

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 19, 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; Linda Schutjer, Senior Legal Counsel; Shannon Pipes, Conflict of Interest and Export Control Officer

Absent: Rob Mitchell, Business (excused); Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering (excused); Frederick (Bill) Rankin, Business (substituting for Rob Mitchell)

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Chair Doe: We will have a slight change of agenda. President McConnell will talk to us for a few minutes before moving into agenda.

April 19, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – April 12, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made to the Executive Committee minutes. Noted that Antonio Pedros-Gascon submitted corrections in the chat.

Hearing no further corrections, minutes approved by unanimous consent with edits.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on April 26, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on May 3, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: We currently have Vice President Kauline Cipriani as our guest that day. We are hoping that she will be able to share an overview of the Inclusive Excellence office. In the fall, she will be coming back to talk to us about the findings from the campus climate survey. They are still in the process of figuring out the presentations for those.

3. Special Faculty Council Session on AUCC 1C will be held on April 22, 2022 from 3:30pm to 5:00pm over Microsoft Teams

Chair Doe: We will have a special session of Faculty Council this Friday, April 22nd from 3:30pm to 5:00pm to discuss the AUCC 1C proposal. Urged members to attend if able.

B. President's Report – President Joyce McConnell

President Joyce McConnell: Thanked members for conversation last week. We have been working furiously on the budget to prepare it for the Board book. The Board materials go out today at the close of business. Wanted this group to see this before it goes to the Board.

President McConnell: This budget anticipates a 2% increase for resident undergraduate tuition, which is the highest tuition increase we can do due to limitations from the legislature. This budget also reflects an increase in state funding. Most important thing here are the resident and non-resident tuition increases. Non-resident tuition is anticipating a 3% increase and resident tuition will have a 2% increase. There is no increase on graduate tuition.

President McConnell: Reminded members that state funding impacts for special education programs are things that we have less control over in terms of spending. Explained the budget sheet around these items.

President McConnell: The new expenses include the graduate stipend increase and includes multi-year central investments in strategic initiatives. The biggest line item in budget is faculty and staff compensation at \$23 million. This is enough to have a 3% merit pool and hopefully some additional funding for some salary adjustments for market competitiveness. There is also academic incentive funding and some mandatory costs. Described some of the costs listed on the budget sheet. We have a structural budget deficit of \$12 million. Our total base budget, including all in, we are in the hole \$5,871,000.

President McConnell: Want to help group understand what we are doing with the budget deficit. In FY21, with the pandemic and lower enrollment, we were \$29 million in the hole. Now we have to try to get out of that hole. This \$29 million represents the values of us collectively with our decision not to lay anyone off and that we would use the higher education relief funds that came our way to help fill this hole. We also made the decision not to lay off any student workers, and paid them for a little over five months. This is actually a remarkably low deficit compared to the burden on the expenses side.

President McConnell: In FY22, we were able to solve about 50% of the budget deficit, and we went from \$30 million to \$12 million. We are making good progress in cutting the budget deficit. We have also increased the contract faculty base, have budgeted for promotions and professional development, increased stipends for graduate students. We are not raising graduate tuition and we only had one year in the pandemic when we did not have a raise.

Chair Doe: Expressed appreciation for sharing this with us. Asked if there were any questions.

Melinda Smith: Wanted to ask about the faculty compensation. The 3% increase sounds like a strategy to provide a 3% increase across the board and then at the department and college level, the decisions would be made on how that is allocated. Asked: Is that correct?

President McConnell: We usually do the salary exercise process as a more centralized process. We set aside in the central budget for the 3% pool, and then at the department level, they go through the salary exercise process and assign what degree of raise that person should get based on performance. The Board requires us to go through this process. In some ways, it feels performative as opposed to meaningful. Think what ends up happening, particularly when you are looking at inflation like we are now, most people will go to 3% raise. The Board will only approve merit-based raises, so this is the approach we have to take knowing full well that it is likely going to be spread. This 3% pool is not only for faculty but for administrative professionals as well. There is also a 3% pool provided by the state for classified staff.

Smith: It is fantastic that increases for the graduate students continue to be provided. Wanted to convey concern that the cost of living is increasing so much and it is hitting the graduate students really hard. When you look at rents, they have increased dramatically, and this also calls to the question about the fees, because that is another way we could relieve the pressure on these students and what they are experiencing.

