

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, April 26, 2022

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Andrew Norton, Vice Chair; Melinda Smith, BOG Representative; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Jane Stewart, Agricultural Sciences; Rob Mitchell, Business; 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; Shawn Archibeque, Chair Committee on Teaching and Learning; Rebecca Atadero, Chair AUCC 1C Task Force; Steve Benoit, AUCC 1C Task Force; Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee; Jill Putman, Committee on Scholastic Standards Representative; Gaye DiGregorio, Executive Director University Academic Advising and Outreach; Richard Eykholt, University Grievance Officer

Absent: Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President (excused)

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

April 26, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – April 19, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the minutes. Indicated a few typos to be corrected.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Posted a few edits in the chat to clarify some wording.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further edits, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on May 10, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: We may have an additional meeting on May 17 for Executive Committee. Requested that members save both May 10 and May 17 on their calendars.

2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on May 3, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Vice Provost Susan James: Indicated that Provost Mary Pedersen was unable to attend. Asked members if they had any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Circulated an email this morning about a concerning situation with people in which they feel the institution is gaslighting them or not supporting their efforts. Think this is a matter to be concerned with. Expressed hope that this would be seriously addressed.

Vice Provost James: Did not see that email, so not sure of the situation being discussed.

Pedros-Gascon: Indicated he would forward the message.

Chair Doe: Asked if Vice Provost James could provide any insights on the Board of Governors meeting next week. Asked: Are there things we might not know about or should anticipate?

Vice Provost James: Not involved in those conversations, so only know what President Joyce McConnell told this group. Think they feel optimistic that the Board will accept the budget proposal with the 3%. The budget people in particular would like it to be a flat cost of living rather than doing a merit exercise. They have never approved a cost of living approach, they have always insisted on merit, but with today's inflation numbers, which we haven't seen since the 1980s, maybe we will succeed with that argument.

Vice Provost James: Believe she is also presenting Courageous Strategic Transformation and trying to get a vote on that from the Board.

Chair Doe: Believe there was an indication they would come back in May with Courageous Strategic Transformation. Have some questions about things drawn from last week. President McConnell indicated that there was a hope that there might be money beyond the 3% merit pool to be available for salary adjustments for market competitiveness. Asked: Do you have any sense about whether there might be some additional funding?

Vice Provost James: Know that it is still a very high priority for us to do the salary competitiveness pieces in addition to the salary exercise. Not sure about the budget numbers. Encouraging Provost Pedersen in this next fiscal year to start the process of looking at the salary competitiveness, thinking about the criteria and priorities and how we would like to do it. We would likely need a plan that spans more than one year, especially if we do the 3% salary exercise. We have to prioritize where we want to start. Once we know what the numbers are, we can put together a plan and starting working on that.

Chair Doe: Was struck that Pueblo and the System were putting in for 3%. Expressed hope that these will be granted.

Vice Provost James: As President McConnell showed last week, we have made progress on the pandemic deficit, which is the kind of thing the Board wants to see.

Chair Doe: Know you have been involved in the conversations about budget models. President McConnell stated that we have not had a budget model that has gone back and critically looked at base and that things can get out of whack over a period of 20 to 30 years when you only do an incremental budget. Asked: Can you explain to us what that might mean?

Vice Provost James: If we look at college budgets as an example, the distribution has not really changed in 20 or 30 years, but the size of those colleges has changed, including number or students, faculty, and staff. The incremental budget has been about planning this tiny little piece of our budget that is changing for that year. It is mostly driven by tuition funding, which is the only thing that has change. In the last 20 years, we have seen phenomenal enrollment growth, while we have seen funding from the state go down. What we are talking about here is that we have had this really static incremental budgeting while we have gone through tremendous changes, so things are not necessarily aligned. They are working on hiring a new CFO and they are talking about then engaging an external consultant who is an expert in academic budgeting.

Chair Doe: Asked: Wouldn't the new CFO know the academic budgeting? Wondering why they would hire an external consultant.

Vice Provost James: They want to hire the CFO first. It depends on who that person is and what experience they have.

