

MINUTES

Executive Committee
Tuesday, March 8, 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; 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); Jennifer Martin, Vice Chair Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Absent: Rob Mitchell, Business (excused); Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering (excused)

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

March 8, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – February 22, 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 22, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
 - a. There will be **NO** Executive Committee meeting over Spring Break

Chair Doe: Our next meeting will not be until March 22nd, and we will not meet over Spring Break. Wondering how this group feels about doing that meeting face-to-face.

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

Chair Doe: We may want to start thinking about how we want to hold our meetings next year. Wondering if we want to continue in the Teams environment or move to hybrid or face-to-face.

3. In-person Executive Committee meeting for Spring semester?
4. Reminder about Harry Rosenberg Award
 - a. Nominations due to Andrew Norton by March 24th

Chair Doe: Asked Norton if any nominations had been received yet.

Andrew Norton: Not yet. Am anticipating one nomination, but it has not yet materialized.

Chair Doe: We researched a question that had been posed whether a retiree can be awarded the Harry Rosenberg Award. The answer to this question is no. There is a bit of a stipend to the award, and it is difficult if the person is no longer on the payroll. We may change the nomination form to indicate that it needs to be someone currently on the payroll.

Chair Doe: The University Officer Grievance survey report is nearing completion. Met with Linda Meyer and the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences about the report and it is coming together nicely. We still need to make decisions around how we share the information from this survey. Was surprised to hear the University Grievance Officer did not see the report last year. We spend a bit of money on this, and it is important for the information to land somewhere. At the very least, Richard needs to see this information. We may want to do follow up with Richard Eykholt about some patterns of response that we have seen from respondents over the last few years.

Chair Doe: We have another survey coming up, the Presidential Evaluation survey. We want to make sure that information lands in the right hands too. Had invited Vice President Robyn Fergus to discuss best practices. We will continue to follow up with Human Resources to find the best way to manage that information we glean from the Presidential evaluation and how to best share it with the President's Office and others as appropriate.

Norton: We received a question from the President's Office. This has been sent to Institutional Research, who is in charge of administering and releasing the survey. Am currently in discussion with Institutional Research about the survey to make sure it is formatted correctly.

Norton: The text at the top of the survey says that this survey will be anonymous, and that Institutional Research will strip any identifying information and that Executive Committee will have no way of seeing who is responding to this. It does not say how these results will be shared. Don't think we can say anything other than we are sharing this with Executive Committee, the President's Office and the Board of Governors.

Jennifer Peel: Seems tricky to use word "anonymous". Think it is safer to say it is confidential and that any results and identifiers will be kept confidential. With it being an electronic survey, feels tricky to say it is anonymous. Institutional Research may have other recommendations.

Norton: Believe we did have this discussion last year.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: It was anonymous for us because we did not use any kind of marker in any of the information that we received.

Chair Doe: Think it is worth asking so we are using the right language. Institutional Research must know how it should be labeled, as they are very conscious of this question. This always comes up with the campus climate survey.

Norton: Posted language in the chat. The reference to anonymous is that the survey is anonymous, meaning personally identifying information such as name, CSU ID, IP address are not collected or tied to survey responses. Believe this is what Institutional Research wrote.

Peel: Think that would cover the bases, given how specific it is.

Pedros-Gascon: When we created the survey, we assumed that the committee would be able to see the comments and we were presented with an already manufactured report. If we are not given access to the material data, there is not a need to say that Executive Committee will receive that information, because we did not. We received a report indicating this was the standard.

Chair Doe: Think this is the value of what the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences does for us, particularly in their collection of the qualitative, open-ended responses. They are maintaining that confidentiality piece and reporting it out. If we said we were collecting the comments as an Executive Committee, it might change the willingness of the President's office to receive feedback. We are trying to keep ourselves out of this. We might be sacrificing some degree of transparency on this for a degree of professional distance, but I don't think we are losing accuracy.

Pedros-Gascon: The discussion about the evaluation is done in Executive Session for confidentiality. Expressed disappointment that the data is not shared with Executive Committee and that we are outsourcing this and just rubber-stamping something without having any access to ratify. Believes that the information should be presented in some way, so we are not just receiving the final product.