President McConnell: Want to have a coalition with Faculty Council around that, because that is controlled by our students. This is something that would take strategy and we should put some experts at the table who have dealt with the fees before so we can understand better. Would like to join with the Executive Committee to understand the fee structure and where the soft spots are, and then we can go to ASCSU to see if we can get some relief somewhere. By us going together, think we have a better chance and can have some graduate students tell their stories.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Thanked President McConnell for reassessing and trying to allocate funds in different ways. Want to come back to a comment made before to former President Tony Frank and former Provost Rick Miranda, which is that we need to find a better term than “merit.” Asked: How do you think the Board of Governors will receive this budget, and what do you expect to hear from them?

President McConnell: Think we are in a good position since they knew we were \$12 million in the hole in February. They knew we started out with \$30 million a year ago and they were concerned that they did not see us reducing the deficit more. Went through this with a fine-toothed comb and really tried to make strategic and value-based decisions about what remains in the budget and what does not. That fact that our deficit has gone down again sets us up for a good conversation with the Board. Showing them how hard we have worked to reduce that deficit puts us in a good position to make the claim for the 3% pool. Our colleagues in Pueblo are also proposing a 3%, and believe they are also proposing a 3% at the System level, so hopefully we are all on the same page. The worse that could happen is that they could say that if we want that 3%, we need to not have a deficit, in which case there are some hard trade-offs about how to reduce that without harming programming. Ready to make the argument for the 3% because we have cut so much and we have worked really hard.

Smith: Asked: Is Pueblo planning on doing an increase in tuition as well?

President McConnell: Yes, we are aligned in that sense. Not sure what Global is doing because their enterprise model is so different. Pueblo has the same kind of values and commitments to access as success as us, so we are aligned with them.

Sharon Anderson: Asked: Are there parts of CSU that are doing well, and why? Asked: How could we benefit from them doing really well?

President McConnell: That is a good question, and if we had more time, we could go over all kinds of figures. Would say that the budget model here is uneven in terms of enrollment, academic credit hours, research. This is part of why we really want to go through budget reform. When we do these incremental budgets, what we are seeing is the increment on top of the base that already exists. In order to do an important budget reform where we can look at what is being suggested here, we have to get down to the base and we have to understand what the base pays for and understand which units are doing better than others. We have not had a budget model that has gone back and critically looked at base. This budget reform is a critical part of Courageous Strategic Transformation. The bottom line is that we do not have enough money coming in to operate the way we do, and we need to have a serious evaluation of what our priorities are. It is not unusual for a university our size. Over a period of 20 or 30 years, when you only do incremental budgets, things can get out of whack. Think we need to ask ourselves some critical questions about what we are going to invest in. Explained the difference between base and incremental. We also have one-time money that comes in through grants and philanthropy or for projects from the state. This money does not get added to base because it does not continue. Thinks helping people understand the basic way we budget is something we need to do a better job of as we go through this budget reform.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell. Asked: Do we see Athletics in this budget, or is that something in a completely different budget model?

President McConnell: Yes, it is a very complicated budget because it has a lot of revenue sources. It has all the ticket sales from all the various operations, and there is a lot of money that gets divided up from the conference level from the Mountain West Conference back to the member institutions. It has a reserve created by the Board, which is what the Hughes property money went into, and then that money went out to pay for the coaches' salaries. Know that is a bitter pill for some people, but those decisions were made at the time they decided to build the stadium, and the reserves are controlled from the System. There was some additional revenue during the pandemic that came from the Mountain West Conference for increased testing and similar things. There is also a shift of scholarship funding from revenue for Athletics because we have about 400 scholarship-eligible athletes. That is where the biggest support from Athletics is, which is really the scholarship funding for students.

Chair Doe: That is helpful. Think we probably all need a primer in the workings of a university budget and where things are housed. Somebody might guess that special education programs would include athletics, but it doesn't.

President McConnell: Not at all. The special education programs are legislatively specified, and there are all the ways in which we are doing service for the state. For example, Extension is driven by federal legislation, and is cooperative Extension, so some has to come from the state and some from the counties. The county funding doesn't show on this budget sheet. In terms of special education programs, you would think there are things like student success, but they are not. In some ways, we have no control of that money. We are just the conduit, so if money comes for the Forest Service, it passes from the state appropriation through us and then to them. If you don't understand the budget, it shows up as revenue, and it may say we have that money, but we don't because we're the pass-through to the Forest Service.

