MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, August 30, 2022
3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Melinda Smith, Vice Chair; Andrew Norton, BOG Representative; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Janice Nerger, Interim Provost/Executive Vice President; Jennifer Martin, Agricultural Sciences; Rob Mitchell, Business; Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering; Sharon Anderson, Health and Human Sciences; Anders Fremstad, Liberal Arts; Christine Pawliuk, Libraries; William Sanford, Natural Resources; Joseph DiVerdi, Natural Sciences; Jennifer Peel, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Guests: Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee

Absent: none

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

August 30, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – August 23, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any changes to be made to the Executive Committee 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 September 13, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on September 6, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: Our first Faculty Council meeting of the year is next week. Reminded members that the Faculty Council meetings begin at 4:00 p.m., not 3:00 p.m. like the Executive Committee meetings. We will have our next Executive Committee meeting on September 13th.

3. Special Faculty Council Session on September 27, 2022 – Helios

Chair Doe: This is something we wanted to get on our calendar so that everyone is aware of it. We will discuss this a bit at our meeting on September 13th. We are hoping to engage in a
conversation around the **Helios project**. Helios is an open research group access strategy. It was clear following a discussion that this was complex and required more time than can be allowed in a twenty-minute discussion. We would like to have a Special Faculty Council Session, for possibly an hour, on September 27th for anyone who is interested in learning more about Helios. In preparation for that, we will have a discussion around Helios at our next Executive Committee meeting on September 13th. Noted that the Special Faculty Council session would take up the last hour of the normal Executive Committee time.

Vice Provost Susan James: Commented in the chat that CSU has joined Helios officially.

Vice Provost James: This is about higher education and open scholarship, sometimes called open science or open research, which is basically trying to be more open with how we share data and publish data across disciplines. There are around eighty (80) universities that have signed on, and CSU just joined this year after someone came here and presented. Gave positive example of open research around COVID vaccines. This went by much quicker by academics who engaged in open scholarship, so they shared data with each other about what they knew, which led to greater and more impactful vaccine development.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. This is an important initiative, so it seems important for faculty to know more about it. The special session will provide more time for conversation around this since it will be a new idea for many people.

Andrew Norton: Asked: Is this related to the Biden administration’s recent decision to Open Access for federally funded research?

Vice Provost James: Believes this predates that by quite a bit but suspect that the Biden administration’s move is inspired by this kind of work.

### B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Interim Provost Janice Nerger

Provost Janice Nerger: Do not have a formal report today. Expressed appreciation for being able to meet with Chair Doe earlier today to go over things being presented next week. It was helpful to understand the timing. Goal in this role is the become more engaged with Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Nerger. Expressed appreciation for both her and Vice Provost James for being here. Feels it is good to have both at meetings to get additional insights. Asked if Vice Provost James had anything to share today.

Vice Provost James: Did not have anything formal today. We will have a small report at the Faculty Council meeting next week, which will occur as part of the Provost’s report. Provost Nerger will do a quick update, and then we will update on the Faculty Success project, which is the rebranding of the National Science Foundation ADVANCE work. We will have a longer presentation at the Faculty Council meeting in October to update everyone on what we are doing.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. Reminded members that our discussion at the September Faculty Council meeting would be the Retirement Plan Revisions that we received a
briefing on last week. We will hear about the Faculty Success initiative in October and then we will hear from our Vice President for Inclusive Excellence about the climate survey in November. We currently do not have any discussion items for December.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Was happy to meet with our Interim President and Interim Provost today to discuss probable questions and discussion items that may arise at our Faculty Council meeting next week. Encouraged members to come prepared with questions in hand and pay attention during the meeting so that we can avoid repetition and have as much coverage as possible so that we hear from a variety of different people. Will be talking to fellow Faculty Council officers for assistance in monitoring the chat. We will be providing some guidance at the beginning of the meeting with how we would like to handle things in this regard. We want to inform everyone of the best procedures so that we ensure everyone is heard. Encouraged Executive Committee members to be participants and familiarize themselves with the Parliamentary motions.

Chair Doe: Am considering putting together some new short-term task forces. We had five task forces in first year of being Chair, who all came forward with wonderful work following a semester of work to be passed onto standing committees. Explained some of the work these five task forces undertook, including intellectual property and shared governance. Would like to get this group’s sense of the value of these task forces and level of interest in being involved.

Chair Doe: One of our first task forces was around shared governance. That task force sent forward a proposal that the Faculty Council approved, but it was subsequently returned after not being approved by the Office of General Counsel. We passed it along to the Committee on Faculty Governance to determine how it might be amended, but they had so much on their plate that this did not go anywhere. Think it might be time for us to return to the questions around shared governance and the participation of Faculty Council. We can look at what our role is and how may better language around shared governance be inserted into the Manual. The current language in the Manual around shared governance is very slight. Would like to see us consider the creation of this task force. One of the first things this task force might do is to go back and look at why the previous recommendations did not pass through the Office of General Counsel. Think it is important for Faculty Council to keep their eye on the central objective, which is to maintain the role of Faculty Council in shared governance and clarify how shared governance functions at CSU.

Chair Doe: The second topic has been brought up by Rob Mitchell several times, and that has to do with innovative leadership or future thinking. Wondering if it is time for a task force to take up this question and get involved in new ways.
Chair Doe: The third task force is around the topic of security of employment of our non-tenure track faculty, also known as our continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty. A central question that would face this task force is whether the contract system, which has been legal since 2012, has been working or could be made better to work for our continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty.