Mike Antolin: This is exactly why we wanted to speak to Vice President Fergus to see what the extent of this is a Human Resources exercise. Don't think it is clear that we have rights to all the comments at that level or the data. This was one of the questions we were going to have answered, whether we could receive the information with all the identifiers stripped off, or if we are even able to be provided with that information. Think we should get that clarified.

Chair Doe: The good news is that we have some time to get an answer from Vice President Fergus, who is aware of the question. Will keep asking about this.

Sharon Anderson: Think the communication needs to be clear when the survey goes out about who it is going out to and where this information goes so that faculty aren't thinking one thing and then what actually happens is different.

Chair Doe: Think we want to be as cautious and as constrained as possible. We have to go with the most conservative route here. If we find out we can spread it more broadly, then that is a plus, but we should go with the more constrained indicator as it goes out.

Norton: We should not state in the preamble limitations on how the survey might be shared in the future. The current language states who we will share the results with but does not state that we will not share more widely if Vice President Fergus and the President agree that we can. The current language allows this approach. Did not realize how much time Institutional Research and the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences needed to complete this, but essentially we need to survey completed by March 30th in order to meet a deadline for a June Board of Governors meeting.

William Sanford: If you look in the Manual, it says we write a written report to the Provost's Office. Asked: Where does it say that we give this to the Board of Governors?

Chair Doe: That is an interesting question. Think it has been a matter of tradition. Was passed along that this was shared with the Board.

Melinda Smith: Asked the Board whether they wanted to see this evaluation, and they said yes.

Chair Doe: Perhaps what the Manual is doing is setting up the obligatory reporting mechanism and also interest from the Board. Perhaps the only obligation is to report to the Provost.

Antolin: Would be comfortable sending this out tomorrow with the header because it covers both the confidentiality and anonymous part of it and does not overpromise where it is going to go. Agree that we can put it out now and if we get clarity on how to move forward, then we can announce that and share where it will go.

Chair Doe: Hoping we can set up at least a conversation with Vice President Fergus and the members of the Presidential Survey committee.

Chair Doe: Last announcement is about the Special Session for Faculty Council on March 29th at the time of our Executive Committee. We will hear from the Housing Task Force, led by Debbie Mayer. This group has worked on everything from ideas around the Hughes development to the Timberline project. There is another project being considered to provide some affordable housing for a select group of employees based on salary levels. Mayer is a housing expert and attorney in that area and is well-versed in federal, state, and regional laws and regulations. She is stepping away and taking another position, so it seems important for us to get her report of the situation in terms of housing before she leaves. We do not want to lose momentum around this important issue of affordable housing. This will be a combined Faculty Council and Administrative Professional Council meeting. The Classified Personnel Council is meeting separately with her over Spring Break, so all employee councils will have heard her report before the end of the month.

Norton: Wondering if we know how much we will have on our agenda for the March 29th meeting, because that is the meeting right before Faculty Council. We will only have an hour to complete business, and if we may need to extend beyond 5:00pm, previous notice would be nice.

Chair Doe: At this time, that agenda is pretty sparse. This is a good question. We will obviously have Spring Break here and then we will rev back up. We will know several days in advance if it is a meeting that will go beyond an hour.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen unable to attend due to another meeting. Vice Provost Susan James was available to take questions.

Vice Provost Susan James: Would like members to promote the Tenure and Promotion workshop that is coming up. Placed the information in the chat. The planned email has gone out. Encouraged members to share this information with the faculty in their colleges. We are hoping to get tenure and promotion committee members and chairs there. The Advance team is working on that. It will be on March 24th from 9:00am to 10:00am. It will mostly be a discussion and Q&A. We will take 10-15 minutes to discuss process and best practices and Advance and then open it up to faculty. There will be a way to submit questions ahead of time, including anonymously, which was noted in the email. We will send a few reminders and try to curate questions ahead of time. We will do more of these. This will be the first one and we will record it. We may cut off the recording at some point in the discussion depending on how people feel, but we are trying to share it with people.

Smith: Asked: What will you be emphasizing in this workshop as far as best practice?

Vice Provost James: One of the goals is to make sure that people know about the Advance program and what we are working on. They are going to hear more about it and some of it relates to tenure and promotion including training and things like that. We will go through the process and emphasize some best practices from the literature. We'll emphasize guiding principles like transparency and consistency. The idea is to really open it up for discussion, which was one of the more helpful parts when we did this with the Deans and heads.