President McConnell: Another thing to understand about a budget is that it is static. It is a one-time shot at what we think we are going to be able to do, but behind the scenes, money is coming in and out and being paid, and sometimes there are salary savings and other times, there are not. There is this whole layer behind the static nature of the budget that is presented to the Board.

Chair Doe: Was looking over the minutes from last week and was looking at your explanation of the state budget. Was struck that it might be helpful to have that kind of picture for educational purposes so people can understand how these things fall into place. This might be something that would not only educate but could contribute to a sense of transparency.

President McConnell: Expressed agreement. If we want to have consultative engagement with our community around these profound issues of budget, we have to do some basic education about how the budget works. For example, the Joint Budget Committee in the legislature decides what the appropriation is going to be. That gets folded into the Long Bill, which then has to be signed by the governor. There are a lot of steps that go into appropriating money for higher education. There is also a completely separate process for capital construction. Stated that we got the first bunch of money for Clark, but that doesn't show up in the regular budgeting process because it goes through a completely different route. Then, of course, that money is not available for anything other than Clark. Would be happy to do a budget process overview once everyone gets back in the fall and gets settled, maybe after Labor Day.

Pedros-Gascon: Think it is a good idea to try to involve faculty and create a process that is more transparent and help people understand. We end up working in silos, so establishing something that creates a better and informed outcome is better. Going back to Athletics, understand this was not your decision. The previous holder of the office promised that the stadium would cost 100 million and paid through philanthropy and self/revenue, and it ended up nowhere near that. The process of how Athletics has been managed and handled, and how the building was built has been anything but transparent, consistent, or inclusive. Understand that we are hesitant to receive information from administration because we had received bad information previously.

President McConnell: We are living with a decision that a previous Board and a previous President made. Will say, with regards to previous presidents, not just at this institution, but others as well, is that presidents are often in a position where something that they really believe is good for the institution is actually going to tie the hands of future presidents. Take this seriously, because there will be future presidents and am dealing with major decisions that were made before. Do not want to tie the University's hands long into the future.

President McConnell: Thanked group for their feedback. We want to have a good partnership with Faculty Council, particularly with the Executive Committee. Have expanded Executive Leadership Team to 300 people on campus and twice a semester, we provide updates. Did this yesterday, and about 250 people participated. One of the difficulties we have at CSU is that there was not a long-standing, trusted form of internal communication. Most universities have an internal communication stream. Think availability of information is important because then you aren't operating in separate spheres. Communication is a high priority, and we are working on it.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions, thanked President McConnell for being here.

C. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: Do not have an official report today. We have been working very hard preparing for the Board of Governors meeting, as well as preparing to finish up our Academic Master Plan. Have been meeting with the colleges, and have met without about half at this point. We are starting to go over their budgets and doing a deep dive to understand each of the college and units budget as part of our preparation for looking at our overall budget.

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

Pedros-Gascon: Not really a question, but part of wish list for next year. Expressed hope that this institution can give consideration to establishing a healthy ratio of tenure-track to non-tenure track in academic units. Think this is vital. Understand this is not an easy decision, but hope we can at least find what the healthy ratios would be and aspire to be transitional.

Provost Pedersen: This is a really important question. Next year, the big focus will be on our reaccreditation, and part of one of the things we need to establish as part of this are those kinds of goals. We need to establish these goals for the University overall, and then establish them at the college and department level, because it isn't the same in each department. Think we can fold our conversations around mission and what it means around what the ratios should be. Thanked Pedros-Gascon for bringing this up again.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions for Provost Pedersen, thanked her for being here.

D. Old Business

E. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – April 8, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there was anything to be pulled for discussion from these minutes.

Chair Doe: Hearing no questions, will consider these approved for the agenda for the May Faculty Council meeting.

2. Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Admissions Requirements and Procedures, Requirements for All Graduate Degrees, Graduation Procedures – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – Melinda Smith, Chair

Smith: Move to approve these revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin as seen in the agenda packet. This is to clean up some language. Reminded members that there was the name change and modification of the Accelerated Master's Program that was approved in an earlier session of Faculty Council. This is cleaning up this section to have that new language and to get rid of the personal identifier section. There are no substantive changes.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith. Asked if there was any discussion.

William Sanford: Directed Smith's attention to section about the advisory system. It says that non-CSU employees may be appointed, and higher up in the Bulletin it says non-CSU can be affiliate faculty and serve on the committee. That seems to be different.

