be careful with our wording and be mindful. Maybe the term “faculty” is too narrow.

Fremstad: We highlighted Section E.1 where it states that all faculty members will have academic freedom, regardless of appointment. Open to a change of language. It is absolutely those that do not have tenure that might have more of a threat to their academic freedom.

Smith: Wondering if group would consider condensing this to a one-page resolution. It is long. Worried that people may not read the whole resolution.

Sanford: Expressed concern about donors controlling what is taught all over the country.

Peel: This may be covered in this resolution but want to make sure the language and the Faculty Manual covers the teaching, research, scholarship, and all the missions of CSU. It seems that the resolution is more focused on the educational and teaching aspect of it. Want to make sure that the research enterprise would fall under this as well.

Meyer: Have a suggestion about the second to last paragraph. It talks about Faculty Council standing with our colleagues who may be affected by this pernicious legislation. We seek to avoid labeling our teaching, and it might be better to use the word “restricted” rather than “pernicious.”

Norton: Asked Fremstad if these editorial changes being suggested are helpful.

Fremstad: These are helpful. Happy to revise and include any other suggestions this group has.

Norton: Think the question that is outstanding is whether this would need to come back to Executive Committee prior to the April Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Doe: If we need longer, we can wait until the May meeting. We could also bring this back next week for Executive Committee. Asked for an indication of support for the principle of the resolution.

Executive Committee members expressed support.

Chair Doe: Asked members how they would prefer to move forward.

Antolin: Vice Provost James had pointed out that there are lots of people who instruct and research besides faculty, so want to make sure that the language is inclusive of the entire University community. Suggested changes to two sections to reflect this.

Smith: Suggested including the Administrative Professional Council on this as well. For those instructors with administrative professional status, that council would want to be included on this resolution.

Chair Doe: Commented that the Administrative Professional Council could come up with their own resolution separately. This resolution would be coming from Faculty Council. We could always add an addendum later on if they wanted to add to this.

Smith: Think it at least makes sense to send this to the chairs. We don't want this to get bogged down by waiting for approval from all the bodies. If people ask why we are focused on faculty, can remind them that this is coming from Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for their comments. Suggested that Fremstad take these edits and send a new document requesting feedback from members in time for inclusion in the packet for next week.

Fremstad: Commented that many of the individuals in support are from the College of Liberal Arts. Wondering if members have suggestions for helping broaden that support or if they have thoughts about whether the co-sponsor list should be less specific.

Chair Doe: Thanked Fremstad. Think we have a few things to consider. Will send this to Executive Committee members with a deadline.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Have a brief report. Asked Norton how the Presidential survey was going.

Norton: The survey was sent out. A reminder should be coming out soon, and the survey closes at the end of this month.

Chair Doe: Encouraged members to complete this survey if they have not already done so. We have another survey we administered that has closed, the University Grievance Officer survey. Asked if Meyer could give an update on this and what our next steps are.

Meyer: There is a final meeting scheduled for next Monday with the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences. They will provide us with a final draft of what they have done, which means we may have something for an upcoming Executive Committee meeting. We will need to check on the deadline for when the University Grievance Officer needs this information in to their department head.

Chair Doe: We will need to check on those dates. We will need to draft a letter that reflects what is in the report and submit this to the Provost's Office as well. Vice President Robyn Fergus indicated that we were able to share this with the University Grievance Officer. Would like to

also give the University Grievance Officer the letter from last year. He apparently did not see it after it went to his Chair. Beyond that, not sure if we are able to share it further.

Chair Doe: Have asked Vice President Fergus to join us at an Executive Committee meeting. Barkley confirmed she is able to come next week to discuss with us about sharing the information from these two surveys. We need to know what the rules are. A considerable amount of resources are being invested in these surveys and we want to make sure that all those investing get a return on that investment. Feels important to have this information straight from Human Resources so we know what the restrictions are on sharing the outcomes of the University Grievance Officer Survey and the Presidential Survey.

Chair Doe: At the March Faculty Council meeting, Pedros-Gascon brought up a question regarding executive salaries and hires. We have shared some questions with the President's Office to go beyond the typical very simple request for follow-up. Read questions to members. The context of this document is that Faculty Council is seeking information about position and salary changes. In the context of minimal pay raises and constrained budgets, interest in this has not gone away. Think this provides an opportunity for clarity.

Vice Provost James: Suggested one change to this document. Suggested that the beginning of this document ask a neutral question through use of the word "change" rather than assuming and using the word "growth."

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

Peel: Not sure if this has been submitted already. Wondering if it was intentional not to ask about the Office of the Vice President for Research in addition to the Provost's Office. Think it should be there.

The Executive Committee discussed frustration with reported pay raises and bonuses among some members of campus leadership.

Chair Doe: Thanked members. Asked if there were other questions. Thanked members for taking time to look at this. Assured group that the changes would be made and the item forwarded to the President's Office.

Chair Doe: Will be meeting with the Council of Deans tomorrow. It was suggested a while ago that it might be useful for the Council of Deans to get an occasional update on Faculty Council about what is in the works. Will also be updating on the status of the 3E to 1C transition.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

No report at this time.

F. Discussion Items

Chair Doe: The results came back, and we will be holding our in-person meeting this semester on May 17th. Hearing no further business, the meeting is adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

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