Vice Provost James: The Advance program is about recruiting and retaining, particularly women, STEM faculty and women of color, and women with intersectional identities. We do plan to expand it everywhere.

Norton: Heard some discussion over the last six months in college. There was an idea of merging or combining promotion and tenure committee annual reviews with department head annual reviews. Wondering if you can speak to this.

Vice Provost James: We will touch on this a little bit in the workshop. Merging might be too strong a word, but possibly going for efficiency. In talking with the chairs and heads, or those who put together dossiers for tenure and promotion, the complete separation of the two does lead to some inefficiencies. Annual reviews are not exactly the same thing and are about performance in the last calendar year. It is also related to the raise process, whereas tenure is cumulative. You're hoping that the information candidates are getting from the tenure and promotion committee aligns with what they are hearing from their department chair during annual review. Part of this is to look at the process and see how we can be more efficient. This new interfolio

system, which we will eventually adopt for both annual reviews and tenure and promotion, will help with efficiency because it will be one software system. That is where that discussion started with the chairs and heads.

Norton: Question is how tenure and promotion committees contribute to the decisions around merit increases if they will be contributing more to the annual evaluation process. Wondering how that will all work.

Vice Provost James: There are some departments where this has already happened with some annual reviews, but there are a lot of departments where it is all just on the chair or some leadership committee.

Antolin: Think that the chair and the tenure and promotion committee have slightly different roles, so even with the desire of efficiency, there's also a desire for keeping each other accountable. As previous chairs, know chairs are supposed to provide untenured faculty or pre-tenure faculty with a memo each year that outlines how their path to tenure is going. Think that is a major step forward in transparency for the person on probation.

Vice Provost James: Believe that comes from the tenure and promotion committee, not the chair. Think that it is one of our goals to get everybody doing the same thing consistently.

Chair Doe: Asked in the chat: Why is the Advance team hosting the tenure and promotion workshop?

Vice Provost James: Part of the Advance activities is around enhancing the tenure and promotion process and training for tenure and promotion chairs. These are out of the Provost's Office, so that is why Advance is co-hosting.

Chair Doe: Asked in chat: Did faculty get a 1% raise (meritorious) in January?

Vice Provost James: As far as pay raises, that did happen in January, but that was for the process from last year. The question now is whether there will be a similar process starting around now and taking effect July 1st of this summer. Know that President Joyce McConnell and Provost Pedersen are figuring out how to find money to put into salary competitiveness and equity as well, so hopefully we will be hearing more soon about that.

Chair Doe: Asked: So did we get a 3% raise in January?

Vice Provost James: If that was the number, then yes. This raise now is supposed to be based on merit, not cost of living, so it doesn't mean a flat 3%.

Peel: Not sure if this falls under the Provost's Office but wondering if we will see the results from last fall's climate survey soon.

Vice Provost James: That is through the Office of Inclusive Excellence. Not sure when it is coming out, but it should be soon. Know the hardest part is analyzing the open-ended questions,

and with the new leadership and reorganization of the Office of Inclusive Excellence, they are a little behind on things. Hopefully will be soon.

Chair Doe: Serve on the Campus Climate Survey Committee with Norton. Believe the results are imminent.

Norton: We have seen a draft and will see another one tomorrow, with presentations very soon after that. Imagine we will start seeing presentations by the end of the month.

Chair Doe: One of the questions was about having the Vice President for Inclusive Excellence Kauline Cipriani to our May Faculty Council meeting. One of the questions in front of her office is whether it would make sense to share the results [of the Campus Climate Survey] at that time. Think we might want to put a hold on that, because if we want to hear from the Vice President for Inclusive Excellence and also about the campus climate survey, we could end up not doing either justice.

Norton: Have had a conversation with Shannon Archibeque-Engle about the best way to present the survey results to Faculty Council. We brainstormed and thought about Antolin's idea of doing virtual seminars and that this might be a more effective way of presenting that information than at a Faculty Council meeting just because of time constraints and the anticipated number of questions and comments that the report is going to generate.

Smith: Want to go back to the salary question. Given how uncertain the state budget has been, it doesn't seem like we will have any word until May or June at the earliest.

Vice Provost James: The budget people usually need to know before that, so we try to decide about raises by reading the tea leaves about all that, but it is tough.