Chair Doe: Remembering from meeting that President McConnell thought we might all benefit from understanding budget better. There are many parts of budget that are just invisible to us, such as auxiliaries. Feels it would be helpful if we could see this more plainly. As the discussions are going on around the CFO, concern is how do we make these processes more transparent. Questions may seem naïve because we don't understand how the budget works. While in this moment of transition, we could perhaps make some arguments that we need not just a new budget model, but a new way of explaining the budget model and new levels of transparency.

Vice Provost James: We had a conversation on Executive Leadership Team where anyone could ask questions. This topic came up. We discussed the need for educating people about budget and having more transparency and communication about it. This could be something Faculty Council asks for at a fall meeting.

Smith: If memory serves, Rick Miranda used to present budget information to Faculty Council. This has been missed. Felt that it was helpful.

Vice Provost James: Indicated that this presentation was usually just the incremental budget. We did not see the base or the one-time deals, and that is the kind of things we need to understand.

Norton: The comments around budget transparency and faculty and staff needing to know more about the budget process would be great questions to ask during the search for the new CFO. Wondering if there will be a general open house or forum for faculty.

Vice Provost James: Not involved with that search, so not sure. They are in the semi-finalist round right now.

Norton: Believe they are doing interviews on campus next week and the week after. Have not received all the invites, so there may be an additional forum there.

Vice Provost James: Cherie O’Neill is chairing that search. She is the president and CEO of the CSU Foundation. Will ask her that question.

Vice Provost James: Indicated in the chat later in the meeting that there will be an open forum for this search. Stated they are getting everything finalized and will have the info posted in SOURCE and on the website.

Pedros-Gascon: Indicated that the figures presented by Miranda had issues around accountability and those figures could not be used to explain anything. It all comes down to accountability and transparency, which is highly needed.

Jennifer Peel: In the past week, we have heard discussions about the 3% merit raise that is in the proposed budget and there have been some mixed reactions. It is better than 0%, but there is acknowledgement that this is not keeping up with inflation. Faculty are still concerned about that level of raise. In this context of thinking about budget and forums, often do not hear discussions about the state funding piece of this. It is a driving factor of the budget and is a limiting factor of our budget right now and is becoming smaller percentage-wise. That context would be helpful to hear and what CSU is doing to increase that.

Vice Provost James: Have heard from President McConnell that they are trying hard with their lobbyists and other ways to interact with state legislature to work on that piece. It would be nice to know and understand.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. The beauty of having minutes from these meetings is that it makes it possible for us to come back and revisit some of these questions later. Would also like to talk further about Section J and intellectual property down the road following our conversation last week.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – April 15, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any items to be pulled for questions or further discussion from the University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Hearing none, minutes approved for placement on the Faculty Council agenda for May 3.

2. Resubmission of 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 [pending]

Melinda Smith: We will need to wait on this and will not hear it at the Faculty Council meeting. Have not had a chance to connect with Dean Mary Stromberger about this.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith. We will make a note that this will not appear on the May 3rd Faculty Council agenda. We will revisit this in the future.

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

Chair Doe: We have a lot of committees and representatives. This is a reflection of the work that the Committee on Faculty Governance does at this time of year to identify new members of committees. Asked if there were any questions about this ballot or concerns about placing it on the Faculty Council agenda for May 3.

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

Michael Antolin: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for May 3.

4. Motion on Transfer Credit Limits – Committee on Teaching and Learning – Shawn Archibeque, Chair

Chair Doe: Requested a motion on this item before discussion.

Sharon Anderson: Moved.

Chair Doe: Thanked Anderson. Asked Shawn Archibeque to speak to this.

Shawn Archibeque: This is a motion coming out of the Committee on Teaching and Learning. This would be a change to the student course catalog about acceptance transfer credits from two-year institutions. This would bring us in line with our peer institutions, and this is standard protocol for all the other institutions in the state of Colorado. This would change our policy from limiting transfers to 64 credits and would lift this, but still maintain the requirements that students have to have 42 upper-division credits and 30 upper-division credits in residence before receiving a degree from CSU.

Archibeque: Part of the issue that was happening was that this was putting an unfair burden on the Registrar's Office. They were essentially having to try to do a best guess of which 64 credits to accept for certain students. This might work if they had the right major, but if the student were to change majors, that might not be the best use of those transfer credits. Unless they had an advisor that caught onto this, it would be detrimental to the student. The idea was to bring us in line with our peer institutions to reduce workload on the Registrar's Office and still adhere to the other rules we have maintaining that students have to have an experience here at CSU to receive a CSU degree. Asked if there were any questions.