Smith: Asked: So that changed to say non-CSU employees may be appointed full voting members of graduate student advisory committees in the following manner, right?

Sanford: Yes, but if you look in the bulletin above, one of them says that employees may attain faculty affiliate appointments to be on a committee.

Chair Doe: Wondering if this is something that needs to be discussed with the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education. Can bring it back in a week.

Smith: Can talk with Dean Mary Stromberger and make sure we are clear about that. Thanked Sanford for catching that.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked Smith and the committee for some of the changes for more inclusive language. Expressed appreciation for use of North American or United States and use of "international" instead of "foreign." Wanted them to know this did not go unnoticed.

Chair Doe: Asked Smith how she would like to proceed.

Smith: Think we can go back to Dean Stromberger and ask for clarification on that and whether there needs to be any kind of language change to what has been modified here. Asked if we could come back to this next week in time for consideration at the May Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Doe: We will send this back to the committee for a quick review and look forward to seeing it again.

Smith: Think this is a good idea to make sure the language aligns with other language higher up in the Bulletin.

Andrew Norton: Encouraged Smith and the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education to keep the language where a vote is required for someone to become a faculty affiliate, because that is really the only chance in a lot of departments for the tenured faculty or tenure-track faculty to weigh in on outside members and whether they are appropriate.

Chair Doe: Think we will need a new motion since we have one sitting on the table now. Asked if Smith could revise the motion for members to approve.

Smith: Move to take what Sanford has brought up back to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Education to make sure the language is correct and we will bring it back.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith. Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved to take this back to Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education for review. Will bring back to Executive Committee on April 26th.

F. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Have been responding to concerns over the salary exercises over the past week. Think faculty will be delighted to hear what the administration is bringing forward to the Board of Governors. This will mean a lot, that there are efforts being made to adjust to make this happen. Asked Vice Provost Susan James when this will be shared more widely.

Vice Provost Susan James: That is a good question. This information will go to the Board today, and then the budget people will have their regular meeting. They are basically going to get everybody prepared to do a salary exercise process because of our antiquated systems and our manual processes. The Human Resources people will be hearing it then. Not sure if there will be a campus-wide email. Reminded members that this is just a proposal, so we don't know for sure. Believe President McConnell will talk about this at the Faculty Council meeting on May 3rd.

Smith: Wondering if President McConnell will actually be at Faculty Council since it is the same day as the Board of Governors meeting.

Vice Provost James: We will figure out a way to get the message out at that meeting, even if it is not President McConnell giving it.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. Main thing for report was the conversations around the budget and feels this group is to be commended for the thoughtful responses given over the past few weeks, which has been helpful.

Chair Doe: Other item is the work being done on the AUCC 1C proposal. The task force will be presenting information on this on Friday. This task force was created in the fall and is comprised entirely of faculty. The Provost's Office saw the wisdom in helping us to assert the importance of the faculty voice in this curricular move. Those coming to the meeting will hear more about

the genealogy of this curricular initiative. Important to know that this group of faculty have been working hard to find a reasonable solution. Asked that members attend if they are able.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Smith: Finishing up report for the Board of Governors. In that report, am going to reiterate how important the faculty increase in compensation is given the current economic climate, as well as the graduate student stipend increase. With temper this with what was conveyed to President McConnell today. The 3% increase is great for graduate students, but they are continuing to be enough underwater. If we care about the research enterprise at CSU, we need to do better and will continue to convey this message to the Board.

Chair Doe: Along with research mission, feels it is worth also mentioning the importance of the graduate students to the teaching enterprise. GTAs are often instructors of record and not assistants to teaching. So here we are talking about constructing lesson plans, meeting with students, maintaining the CANVAS system for each class, responding to student writing and similar items. These graduate students are often carrying a teaching load that involves more than one section. They are burdened with the responsibility for student success efforts, too, and they understand the role that resident instruction plays. These graduate students were the first back on campus and often they need to work other jobs to pay their rent. It is a difficult reality for our graduate students.

Smith: Thanked Chair Doe for this reminder. Will make sure this message is conveyed for both sides, the research and the teaching enterprise.

Norton: Asked: The 3% increase for graduate students, assuming it passes, will adjust the GRA and GTA minimum, correct?

Smith: Believe that is the understanding.

Norton: Asked: Is there an expectation for departments or units paying at something above the minimum that they would still increase it by 3%, and if not, do we have a plan for managing expectations around that?

Smith: That is a good question. Will be meeting with President McConnell before the Board of Governors meeting and will make sure to ask her this.