Pedros-Gascon: Thinks we should stop calling these merit raises. We have not had any merit exercises in at least thirteen years while at this institution. Feels it is better termed as an annual revision.

Vice Provost James: That is feedback for the Board of Governors. We have been trying for years to get them to not force us to do the merit exercises. The budget people have asked for raises to be cost of living but doesn't work if cost of living goes up 7% to 9% with raises only being 3%.

Smith: To follow up with Pedros-Gascon's comment, it would be interesting to see if records were kept about these raises.

Vice Provost James: Read all of this last year. Even though it was only 3%, there were a lot of them that were pretty flat. When you look at the evaluations, it feels like splitting hairs to get, for example, 4.4 points versus 4.5 points, so people get a little less of a raise. That is just chairs trying to do what they are told to do, which is merit and matching it to evaluation.

Chair Doe: Wonder about the amount of effort that is expended for the very small merit differentials, distinguishers. There is a lot of time, effort, and labor involved and that doesn't seem like a good use of anyone's time.

Vice Provost James: Feels it is not a waste of time to give feedback to an employee, even if you cannot give them the raise they deserve. Human Resources is supposedly hiring a compensation specialist and a performance management specialist to bring us forward in performance management. There are a lot of ways we could do it better and more efficiently, as well as giving feedback more often and in a way that is less intimidating to employees.

Chair Doe: When things are as flat as they are, and with feelings around the absence of acknowledgement of actual merit, one does wonder whether the extent to which there have been pay raises at the executive leadership level and for executive leadership support positions and especially since there is no salary exercise that they must participate in. Decisions are just made. Feel we need an accounting of this.

Vice Provost James: Not sure about the President's Office, but the Provost's Office was just like every other office and received the 3% raise and it is based on annual evaluations. Am working on a policy around this around retention. Once there is a draft, will bring to group to discuss. We are going to try to change our retention culture because it leads to so much inequity.

Chair Doe: Requested clarification that you can only request one retention package.

Vice Provost James: That is the understanding and that is where we have been holding the line. Know some people have gotten more than one.

Chair Doe: We should hold to similar standards for all employees, including administrators. Wondering why this stuff only applies to faculty and administrative professionals.

Vice Provost James: Think we should continue asking for accountability.

Chair Doe: Maybe we can formulate some questions to satisfy curiosity and set record straight.

Smith: Being able to do a comparison between how much is invested in retention versus how that compares with investment in raises would resonate with the Board of Governors. They brought this question up and if we could show them what was different, think that data would resonate in some way beyond just us asking for raises.

Vice Provost James: To be clear, we spend a lot more on raises than we do retentions, because a 1% raise still costs quite a bit. The thing with retention is that there may not be a lot of them, they are just the big ones that happen, and they affect a small number of people. Goal would be to use that retention money to preemptively support faculty.

Pedros-Gascon: When we are talking about faculty, we are talking about a pool of 1,200 people. When we talk about operational, it's a pool of 50, and when something is happening that affects

maybe two or ten of those 50, it's the equivalent of almost 300 in the faculty group. Don't think the figures are equitable when it comes to that.

Vice Provost James: Asked if Pedros-Gascon was referring to retention figures.

Pedros-Gascon: Yes. Talking about applying the same percentages for upper echelon onto the rest of the institution. Do not think we are applying retention evenly.

Vice Provost James: We are talking about retention of faculty assistant and associate professors.

Pedros-Gascon: It is personal when one person has a pay raise that could bring the teaching down. Expressed hope that administration will address this soon. Have been here for thirteen years and am still in the same place. Think that needs to be addressed.

Vice Provost James: Encouraged Pedros-Gascon to be on committee to address workload. We will be probably getting together after Spring Break. We will be looking at faculty workload across all faculty.

Norton: Asked: Is there a policy on what you need to have to get a retention package? Wondering if there is an invitation to apply or if you need an offer in hand.

Vice Provost James: There is no policy, which is really the problem. Even the rule of only one retention is not written down anywhere. This is what we are trying to develop right now to have guidelines on these things. It would be that you have to have an offer in hand, and you have to do a salary equity analysis and competitive analysis. We will try to have guidelines for faculty chairs and Deans. We are coming to the end of faculty hiring seasons, so this is a good time to try to change it.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. There is a lot of food for thought here.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – February 18 & 25, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were questions about these minutes to pass to Brad Goetz.