William Sanford: Asked: How many credits need to be taken at CSU to get a CSU degree?

Archibeque: They would need to have a total of 42 credits at CSU and meet all the components in their major. They are probably looking at about two years of classes. It would be 42 upper division credits, so the 300-level classes and above here at CSU.

Antolin: Asked: The credits in total still need to add up to over 120, correct?

Archibeque: Yes. It would still be over 120 total, but at CSU, they would have to complete 42 upper-division credits. Thirty of those have to be in residence. They could have twelve done at CSU online, which would meet the requirement as well.

Smith: Asked: Is there a reason why this was not articulated in this change and it has been left as there is no limit to the credits to be transferred?

Archibeque: We are not changing any of the upper-division requirements. We are just lifting the 64 transfer credit limit right now. Let's say a student had 68 credits from Front Range. The Registrar's Office would then have to figure out which four of those credits not to accept as transfer credits.

Andrew Norton: Asked: What is the importance of the word "regionally" in regionally accredited institution?

Archibeque: This is bringing us in line with our stated agreements with the Colorado two-year programs in the state.

Norton: Asked: Is this also intended for somebody who, let's say, attends a two-year in Florida?
 Asked: Would they be able to transfer the same amount of credits?

Archibeque: Yes, they would be able to transfer those credits as well. We would still have the same upper-division requirements here at CSU.

Norton: Asked: Is it correct to say that there is no limit for the amount of credit that can be transferred from accredited institutions and we are just saying "regionally" to make Colorado people comfortable?

Archibeque: Believe the wording came from Vice Provost Kelly Long. Understanding was that this was just to bring us in line with our agreements in the state with our two-year institutions, but it would apply to everybody. This just makes sure we are meeting our stated agreements with those institutions.

Antolin: Given the overview of majors requirements coming from departments and programs, it sounds like you all were doing more work than you had to because of checking on the individual to make sure they would meet the standards. So, you are essentially taking something away that was being done anyway and moving it along.

Archibeque: Yes, mainly from the Registrar's Office.

Antolin: That makes sense. All the other oversight still exists.

Archibeque: All the other oversight is still there within the programs. Essentially, the Registrar's Office, with every student coming in with over 64 transfer credits, had to make a best guess based on the student's current major and what would be most effective for them.

Anderson: Because this language will be in the catalog, am wondering if there could be more open language around the regionally accredited. A student from Tennessee may look at this and their two years and wonder what that will mean if they want to transfer to CSU. Wondering if the language might be more inviting and state that they can come from an accredited institutions bringing credits to CSU, with the understanding that you have to have a certain number of credits from CSU.

Archibeque: Asked: So, you would like to get rid of the word "regionally" as described earlier? Indicated he was fine with this change. We could strike out that limitation and add the words that there is no limit to the amount of credit that can be transferred from accredited institutions.

Norton: Believe that "regionally" just refers to a level of accreditation. All universities are regionally accredited.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked: Could it be substituted for something like "fully" accredited?

Rob Mitchell: On the accreditation side of things, particularly if we are wanting schools such as community colleges to make options for students, that regional accreditation would not be as high a bar of accreditation. If we put "fully", it might be perceived as needing to be a peer university that is nationally accredited, as opposed to a regional accreditation. Feels it would be worth verifying, as there might be implications on the accreditation side.

Archibeque: The regional accreditation is exactly what was just said, versus a full or national accreditation. It is just the smaller regions, but this would not limit it to just the Colorado region. This would apply to students from other areas as well. Reminded members that this would still only be accepting those credits at the lower level.

Norton: Posted some language in the chat. “Regional accreditation agencies oversee institutions that place a focus on academics that are state-owned or non-profit colleges or universities. There are six regional accrediting agencies for higher education institutions in the U.S. These agencies oversee institutions within their particular clusters of states.”

Antolin: There is a paragraph that states that coursework from institutions not regionally accredited will not be transferred. It could be that it is not clear to people because it’s not just in the title, it’s in the text as well.

Archibeque: Clarified that the text Antolin was referring to already exists in the catalog. Stated that the strikeout is the only thing being removed. Everything else is already in the catalog.

