

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, March 29, 2022
4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Andrew Norton, Vice Chair; Melinda Smith, BOG Representative; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Jane Stewart, Agricultural Sciences; Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering; Sharon Anderson, Health and Human Sciences; Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Liberal Arts; Linda Meyer, Libraries; William Sanford, Natural Resources; Mike Antolin, Natural Sciences; Jennifer Peel, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Guests: Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Frederick (Bill) Rankin, Business (substituting for Rob Mitchell); Jenny Morse, Chair Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty; Anders Fremstad, College of Liberal Arts; Robyn Fergus, Vice President for Human Resources

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

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

March 29, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – March 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 April 12, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on April 5, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

B. *Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen*

Vice Provost Susan James: Provost Mary Pedersen had another event. Did not have anything specific to report on. Provost Pedersen is planning a report for next week's Faculty Council meeting on topics of interest. We are starting discussions around investing in our employees' pay

over the next several years for faculty and administrative professionals. Expressed hope that Provost Pedersen will be able to speak to some of this next week.

Vice Provost James: There is also something coming out of Human Resources regarding administrative professionals and the Aon study. Human Resources hired this consulting firm, AON, over the last several years to work on administrative professional salaries and job descriptions. We are also following up on the administrative professional evaluation discussions. Communication is going out to the Human Resources folks and supervisors around that.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Wondering when we will have information regarding how many units were not doing evaluations of their administrative professionals. Looking for contrastive information.

Vice Provost James: Not sure of the answer to this. Unsure where to locate this data.

Chair Doe: Asked: Does it appear that things are on track for this year in a different way than in past years? Seems there is a plan for moving forward since this is an ongoing concern.

Vice Provost James: Yes, there is. Human Resources is working on a system. Asked if Vice President Robyn Fergus could speak to this.

Vice President Robyn Fergus: We have begun communication with our Human Resources community partners about the expectations of collecting this information. Over the past month, we have had multiple meetings with the Human Resources community about expectations. There is also a memo that may have been sent out to supervisors, or will shortly be sent to them, about reinforcing the expectation that those completion data points are submitted. Not sure if we can recreate the past information requested by Pedros-Gascon. We are looking forward to the collection of this information on an ongoing basis.

Pedros-Gascon: Wondering how the administration was doing salary exercises if these annual evaluations were not being completed. Asked: How did they decide that people were doing a good, superb, or bad job? Want to make sure we understand what has happened, how we address this, and that we make sure to identify problems and that there is accountability.

Vice President Fergus: The understanding is that evaluations were being managed at the unit level and there was not a central collection of that information. Going forward, the steps we are taking has us monitoring that at a central level. Cannot speak to specificity of the question here because it was being administered at the local unit. Actions we are taking move this up a level. We have received funding to hire a performance program manager, which Human Resources will be posting in the next month or so. Once we identify that individual, we will be working on an alignment of the approach across the board. There has been a decentralization approach to this work historically, so going forward, the plan includes creating a program that will create alignment and calibration across the administrative professional workforce so there is a more unified approach. We have also been given a Presidential Fellow to help us in the early days of building the program. Those interviews are currently ongoing. Fellows will be devoted to this performance management, programmatic work as well as the full-time hire.

Pedros-Gascon: So there is no intention to understand how some units did salary exercises without the annual evaluations and that there will be no consequences. Asked: Is that correct?

Vice President Fergus: Not saying that at all. This is the first time hearing this request. Think we will need an offline conversation to better understand where we are in that process. We have been focused on moving forward and how we can stand up a program that is more aligned universally.

Pedros-Gascon: Surprised that this is the first you are hearing of this because it has been a serious topic of discussion within this committee on multiple occasions. Expressed hope that there is a better method of communication with administration about these kinds of concerns.

Vice President Fergus: Clarified that it was just the specificity of the questions that she has not heard. Stated she is aware and familiar of the concern as a whole.

Jennifer Peel: Have a question for Vice Provost James. We have been hearing more and more questions from faculty recently about the issue of and the lack of pay raises, or very small pay raises, especially in light of the state classified and graduate student pay raises. Maybe this will be discussed by Provost Pedersen at Faculty Council next week. We are wondering if there is somewhere we can point faculty to in terms of providing context and information about what CSU is doing or plans to do. Wondering what information we have to address these questions.