Hearing none, University Curriculum Committee minutes approved for placement on the April Faculty Council meeting agenda.

2. Proposed Revisions to Section E.2.2 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Vice Chair

Jennifer Martin: We are looking at proposed language to incorporate into Section E.2.2 which represents other types of faculty within the Faculty Manual. This would specifically address the desire to recognize through faculty status the work of our Extension colleagues in CSU Extension. Vice President Blake Naughton discussed this in front of Faculty Council. The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty took up this work last week and this is the language we agreed on as a committee.

Chair Doe: Have a question about bullet point E that states that faculty members shall participate in annual reviews and the annual salary exercise in the same manner as tenured faculty.

Martin: That does not reflect the language we discussed as a committee. Think that does add some confusion, since these faculty are not eligible for tenure, but they would have the opportunity for annual evaluation in annual salary, salary exercise increases, as would other non-tenure faculty. Think this is a remnant of language that probably reflects an older version of our Manual recognizing that all faculty have this opportunity.

Chair Doe: Wondering if we can check with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty to see if that could be a friendly amendment.

Martin: Expressed agreement. Would be happy to take this back.

Chair Doe: If we approved everything else, this could just be a friendly amendment after the fact. Asked if there were any other items that members wanted to discuss. We are just trying to ask ourselves if this is ready to stand debate on the Faculty Council floor.

Pedros-Gascon: Have a question about the application of this and how it is intended to be used down the line. Would like to understand the part of the evaluating committees and the model.

Martin: Every faculty member within this Extension faculty appointment type would have representation on Extension committees where they would evaluate the promotion within the rank of their colleges.

Chair Doe: This is something we might see ourselves returning to at some point. The way it is being set up now is that there will be committees within Extension and the faculty who are in these categories will participate in those internal governance processes but will have no relationship to Faculty Council or larger campus governance. Asked Martin if this was correct.

Martin: That is the perspective at present. This may change as conversations on campus continue, but for now, there will be no representation on Faculty Council for these appointment types.

Norton: Related to bullet point F, asked who creates and approves the CSU Extension code. Asked: Would that sort of follow along college codes? Wondering how this would work.

Martin: Yes, it would be a similar process that is currently implemented at the department level. A committee within Extension creates the code, and then it is approved by administration from

above the committee. There currently is a code that exists within Extension, and they are working with it to make sure there is representation of those faculty members who are not currently represented as faculty members on campus to have buy-in and insight into that code.

Antolin: Asked: Is having presentation on Faculty Council a right that is given automatically to all faculty, or are different types of faculty given that right in the Manual?

Vice Provost James: The types of faculty under this category of other faculty, none of them have representation on Faculty Council.

Martin: The other types of faculty appointments are joint faculty appointments, joint administrative professional appointments, affiliate appointments, visiting faculty, University Distinguished Professorship in both teaching and research. In this section, there currently is not language about the lack of representation on Faculty Council. It does not seem explicit that these faculty would not have representation or voting rights on Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Have one more question about “at-will” designation. Understand this is part of the “other faculty” category. We have worked hard to make it possible for people who are on continuing or contract appointments to not be at-will. It feels like a slide in the wrong direction. We have this group who are being called faculty and could have been in position for 30 years and be at-will.

Martin: With continuing, after twelve semesters, there are some opportunities for them to consider moving to a contract. One of the challenges with Extension faculty is the way these faculty are paid. In some cases, a large portion of their salaries come from the county level. It doesn't represent the traditional appointment type of a tenure faculty or even a non-tenure faculty who are paid off of University house dollars. These are federal dollars that are appropriated both to the University as well as the county in which these agents are often housed. This is something that is a challenge for Extension personnel across the United States which makes it difficult for them to be embedded in the fabric of the faculty on the campus which they represent. Financially, the structure of their appointment is different. This is akin to a continuing faculty member who is paid from grant dollars and it requires a continuous stream of funds to support them, and in this case, the county funds would support the faculty members in some instances.

Chair Doe: Years ago, when we were first looking at non-tenure track faculty on research dollars, they were the first group to get contracts. What could be done is they could anticipate the period of time for the research contract and therefore could comfortably make that contract with the faculty member. A contractual period would provide them some degree of assurance. This seems like an area worth looking into and thinking about into the future because one would assume that the state is making binding provisions around their Extension effort for at least a period of time.