Chair Doe: Seems that the information in that paragraph is basically reaffirming the importance of the term “regional.”

Pedros-Gascon: Asked: To address concern that Anderson was expressing, could we consider that “regionally accredited” be capitalized to have it identify as a different category? That might make it clear that it is not only Colorado, but would be for a national level.

Archibeque: The feedback we have received is that the regionally accredited is the designation of those institutions. Think the capitalization would be fine.

Pedros-Gascon: Think it would make it clear we are referring to a title and specific concept.

Chair Doe: Clarified that the capitals would refer to “regionally accredited.”

Peel: Asked in the chat: Is there a reference to cite for clarification?

Archibeque: Do not have a reference for that.

Antolin: Posted link in the chat: <https://www.chea.org/regional-accrediting-organizations>.

Peel: Capitalization may help, but am not sure if it will clear up confusion. Think someone would have to go find out what regionally accredited means.

Chair Doe: In theory, there could be a link in the explanation that the catalog information says 7 regional associations of colleges and schools.

Antolin: We could put in the modifier and say one of the seven nationally recognized regional associations from what Norton found. Asked: Does this lead to phone calls to the Registrar’s Office from people applying, or do they know this?

Archibeque: The Registrar’s Office already enforces this and would continue to enforce this.

Mitchell: Think the less we change will be better. Think that not many students are reading this, and it is more likely advisors from these institutions. If we change too much, we might actually

get more questions about what we mean by these changes. Think the capitalizations would be fine, and may clarify this for students. Think we should be focused on what changes, otherwise we might make more work for those we are trying to simplify this for.

Chair Doe: It sounds like we have a small amendment to capitalize. Asked Archibeque if that sounded alright.

Archibeque: Confirmed the amendment. Stated this was fine.

Chair Doe: We have a motion on the floor. Requested members to vote in the chat for placement on the Faculty Council agenda for May 3.

Motion approved with minor amendment. Will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for May 3.

5. Motion Regarding AUCC 1C – AUCC 1C Task Force

Chair Doe: Requested a motion prior to discussion.

Anderson: Moved.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that we had a 90-minute discussion session last Friday, April 22nd. Thanked any members that were able to attend. We had a robust discussion and there have been email exchanges and further discussions following that meeting. We have plenty of time to discuss this today as well. Asked Rebecca Atadero to speak to this item.

Rebecca Atadero: The 1C has been added to the AUCC since 2020, and it has undergone a few modifications since then. The task force was trying to look at what the curriculum requirements should be and then we also had a charge to look at assessment and the resources that would be needed to pull this off. We focused the later half of the semester looking at the curriculum requirements we developed, and we created a guideline document, which is one page. We also made a few changes to the policy document for AUCC, which is the 21-page document.

Atadero: We proposed a few changes to the core curriculum specific to 1C. Those changes were partially deleting a section that was calling for 50% of the grade to be based on dialogue, because this was raised by a lot of faculty as a concern and a barrier to creating these courses. We also added in a broader definition of dialogue. We are also suggesting that there be a guidance committee to help faculty develop these courses to go with the guidelines, and we envision that this committee would help support professional development and make sure these courses are meeting the objectives for 1C.

Brad Goetz: Indicated that the primary changes to the document as seen in the agenda packet can be found on pages 34 and 35. The only other changes to this document are accounting and moving the credit accounts around for various categories. As Atadero mentioned, the most contentious point in the previously approved version was the 50% dialogue. That has now been removed, and the second paragraph hopefully does a better job of describing the ways that dialogue can be involved in the course and be less prescriptive than the 50% requirement.

Steve Benoit: Expressed appreciation for robust discussion on this last Friday. The task force took that feedback to heart and made a minor change to one of the statements in the guideline document to rearrange how it refers to the influence of domestic U.S. issues in a 1C course.

Chair Doe: Believe that change reflected language provided by Jonathan Carlyon as a recommendation. We took that language and replaced the first bullet in the content and pedagogy document that was mentioned.

Norton: Noted that the document provided in the packet did not have the cross-outs, so it is difficult to see what the changes are. Feels this would be helpful if this moves forward so we see the details. Asked: Is this the entirety of what Faculty Council will be considering on May 3rd, or is the task force also seeking approval of the task force report?