Vice Provost James: Believe Provost Pedersen will try to speak to this at Faculty Council next week. Vice President Fergus is working on the administrative professional side of communicating, because the very same questions are coming from administrative professional employees. In the month of April, there will be communication about this and more discussion. We won't be able to magically fix this, but it is a high priority for our President and our Provost to invest in our workforce.

Peel: Think that will go a long way. Something that has been considered is having an FAQ page for faculty to look at when they have questions about this to keep them up to date on the latest information and latest initiatives.

Vice Provost James: Human Resources is working on this on the administrative professional side around the study results. We can try to model that and do it for the faculty side as well. Thanked Peel for the idea.

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

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. Updated Election – Faculty Representatives to Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Doe: We have a ballot for faculty representatives to standing committees for our consideration. We have nominees for the Committee on Information Technology and the Committee on Scholastic Standards.

Amy Barkley: Clarified that this is an updated one from the one we saw last week. There is an additional nominee for the Committee on Information Technology and one nominee for the Committee on Scholastic Standards.

Chair Doe: 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 Faculty Council agenda for April 5th.

2. Election – Faculty Representatives to University Benefits Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Doe: Our second ballot is for the University Benefits Committee. Asked if this ballot is ready to appear on the Faculty Council agenda. We have one nominee, Amanda Wright.

Andrew Norton: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

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

3. Proposed Revisions to Section E.2.1.3 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Marie Legare, Chair

Jenny Morse: This was co-authored with the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, so am here to present this since Marie Legare could not attend.

Morse: These motions are to close a loophole. In the original language, it said that a person could move to a contract appointment after ten semesters, and if you are on contract and moved to continuing, it was not clear if you have to wait another ten semesters before you can be offered a contract again. The clarification in this motion is that once you have been here for ten semesters

and once you have been on contract, you can be moved to a contract at any time and do not have to wait.

Chair Doe: Thanked Morse. Directed members' attention to the one-sentence change. Requested a motion prior to any discussion.

Melinda Smith: Moved.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any discussion of this motion.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty are happy with this re-wording and the phrasing of this section.

Morse: We were more concerned about closing the loophole than wordsmithing, so we prioritized that. Don't think we are committed to this language specifically, but this was brought to us and it certainly closes the loophole, so we are happy to move forward with it.

Norton: Would like to discuss both this motion and the next motion rather than doing them separately. Wondering if there is a motion to do this.

Chair Doe: Asked for agreement among the group to discuss both motions. Asked if there were any objections to this. Hearing none, asked Norton to continue.

Norton: Have been trying to understand for a while whether contract or continuing is better. Have heard different things from different people, and this has come up in Executive Committee before. It says in the first motion that a contract faculty member who has a contract that expires moves automatically to continuing, and in the second motion, it states that if you are continuing, you are eligible for a contract after twelve semesters or at discretion. [Morse noted that it is ten semesters]. This does not seem to imply that there is any real hierarchy or preference between contract or continuing. This is point of confusion.

Morse: Not alone in this. This goes back to the development of these appointment types. The goal was to have rolling, renewing contracts so that we could create a ten-year system for faculty. On contract, you have access to grievance procedures, and this is because a contract has an end date, so anything that happens before that end date allows you to go through the grievance process. Continuing faculty technically have access to the grievance process, but because their appointments can be terminated at any time, they are at will and neither part has to go through the grievance process with them. Contracts are interpreted as the better appointment type because you have access to grievance processes.

Morse: The concept of contracts is this rolling and renewing idea, which is reflected in bullet point A that we put in here. It states that at least one year prior to the expiration of the contract, faculty members shall be given a new one or informed that it will be allowed to expire. This is the line we put in to encourage the rolling, renewing contracts. This is not how it has played out, and it is still challenging. A lot of people who have been on contract and their departments or colleges are not sure if they'll be able to issue new contracts, so they get moved to a continuing

appointment. Then, after being moved to continuing, they may want to be moved to a contract and the Faculty Manual says that we have to wait another ten semesters, which is not true.

Norton: Thanked Morse. Understand now that contract is the preferred state of being. Have heard different things from Human Resources people around the University and that continuing is preferred because it has no end date as opposed to contracts, which do have an end date.