Martin: In an ideal world, we would certainly see something similar to that. What we unfortunately find is that county government is fickle. A change in county commissioners may redirect funding and move priorities. Fortunately, in Colorado, we have a smaller number of counties and try to identify some uniformity on how they manage annual budgets and how they

delegate Extension dollars. Think this is an incredibly valid point. Wish there was more uniformity for our Extension colleagues across the state. It really boils down to how a county within an individual year decides to appropriate funds. Don't think at this point that the federal government has provided much structure for that. It is left at the county level for management, and it is having dramatic impacts. We have programs across the state of Colorado that are underfunded because county priorities have changed. Their demands aren't going away, but the personnel support they have is decreasing. We have a long way to go, but it would make life easier for our Extension faculty and colleagues if they had some sort of structure that gave them some guarantee for a job into the next year.

Martin: As we move into this direction as a land grant institution and the role that our Extension partners play in that, we're going to uncover lots of similar challenges that are endemic within Extension across the United States, such as salaries. They are some of the most underpaid professionals that exist. This is hopefully something the University will recognize as well as the role they play in completing and addressing our land grant mission and actively as a campus try to improve their rights and abilities to do their jobs. It is critical to our mission.

Chair Doe: Thanked Martin. Asked if there were other questions regarding this proposal.

William Sanford: Asked: Who is appointing these faculty and how do they decide that they are going to be faculty versus just Extension agents?

Martin: The hope is that Extension agents would just be faculty. If you are hired as an Extension agent, then you would have the opportunity to be a faculty member through your position. They would be hired through a committee, which includes Extension representatives either within the county or across other counties in similar positions. Often they do reach out to faculty on campus who have academic homes and also have an Extension appointment to serve on those committees as they are hiring Extension agents. It is very similar to how we hire a position in our traditional sense, whether it is tenure-track, non-tenure track or an administrative professional.

Sanford: Asked: Does CSU hire some of the Extension agents with the government money or does the salary structure look different if the county hires them?

Martin: It varies from county to county. Usually, it is some split of money coming from CSU or from the county. Some counties are well-supported and that is because of county appropriations as well as government appropriations. The structure is not consistent across the state, but generally it is some share between the University and the local municipality.

Antolin: Wondering who is going to present this at Faculty Council. Feel we might be able to head off a lot of the same questions by expanding the rationale.

Martin: One thing we have seen is that many of our campus faculty are not well-informed about the role of Extension and who these people are that are representing us across the state. Can certainly take that back to enhance the rationale. The Provost's Council for Engagement is similarly working to provide some information about what Extension is and the role they play across the state and who our colleagues are so our faculty have more data to evaluate this

proposal. Hope is to have that from the Provost's Council before the next Faculty Council meeting. Will take request for an increased rationale to Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty.

Chair Doe: It might be helpful if this rationale was brought to us again to see any changes we were discussing. The role of us today is to decide if this is ready to stand debate. Either way we vote, changes will likely be needed.

Smith: Another thing that might be worth including in the rationale is emphasizing how these faculty are not counted as part of faculty at CSU. A major concern of faculty is that we are becoming really imbalanced between tenured faculty lines versus non-tenure faculty lines versus this new category. Seeing this proposal, it appeared that it would inflate our non-tenure track faculty lines in a big way, but what Vice President Naughton stated that it will not do that. Think faculty need reassurances of that.

Chair Doe: Think the discussion of apportionment and whether this counts towards apportionment will likely come up on the floor of Faculty Council. This might be something worth integrating into the rationale so people can wrap their heads around it before the meeting. Heard at one point that this would apply to just Extension agents but not specialists, so there is a definitional problem here and anticipate that on the floor as well. Will be helpful to get some clarification around who is eligible.

Martin: This resembles our conversation that happened with our CCA faculty, and we don't have definitions on what those faculty and what they do because of the diversity of their work, it's hard to represent. In the conversations with the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty and with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, we were assessing how best to represent that work in the Faculty Manual. We purposefully did not provide those definitions outside the scope of teaching, research, and extension and engagement and service, which are parts of our mission. The struggle is how descriptive to be in the Manual. We have also struggled with the recognition that campus faculty are not familiar with the work of Extension, and there is a lot of work to be done in that space to increase familiarity. Also need to recognize that if we begin to identify with descriptive language, wondering if it will create different challenges. Think as faculty on campus, we can appreciate the diversity of faculty of multiple different experiences and expertise areas and bringing in descriptors might have a negative effect.