Goetz: Sense is that this will be the policy piece that goes forward. The other item is procedural and probably will continue to evolve, so do not anticipate that there is any approval of this at the Faculty Council meeting. The document we are looking at resulted from the first change to the AUCC in adding the 1C category and the removal of the 3E category in Spring of 2020.

Chair Doe: Norton brings up an interesting question that we will have to answer down the road, which is where that guidance document will reside. Also wondering who will enforce it and who will utilize it. This highlights the necessity for further conversations around the professional development piece that might be needed for some faculty and the resourcing. The Provost's Office has given a nod of agreement that this would be needed, but specifics remain to be seen.

Linda Meyer: Looking at the document from Friday, there are changes throughout. Just want to make sure that when this is sent to the Faculty Council, the underlines and strikethroughs are there and preferably in red so we can see them very quickly.

Pedros-Gascon: Still very concerned about the use of "domestic" in this sentence and the weaponization that can be coming from that for the people who have to utilize the word. In the teaching effectiveness framework, we are talking about linguistic justice and the need to have our classes represent and look like our students. This looks extremely Anglo-centered and privileged. Would like to have an explanation of what "domestic" is. Expressed appreciation for the efforts of the task force, but do not think that the document is ready to address this issue. Think the concept of "domestic" is problematic and goes against what we are honoring in other areas. Also expressed concern that we are asked to approve this with the ability to change things down the line. Feels those changes never happen and this will remain as is.

Goetz: Clarified that Pedros-Gascon was referring to the paragraph that says, "on U.S. domestic cultures, as they are situated within a global context." This does not restrict anything to domestic topics or domestic issues. Think it is intended to focus on the campus community. In a hierarchal way, it would be campus community, the local community, the regional community, the national community, and then the international community, rather than taking a view from the other perspective. That being said, we hope the language is open enough that it will not eliminate the possibility of any individual faculty member interpreting how they wish to, if in fact they were addressing a more global issue. The hope is that they would bring that down to the way students

on the CSU campus would begin to relate to that and understand it. It does not restrict one or the other, it just situates it in a hierarchy.

Pedros-Gascon: If we are expected to teach specifically with the concern of locality and with the frame that privileges U.S. understanding of any issue, it would limit not only specific situations, but international studies and many other people who aspire to have understandings that transcend the local. Asked: Why are we not using “U.S. cultures” and why are we saying “U.S. domestic cultures” instead? Need to understand what constitutes U.S. domestic cultures, because you are using them as something different from U.S. non-domestic cultures. Would feel more comfortable if we got rid of that qualifier and just say “U.S. cultures as they are situated in the global context.” Feels this would still facilitate an understanding based on the U.S. experience.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon for those insights. Given that this document will be an evolving document, these are good things for us to be thinking about and endeavoring to address. This allows the opportunity for the content and pedagogical document to evolve.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further discussion, we have a motion on the floor. Requested a vote in the chat to determine if this is ready to stand debate on the floor of Faculty Council.

Motion rejected.

Chair Doe: Asked Goetz to explain what happens next if this does not go on the Faculty Council agenda for May 3.

Goetz: There are two potential routes. The first is that the task force could reconvene and produce another version of the proposal. The other scenario, given that this has failed Executive Committee and will not go forward to Faculty Council, we are in the position of the previously approved AUCC experience which will continue to include the 50% dialogue and a number of other items that were there. As the chair of the University Curriculum Committee, will have to come back with a University Curriculum Committee proposal to revise the numbers in the document to match the actual accounting of the credits. Do not believe either of these will be resolved today without some other directive, given what we see right now and the timing of the semester. Come fall, we will be working under the previously approved AUCC guidelines and the 50% dialogue will stand.

Chair Doe: Added that this task force was created to reflect the views of the faculty. The previous proposal that was in front of us was largely understood as coming from administration. The language that existed previously that was brought to us from the Provost’s Office will stand. Reminded members that this task force will disband at the end of this semester. Any movement forward will be starting from scratch. Accepted the will of the people and will figure out a different way forward.

Pedros-Gascon: Would characterize this differently. Would consider this more like the situation in which there is a big improvement from the previous document. However, there are still some unresolved issues that make it impossible to engage in the wording as it is. Recommended that this be sent back to the committee, and if not this one, the next one. In general, feel this

institution needs to start opening some frames of understanding. This is a limitation in the way in which we are trying to understand diversity, and this institution is much more diverse than what this document portrays. Think this is a good movement forward, but still needs to be refined. Expressed concern that approving this document as is may mean no revisions for a long time.