Morse: That's right. Continuing does not have an end date, but because it is at-will, you have no rights.

Vice Provost James: Continuing is at-will, and during the term of the contract, you are not at-will. That is the difference, but it is confusing. Asked: Do you feel this language will clear this up for people?

Morse: Not sure but do think the loophole that we wanted closed will be, that anyone who has been on contract and moved to continuing does not have to wait another ten semesters before getting another contract. We can revise the other language whenever we want.

Chair Doe: Thanked Morse for the explanation. Asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, we have a motion on the floor. Requested a vote in the chat.

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

4. Proposed Revisions to Section E.2.1.4 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Marie Legare, Chair

Chair Doe: We had opened up the floor for discussion of both motions during the last one. Requested a motion, and then we can have any additional discussion on this motion.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any additional discussion.

Norton: Think there may be some education that needs to occur with department heads around this. Going up and down the ladder is not something that we usually do in faculty ranks.

Morse: This is an important point of clarification. Appointment type has nothing to do with rank. Am a senior instructor on a contract appointment and would also be a senior instructor in a continuing appointment. It does not change pay or anything other than how protected the job is.

Mike Antolin: Asked: Does the Manual stipulate anywhere that continuing is at-will and contract is not?

Morse: This is stated in Section E.2.1.4.b. They use the legal term of contract from HB-1144. The way we are allowed to use the word “contract” in our Faculty Manual is defined by the state.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, we have a motion on the floor. Requested a vote in the chat.

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

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

Chair Doe: We have a revision of the resolution. We need to decide whether this resolution is ready to stand debate at Faculty Council.

Smith: Think it is improved. There are a few things that may be considered for modification, but don’t feel these would impact its ability to stand debate on the floor of Faculty Council. Just have a few suggestions if we want to entertain them today. They are just editorial suggestions.

Smith: First sentence lays this out nicely. Not sure if the next three statements are necessary because a lot of that information is captured by the following three statements that address the Bulletin or the Manual. Suggested removing those. Think that you can get to points pretty easily by referring to University documents.

Anders Fremstad: Was not sure of the norms or if it made sense to refer to documents. If people are happy with this, can do that.

Smith: Would also suggest removing references to page numbers, as those may change. Last suggestion is in the first “be it resolved,” it should say “including matters related to race, gender, and social justice” rather than “racial, gender, and social justice.”

Fremstad: Thanked Smith for the suggestions. Would love to hear from others. Think the smaller suggestions can be done right away, but with the others, we wanted to put in our own words what we think about the current situation as well as referencing our history.

Chair Doe: It sounds like Fremstad has no objection to the editorial changes suggested so far. Question now is about the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th “whereas” statements.

Norton: Understand where Smith is coming from. Like the idea of streamlining, but we also want to consider the question of audience. If this is directed internally at the University, then those three “whereas” statements are things that are foundational to the Faculty Manual and our jobs. If it is directed at an external organization, such as the Board of Governors or the state legislature, they may not have these things at top of mind, and it might be useful to remind them of it using this resolution.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed agreement with Norton. Suggested combining the second and third statements since they are connected.

Antolin: Would like to speak for keeping all these statements for the reason that this is for a broader audience. Stated that there is legislation in Florida that schools will not be allowed to look at certain topics that make certain people uncomfortable. This speaks to that and feel we should keep it.

Peel: Suggested that we remove the names of President Joyce McConnell and Chancellor Tony Frank and make this broader, so we do not have to update it with every administration update.

Smith: We should make it CSU President and Chancellor of the CSU System.

Fremstad: Think that makes sense. Full supportive of that change.

Chair Doe: We are back to the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th “whereas” statements. Seem we have a difference of opinion. Wondering if we want to do wordsmithing on this or put it in front of Faculty Council. Would like to avoid getting into wordsmithing on the floor of Faculty Council.

Executive Committee members discussed wording of the second, third, and fourth “whereas” statements. Revised wording with assistance of Fremstad.

Chair Doe: Fremstad is keeping track of this. Will coordinate and confirm with him and Barkley on the changes. Question before us is whether this is ready to stand debate.

Executive Committee members made some additional editorial suggestions.