Jane Stewart: Asked: How much do Boulder graduate students get and what is the difference? Know there are difference in stipend amounts between departments.

Smith: Not sure but can check. There is a tremendous disparity around graduate student stipends. It tends to be GTAs that make the minimum, whereas GRAs have opportunity to make more.

Pedros-Gascon: Have a question for Chair Doe. Wondering if we will receive clear guidelines and expectations around AUCC 1C. Understanding was that this was relatively loose and feel it would be better to have clear expectations around this and have it spelled out.

Chair Doe: Think what the task force has is pretty well spelled out. Think the challenge is to welcome a variety of faculty and also to consider who enforces this and how it is supported. If there are certain expectations for courses, there also need to be opportunities for faculty to develop these courses and for people, if needed, to get additional professional development. The task force is going through what will follow after the conversation on Friday and after a discussion on May 3rd. There are conversations we have to have with the Provost's Office in terms of the funding issues. There is a budget proposal that the task force has come up with to be supportive of faculty who go this direction. Feel confident that the groundwork is being laid for the rollout in a way that will work and have this be successful.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked: Will we receive the presentation in advance so we can come prepared and understand? Want time to digest this material.

Chair Doe: The task force has discussed this, and the objective is to get information out ahead of time. The group is still working on the details, but intention is to share it so there is an opportunity for people to mull this over to some degree.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed appreciation for this. The last thing we want is for faculty to feel rushed and end up with the same issues we had before.

Pedros-Gascon: Also have a question for Smith. Asked: Is there a place where faculty can go to see what the bonuses are that have been approved by the Board of Governors? Asked: Where is this information published and how can it be retrieved?

Smith: Don't believe there was a written report. It was not in the agenda but was a verbal statement for the Board. The chair of the evaluation committee made the announcement during the Board of Governors meeting. It could be in the minutes if there are some, and it was part of the public part of the meeting. The information is out there, just not sure if it is written anywhere.

Pedros-Gascon: This is why it is important to have a record of what is being said. We are a public institution with public records and these things should be spelled out just like salaries. Asked if Smith can check on the minutes.

Smith: Stated that salaries can be found on a database, it is recorded online.

Pedros-Gascon: Salary is not the same as a bonus. Salaries will appear, but not bonuses. Think that some of the offices do not appear in the system. May be wrong about this.

Smith: Expressed agreement. The bonuses will not show up, but salary increases would be visible. Put name of Vice Chair Armando Valdez in chat, who made the announcement.

Pedros-Gascon: Curious if the minutes reflect this. Have been asking for members of this committee to have the minutes to reflect the discussions and the terms and figures.

Smith: Not sure if minutes are taken at the meetings but can look into this.

Anderson: Asked: Is there ever a discussion about where all this money comes from?

Smith: Don't entirely know. Understanding is that during the budget presentations, they always start with the CSU System budget, which is the higher-level budget. The bonuses and raises for Presidents come from the System, and they have an investment portfolio and have a lot of money. There is also revenue that comes in from CSU Global, which goes straight to the System, and they decide what to do with that money.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith. Hearing no further questions, will move to our discussion item.

G. Discussion Items

1. Policy Discussion – Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Susan James, Linda Schutjer & Shannon Pipes

Vice Provost James: As many know, there are many policies in the Faculty Manual, and we also have a lot of policies not in the Faculty Manual. Have been working with Linda Schutjer and Shannon Pipes on a couple of committees to work on policies. We have been working on conflict-of-interest policies, as well as Section J in the Manual, which are the policies around intellectual property. We are working on revisions, which have not gotten out of committee yet. Asked Schutjer and Pipes to introduce themselves.

Shannon Pipes: Am director of Secure and Global Research and am the conflict of interest, export control, and facility security officer in the Office of the Vice President for Research.

Linda Schutjer: Am senior legal counsel and largely support the Vice President for Research, but do other duties as assigned.

Schutjer: Globally, what has been an issue as we work through some of these policies is that they exist in the Faculty Manual, but the Faculty Manual is not necessarily accurate in terms of legal requirements or as a practical matter. Some of the processes aren't spelled out. We have come to this odd situation where we have something like conflict of interest, where we have a very robust conflict of interest policy that exists outside of the Faculty Manual but wondering if it is consistent with the Faculty Manual. We also have Section J, which is our intellectual property policy. Have been trying to change this for years because there was a change in the law that needed to be reflected in the Faculty Manual. Would meet with previous chairs to try to get this done, and it has just never been changed.