Meyer: Asked in the chat: Is the question of the word “domestic” the only thing that keeps this document from being able to sustain debate?

Chair Doe: Responded to Meyer’s question from the chat. Believe so. Noted that the word “domestic” is not in the motion, so we may be confusing matters here.

Vice Provost James: Asked in the chat: So, the current version that is already approved maintains the word “domestic”, correct, and the 50% dialogue requirement?

Atadero: It is in the AUCC and in the guidelines, as well as the 1C description. That language is already in there.

Vice Provost James: Asked: If that is part of the concern, would an amendment or revision make more sense than letting it stand?

Atadero: Asked: Should we delete it?

Meyer: Asked in the chat: If it is put forward to Faculty Council, can an amendment be proposed to change the document to remove the word “domestic”?

Norton: Would have been nice to see this debated and potentially amended on the floor of Faculty Council. Not clear as to whether that section that is not been revised could be amended, but it probably could.

Smith: Expressed concern that this single word caused this committee to decide that this could not stand debate in Faculty Council. Feels we have stopped something that could have stood debate on the floor and could have been modified in Faculty Council.

Atadero: As a task force when we were debating this, think we did not understand the concern with the word “domestic.” We thought that people wanted to be able to not teach about what was going on in the U.S. We felt that this course requirement needed to look at the U.S. environment for different races and ethnicities. When people were hesitant about the word “domestic”, we thought they just wanted to also have the international piece, because there was a lot of debate about international as well. We were saying that we need to talk about what is going on in the U.S. and how people are experiencing life in the U.S., which is why we thought we needed to keep the word “domestic” in there. We acknowledge that international diversity is important, but we think what our students are asking for is for understanding of the U.S. context. We could stick to the U.S. context by saying “U.S. cultures.” Think the task force would have deleted that, but do not think we interpreted it that way because of all the feedback around global awareness.

Pedros-Gascon: This is part of the problems of having a committee. We end up finding that we are not able to integrate or understand the counterpoints just by nature. Would be fine getting rid of the word “domestic”, and it is already saying “U.S. cultures.” Would welcome the idea of advancing this with that word crossed out.

Vice Provost James: To Norton’s point, “domestic” is already in the approved language, not just something the task force put forward recently. This language was already approved, so it would have to be amended.

Pedros-Gascon: If we are amending the document, we can also amend that section. Do not see why we can only amend these specific lines and not the frame. This is reflective of the idea that we approve a document and being told we can discuss it down the line. Feels the document reflects the way in which it was approved. It was rushed as extremely urgent when presented to Faculty Council and it was approved back then in good faith, but now these issues need to be addressed. We were told that we could review them later on.

Chair Doe: Wrote in the chat some language: “U.S. culture situated within global context.” Asked: Would that work if it is reflected throughout the document? Would like to reach a resolution on this.

Pedros-Gascon: Indicated in the chat that this works. Gives a broader understanding.

Sybil Sharvelle: Indicated in the chat that she voted yes but would like the suggested verbiage on culture better than the current language.

Goetz: Reminded members that the history of this document and its approval indicate that it was approved unanimously across the board at every one of those meetings. What this would mean is going back on a vote. The best way to revise this would be an amendment on the floor of Faculty Council, rather than asking the task force that was charged with a broader group of faculty input and now addressing a word that did not come up until now during that process.

Smith: Understanding of our position as Executive Committee is that we make decisions whether documents can stand debate in Faculty Council. Voted yes because this could stand debate and if there are amendments to be made, they would be made at Faculty Council.

Pedros-Gascon: This is an extremely important curricular decision that merits more than ten minutes of discussion, because many of the members in attendance at Faculty Council did not attend the previous meeting. Believe a decision like this merits two or three meetings. This cannot be decided in a vote after ten minutes of discussion on the Faculty Council floor, because this is a really impacting and binding decision for this institution.

Chair Doe: We did attempt to address this, and thought we had. The task force worked for a couple more hours following that meeting in an attempt to address that. Am going to call this right now, following Mitchell’s comment.