Sanford: Another thing to keep in mind with the rationale is that there might be a lot of faculty members on campus that are not sure what a land grant university is and what the purpose of Extension is. This seems like an important point to get across. Wondering also if the degree level will be cause for some concern. There are some Extension agents who have been around for a while and only had a Bachelors degree.

Smith: Thinking about the rationale, the first line says this seeks to bring CSU up to par with peer institutions. Wondering if that can be more specific and whether peer institutions like Kansas State University also consider their Extension agents as faculty on campus.

Martin: Some of the research being done by Vice President Naughton and his office has been assessing whether other peer land grant institutions are doing. Think it was assumed, when the language was put together, that some faculty and Extension are represented within departments, so they have an academic home. That was the model previously utilized at CSU and others have a separate school of Extension as a separate academic unit that Extension personnel are housed in. It varies across land grant institutions. There is faculty status in some form.

Smith: If we are thinking about putting this in place, it makes sense that they should be considered more formally a part of CSU and its mission. It seems a bit retroactive to give them status. Wondering if these people were hired with this idea in mind, giving people faculty status when they may not have been hired with the idea that that's what their role would be.

Martin: That is a fair question. Cannot speak to the history completely. This has been a process of almost a decade of trying to evaluate what this might look like. Vice President Naughton was hired prior to the pandemic and has continued conversations.

Chair Doe: Thanked Martin. Believe we are at the point where we can entertain a motion. We have suggested some changes to the rationale. We have suggested adding how these faculty will not be counted as part of apportionment for representation on Faculty Council, to include a definition of land grant universities so we understand the larger context. Also suggested clarifying which peer institutions are being discussed. Asked if others had any additional potential changes to add.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, requested a motion on the floor. Need to ask whether we want this to go back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty to consider these changes to the rationale. We could have this come back on March 22nd to look at this again. We could also just ask them to make friendly amendments and say this is ready to stand debate.

Antolin: Move to refer this back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. Think Martin's explanations were very clear and expressed hope that some of this explanation can be included in the rationale.

Smith: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved to refer this back to committee. Executive Committee will address this again on March 22nd.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Met with the chairs of the other employee councils yesterday. They are planning to activate their standing committees to look at the Courageous Strategic Transformation plan with some care and ask their standing committees to examine where they have concerns or some

relationship with the Courageous Strategic Transformation plan. Figuring out how they would like to be involved in those conversations. This is a proactive effort aimed at seeking the kind of collaboration that went on in the phases leading up to the report and the plan. These employee councils are suggesting that employees need to be involved in the conversation. Wondering if this is something we see ourselves wanting to do so that faculty have a voice in next phases.

Chair Doe: There is a keen interest among some faculty who have come to Faculty Council leadership about examining the dark side of land grants and the ways in which the land itself is generating a substantial amount of money. There is a report that puts numbers around the amount of money that is being generated and has been generated over time by the land itself. Can ask ourselves what might be done to be an ethical steward of that money. As an example, South Dakota State University has done some remarkable things with their revenue, and they now roll that revenue into scholarship money for all native students. We could do something like this to acknowledge that there is still money being generated by the land and that revenue could be positively affecting native peoples. There has been some interest in this and am inclined to create a task force around this.

Chair Doe: There may be some interest in having an Executive Committee retreat among the employee councils. It probably would not occur until the end of the semester, but these Executive Committees may benefit from hearing from one another.

Smith: Asked if members had seen the AAUP newsletter. They took the Courageous Strategic Transformation plan to task. Does speak to the idea that the separation between how faculty view the plan versus other groups.

Chair Doe: Think we should talk more about how we might get involved with the Courageous Strategic Transformation. Maybe Executive Committee wants to consider themselves as one of the standing committees involved in doing a deep dive. We should read this plan with some care and ask ourselves where we want to be involved in the conversation.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

No report at this time.

F. Discussion Items

Chair Doe: Hearing no further business, consider our meeting adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

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