Schutjer: Then we have policies that don't exist in the Faculty Manual and maybe should. An example of this is the data policy. This started as a conversation between this three-person group about how we make decisions about where these are placed. Am chairing the Section J Revision Committee and had a recent discussion about where Section J should go. Section J is currently in the Manual, but problem with having it in the Manual is that it is hard to go about changing it. There is a lot of process involved. This is a significant policy for faculty rights and there should be a higher hill to scale to change it than a mere policy that gets reviewed every three years.

Schujter: What our group is going to propose is that the Faculty Manual will contain the intellectual property policies, which will now be called copyright policy and patent policy, and that there would be a shortcut revision process for changes. The Executive Committee would be able to just approve this. There are some policies that need to be in the Manual, but there are others, such as the conflict-of-interest policy, that need to apply broadly to everyone on campus.

Pipes: Biggest concern right now is that we do not have an actual stand-alone conflict of interest policy. It is referenced in the Faculty Manual, and we are working to encompass everyone. This is the policy we are looking at and we are drafting a stand-alone policy so that this will encompass more than just faculty and administrative professionals.

Schujter: Would like to socialize about this a little bit.

Chair Doe: Think it would be helpful to have what is being proposed visually presented in something like a table. Whenever we talk about Section J, faculty grow concerned because this is intellectual property, the essence of what faculty do. Think we would need clarity around what is being proposed so that we can show people what is being considered. Noted that we have a faculty representative on the University Policy Review Committee, and they are ready to serve, but the committee has never been convened. There seems to be some discrepancy around who should convene it. Think there are policies of interest to faculty and want to weight in on them.

Norton: Question was around whether this group was interfacing with the University Policy Review Committee. As far as taking things in and out of the Manual or changing the oversight process, think it would be helpful if the process was more overarching rather than just the intellectual property piece. Can show the philosophy for how policy is created.

Schujter: Expressed agreement. At last institution, had a policy on policies, which does not seem like something we have here. It helped call out some of these points. Have never heard of the University Policy Review Committee.

Vice Provost James: Asked: Who chairs that committee?

Chair Doe: It is in Tammy Hunt's province. There are representatives from all the employee councils, plus some additional people.

Amy Barkley: Posted link to Section [D.2.2 of the Manual](#) in chat where committee is described.

Schujter: Will email Hunt and see what is going on with this. May have been something that Bob Schur was dealing with before he left.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked group for bringing this discussion. Would like to reinforce that it is important to have clarity and philosophy and a clear set of language. Would not feel comfortable approving a process that moves this out of the Manual and that may end up being used unilaterally by administration to advance changes.

Schujter: Expressed agreement. Am always saying that faculty need to take more power, and this is an area of shared governance. You can't have shared governance unless all the branches are working hard for their own benefit so they can work together and arrive at everybody's benefit. Would like to have a committee of faculty go over existing policies and to be involved in this. Chair Doe: Felt that the University Policy Review Committee was our mechanism for doing this. Our representative is Carole Makela, who is no stranger to the institution, and she had gone through and identified things that she felt we needed to pay attention to. Expressed hope that we can reenergize or reactivate that group. We have tried to be in touch about this committee but have not had a lot of traction.

Schujter: Will contact Hunt after this call. Could also pull together a policy review committee.

Chair Doe: We could have a separate one, but not sure we want to create an entirely new standing committee since we already have one. This is something that just hasn't happened yet.

Chair Doe: Thanked Schujter, Pipes, and Vice Provost James from bringing this forward. Asked: What next steps can we expect to see?

Vice Provost James: We will see if we can find the University Policy Review Committee members. We will contact Hunt to see what she says, and we can see if we can reinvigorate this committee.

Chair Doe: Without a group to address these policies, hearing about these ends up being very ad hoc. Feel we need to make this much more systematic. Think we might need to come back to the Section J ideas as well. Eager to hear more about what may be needed for this.

Schujter: This is helpful. If we have a policy review committee that exists and is robust, it could be a great tool.

Chair Doe: Thanked Schujter, Pipes and Vice Provost James. Hearing no further questions, concluded discussion.

2. Executive Session – Harry Rosenberg Award nominee – Andrew Norton, Vice Chair

Pedros-Gacon: Move to go into Executive Session.

Smith: Second.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Executive Session ended at 5:22 p.m.

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