Mitchell: Think the task force did a great job on this. Attended the meeting on Friday, and a number of questions came up that the group stated they would take under consideration. Not sure how those were taken into consideration. Expressed agreement on the issue of “domestic”, but there were a lot of other points raised as well. This is a big curriculum decision that has to do with core, that has to do with the perspectives on what people will be studying, and the strategic positioning of our ability to recruit students. Do feel that it does feel rushed at Faculty Council. Asked: Does every faculty member feel they can voice their opinion? Think there may be people that did not necessarily feel they could express their opinion in a public forum. Do not feel this is ready from a procedural perspective to be voted on. This is a tough predicament given the work that has already been done on this and would love to explore if there is some kind of alternative pathway that does not have to be a restart and can address some of these questions.

Norton: From the students’ perspective, we have been debating this for over ten years. This motion originally passed two years ago, and it caused us trouble. We have been working on this for years, and just had 90 minutes of debate last Friday. If we want more debate than this, not sure we are going to get it.

Mitchell: Expressed appreciation for what students have done. Would like to see if there is a pathway where people can freely express their opinions without worrying. Would be happy to reconsider this but would like to have this done in a place where people can voice opinions and their voice in a setting where there is not pressure associated with the way they vote. Want to get voices represented in a way that is transparent. Gave example. At meeting on Friday, someone brought up religious freedom, and someone else attacked it in the comments. It can be an uncomfortable setting to state a concern and then have someone respond in such a way.

Smith: Maybe we need to reiterate the code of conduct that faculty members should be carrying out. Expressed agreement that that is not appropriate. However, one person as a bad actor does not necessarily mean that we are squelching debate.

Mitchell: Just want to make sure that people are free to express diverging opinions. Do not want all the work of this committee to go to waste but want to make sure these voices and these concerns are brought to the table in a way that people do not feel they may be personally attacked.

Chair Doe: Recalled that the first question that was asked was whether there should be an opportunity for religious exemptions. Had responded that the history at this institution has been that if there is a need for a religious exemption, it has been given. Did not hear the second comment.

Mitchell: Clarified that it was in the chat. To Norton’s point, we do need to do something so the work of this committee sees the light of day but need to do it in a way that is procedural. If the decision is to start over or to figure out how to manage the situation at Faculty Council, would change vote to say we should figure out how to manage it then. This is just a possibility that we need to be mindful of.

Chair Doe: Thanked Mitchell. Reminded members about the constraints of the Faculty Council meetings. The reason we had a separate discussion last Friday was because of those constraints. It makes it difficult to have an extended discussion like we did last Friday. Believe the general rule of thumb is that if the discussion is continuing and it is not repetitious and is meaningfully moving forward, the discussion can continue. Asked Richard Eykholt, who had joined the call, to chime in with thoughts on this.

Pedros-Gascon: Would like to speak. We voted, and just because some people are not okay with outcome, we are willing to vote on it again. Clear concerns have been transmitted and have been asked to be addressed. Do not see why this committee cannot advance new wording. Feel tricked by the way this discussion is happening and how the vote happened.

Chair Doe: There was no intention to trick.

Pedros-Gascon: The vote happened. Unless there is new wording, it should stand.

Chair Doe: And it does. This measure has failed, and we will take this information forward. Asked if Eykholt had any insights on discussion in Faculty Council.

Richard Eykholt: Discussion can continue as long as it is being productive, which is the call of the chair. Have only two comments about this. You cannot amend language on the floor that is not being changed in the motion. Someone mentioned the word “domestic.” If that word is not in the motion, you cannot amend it on the floor. Asked: Is this motion coming from the University Curriculum Committee?

Chair Doe: No, it is deliberately not coming from the University Curriculum Committee. The motion was going to come from the floor, from one of the task force members, but we felt it would be better if it came from the task force. The task force that has been addressing this because the original motion came from the University Curriculum Committee.

Eykholt: It is up to you how you want to do this, but the task force could submit a motion with the word “domestic” removed. The Executive Committee could approve this contingent on that being the motion. If the task force meets and decides not to remove it, it does not move forward since Executive Committee approved it contingent on that change. Would need to discuss this prior to that meeting.

Jane Stewart: Moved in the chat to vote on approval with removal of “domestic.”

Norton: Second.