Chair Doe: Requested a motion to place this on the agenda for Faculty Council.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved with revisions that we have agreed upon.

Antolin: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Revisions will be emailed to Executive Committee members to confirm. Once approved, will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for April 5th.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

No report at this time.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

No report at this time.

F. Discussion Items

1. Presidential Evaluation Best Practices – Vice President for Human Resources Robyn Fergus

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice President Fergus for being here. Our concern has to do with what we can share from the Presidential Survey report. Last year was the first year we did a serious Qualtrics survey and had gotten Institutional Research involved in doing the quantitative work. We also got the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences involved to do the qualitative review and got a robust report at the end. Question becomes what we do with this. Wondering whether it is appropriate for there to be stripped-down versions of this, and whether we want all the details going to some parties and report general findings to other parties. Struggling with how we should proceed. Hoping to get guidance.

Vice President Fergus: Expressed appreciation for this thoughtfulness. Tried to do some legwork about how historically this approach has been used with other surveys. The feedback for the President's role has been accumulated and provided to the Board of Governors as input for them to use with the evaluation of the President. With the University Grievance Officer, this is a piece of data that would help shape the larger evaluation of that individual. Have exchanged messages with Chair Doe about making sure this data gets to the right individuals and timing it correctly so that the individual themselves has a chance to receive, process, and engage in a dialogue about the feedback and the nature of the survey, which is a best practice model with any evaluative process.

Vice President Fergus: In terms of distributing it more widely, would suggest that at this stage you should sit down with the President and discuss intentions. Would also do this with the current University Grievance Officer. Not sure how this group has engaged with the Board of Governors in the past. Suggested creating themes and highlighting information to catch their attention differently than you have in the past. Wondering if you can focus on themes rather than releasing the full survey. Think it would be appropriate to have this discussion with these individuals and their supervisors to make sure they have a chance to engage about your intentions and come to a mutually agreeable decision.

Chair Doe: Explained that the letter and information was shared with the President as well as the Board of Governors. Prior to this past year, the process involved Executive Committee members going to their colleges and asking faculty to send them emails about what they thought about the President's performance. A lot of it depended on who responded and the distillation of what the Executive Committee member wanted to share. This is a much more scientific approach, and it yields a tremendous amount of information. We did attempt to share a succinct letter last year with thematic categories. We did this both with the University Grievance Officer and the President. Then the question became around who should get it and what else can be shared.

Smith: The letter was sent directly to the Board of Governors and was not submitted as part of the agenda packet. Think this is an important distinction because the Evaluation Committee of the Board of Governors holds this in Executive Session. Can send them a letter that provides a nice overview of what is going on.

Smith: There is another piece of this that we may want to consider. Included a condensed overview of the outcome of this evaluation at the May meeting, which is public record. Question we have to ask ourselves is whether we are fine with the letter just going to the Board of Governors and then whether we also want to have an overview provided as part of the Faculty Representative report.

Norton: Think it is important to give this feedback to the Board of Governors and think it should also be used as formative feedback for the President's Office. We want to make sure the President sees this evaluation. Leaning towards idea of the President's Office controlling whether or not to share this. Think there are a lot of faculty that would like to see the results for various reasons.

Pedros-Gascon: Think there is a delicate line when it comes to personnel. Also feels there needs to be some transparency, so we need to find a way to manage both.

Vice President Fergus: Suggested that as we have these conversations with these parties is to invite them to a future meeting to thank people for the feedback and to share what they learned from the results and how they may be responding and shifting. In previous organizations, we launched surveys with pointed feedback for leaders of units and then facilitated conversations within their teams. Looking at this from a growth perspective moving forward.

Chair Doe: That is a great idea. Might engage you further about how best to have that conversation. We could develop a different pattern here where the feedback becomes something that is invited and appreciated and then becomes useful data and feedback. Asked to stay in touch about having this conversation.

Vice President Fergus: Would be happy to stay engaged and continue this discussion.

Chair Doe: Expressed appreciation. This is the feedback of the faculty and, among other things, we invest quite a bit into the surveys themselves.

Vice President Fergus: Expressed appreciation for the approach and the willingness to make sure the right steps occur so that the individual can learn and grow, and that people also feel heard.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice President Fergus. Hearing no further discussion, adjourned meeting.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

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