Chair Doe: Understanding is that if this is approved, the task force would take this back and see if they feel they can go in that direction. If they do, it would move forward, and if not, it would remain not on the agenda. Hearing no further discussion, we have a motion. Requested vote in the chat.

Motion to approve placement of AUCC 1C proposal on Faculty Council agenda contingent on removal of word “domestic” approved.

Mitchell: Want to stress that in the meeting people are following proper protocols and that perspectives are welcome.

6. Motion Regarding S/U Grading Policy – Committee on Scholastic Standards – Jill Putman, Associate Director for Outreach and Support Programs, CoSS Representative

Chair Doe: Requested a motion prior to discussion.

Smith: Moved.

Jill Putman: Thanked Executive Committee for having her. Am representing Alan Kennan, chair of the Committee on Scholastic Standards, who was not able to attend today.

Putman: The proposal the committee has put forward is a procedural change to a previously approved policy regarding S/U grading during the academic terms impacted by the pandemic. The process for students to utilize the S/U grading option for these terms is that they need to initiate an email request to the Registrar’s Office with the information about the course(s) they would like to change to either an S or a U grade. This past fall, the Committee on Scholastic Standards, as part of their dismissal appeal review process, was observing that there were several students in the process for dismissal appeal that had not yet utilized that option to request U grades instead of F grades on their record. This would have made a difference in terms of their progression in the probation process and ultimate ability to persist.

Putman: As part of this, the Committee on Scholastic Standards endorsed and has put forward this motion for a procedural change to convert the remaining F grades that are on student records for the 700 students enrolled this spring to a grade of U with the continued option for students to opt out of that process.

Putman: The Committee on Scholastic Standards did vet this through several different groups. Believe they have consulted with all the appropriate bodies, including General Counsel, other faculty members, the Registrar’s Office. The committee also pulled a lot of data and reviewed it to see how this would impact students. Reminded members that there would be 700 students that would be affected under this procedural change, again with the ability to retain those F grades should they wish to do so. The majority of those students do have GPAs between a 2.0 and 2.5 cumulatively, but about 20% of the students affected by this change do currently have a GPA below a 2.0, so they are currently in the probation process.

Gaye DiGregorio: Would add that there was concern raised through our discussions about the impact this would have on graduate school applications as well as getting certification to be a CPA. If this goes forward, we would communicate with students about these implications. We want to directly communicate to these students rather than doing the university-wide announcements, which was done in the past.

Putnam: Added that in our consultation, we did determine that students who utilized the GI Bill benefits would not benefit from this change because of some of the stipulations around the use of those benefits. We have also worked with the Registrar’s Office to identify from a processing standpoint how we would exclude students who receive F grades due to academic misconduct from this processing change. Those grades of F would continue to stand on their record without the option to change these to grades of U.

Chair Doe: Have a question about language in the motion around the GI Bill. There is a reference to GI benefits. Think adding “GI Bill” would assist with any confusion there. Wondering if that could be a small editorial change.

Putman: Absolutely. We could even rephrase it to say veterans education benefits if that would provide more clarity.

Anderson: Have a question about the reference referring to graduate school and how that is currently calculated. Asked: What does that look like on our end?

Putman: Not sure there is consistency across departments because the Graduate School process is so centralized. It is decentralized into the departments with faculty advisors. Understanding is that at other institutions, this is being interpreted as a failing grade, so it would be calculated in a GPA. When this CSU policy was implemented and approved, on the processing side, the Registrar’s Office retained all the letter grades that students have earned on their record, even if they have been converted to S/U grades. We have continued to maintain those on the back end so that students could request a reversal at any time. In some cases, what we are hearing from students is that they are requesting those reversals because for graduate school admission, they are being asked to demonstrate what those letter grades were.

Chair Doe: Thanked Putman. Asked if there were additional questions from members.

Chair Doe: 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 May 3.

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. Executive Session – Discussion of UGO Survey results

Eykholt yielded time to allow for AUCC 1C discussion.

Chair Doe: Thanked Eykholt for his service and confirmed he received the documents regarding the survey results. One of the great things that came out of this was how much education occurs as a result of this new survey we are using. Feel we are getting robust feedback through our work with Institutional Research and the Institute for Research in Social Sciences. Expressed hope that this feedback would be helpful and useful.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

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