Chair Doe: The other suggested topic may be better housed with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, but they may be assisted by a task force that would address the issues around disciplinary procedures for faculty and why Section E.15 hearings have not been occurring in the past fifteen (15) to twenty (20) years. Have it on good authority from our current University Grievance Officer that they have never convened a Section E.15 panel. We can ask questions around why this is not happening, whether the items are solved before a hearing or whether faculty just feel ground down by the lengthy and arduous processes, and whether we are comfortable with the way things are settled. Would also like the task force to look at the role of the media when it comes to disciplinary procedures for faculty and how media coverage is integrated into the decision-making around discipline and whether media is relied upon equitably. The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty could take this up, but they would prefer a task force work on the issues first and then forward objectives that the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty could turn into Manual language.

Chair Doe: Another topic is a bit broader and is around needs of faculty for retention. Know there are many concerns around several different things, such as the cost of living in Larimer County and its relationship to compensation. Wondering if we need a broader task force to ask what the current needs of faculty are for retention purposes.

Chair Doe: Asked for feedback from the group on each of these items.

Vice Provost James: The issue of retention is something we are particularly interested in at the Provost’s Office. As part of the Faculty Success program, we are working with a research institution out of Harvard that involves hundreds of universities and studies faculty retention. We joined last year, so we are in year two (2) of gathering data in the three-year project. They are doing exit interviews with everyone who left and talking with everyone who was retained. We will have a lot more data to inform a task force like that next year. We are just starting to think about putting more guidelines around the retention process. Both retentions and departures have gone up for the last year compared to the year before. Will say that the ADVANCE project is only looking at tenure-track faculty because that is what the National Science Foundation funded, but we could certainly do it with continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty as well. Wanted to just mention this and encourage working with the Provost’s Office because we are actively working on issues around retention.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost James. Thinks it would make sense to allow Provost’s Office to continue to do that work and perhaps form a task force in a year. Not sure there is any need at this moment for us to be working parallel or potentially across purposes. We can revisit this in a year with the new Chair of Faculty Council to see if they want to take this up.
Vice Provost James: Wanted group to be aware of what is going on with that. Would be happy to collaborate on that as well.

Vice Provost James: With regard to the task force around Section E.15, understanding from Richard Eykholt is that these have all ended with separation agreements. The frustration you might run into is that these are personnel matters, so you may not be able to learn much about what happened with these, so it will be very generic.

Chair Doe: Think it is less to do with the specifics of any case than sort of a general theme or feeling around the language. We have this language in the Manual that details how to establish a committee or panel, and then it never gets activated because things are settled elsewhere.

Joseph DiVerdi: Wondering what the issues were that were discussed with the Interim President and Interim Provost that we may see next week at the Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Doe: We discussed questions that have come forward about how we landed where we are and to what degree Faculty Council was involved. There are also questions about where things stand in terms of the Courageous Strategic Transformation plan and the Academic Master Plan. There will likely also be questions around compensation and the faculty need to understand budget. Interim President Rick Miranda is committed to a concerted education for faculty around budget and believe we will be getting a primer on this next Tuesday on how university budgeting in general works.

Provost Nerger: Stated that former Vice President Lynn Johnson and Interim President Miranda used to hold a budget 101 before COVID. They would do three (3) or four (4) sessions each year. They weren’t very well attended. Expressed hope that this would be done with Faculty Council and then again later on. Budget drafts are going to start coming out soon and it will be helpful to be able to read those.

Chair Doe: Have also requested that materials be provided ahead of time, even if only the day before. Hope is that while this is not what the budget will look like for this year, we can be shown a page that will help us understand.

Sharon Anderson: Suggested in the chat that a presentation could be done online where faculty could attend, not just Faculty Council.

Melinda Smith: Commented in the chat that a timeline of budget benchmarks would be helpful.

DiVerdi: Commented in the chat that it is important and can be effective and even impactful to be speaking about budgets. We have to get it front and center in the faculty’s minds. We generally know that our income sources include student tuition, research funds and state appropriations. These are very important items with sometimes surprising components. It has been claimed that common overhead recovery rates for state research universities are insufficient to the point that it actually costs a representative university $1.25 for each $1.00 received! Asked: How can this be true? What is the corresponding value here? One of many important
Chair Doe: This could be another special session we could hold at some point.

Provost Nerger: The budget 101 presentations were really well done, but just didn’t hit off for some reason. Maybe the online version is the way to do it.

Norton: Suggested using an Echo360 classroom session so that it is available whenever someone has budget questions. We can provide them with basic information with that initial session. Thinking about the new faculty orientation that is done around shared governance. Believe this is worth pursuing and engaging with administration over.

Rob Mitchell: Other thing to think about is the interaction between these different components. When we start talking about budget, we want to understand it, similar to shared governance and what that means and how these relate to what the future of university is and who is thinking about that. The other piece we will want to consider is how all of these different groups work together and what they mean and making sure they are talking back and forth. For example, when you start talking about salaries and retention, you talk about budgets, and a big piece of that is to ensure that students keep coming and how we manage the future with demographic cliffs. Want to make sure those integrations across task forces are happening. Real issue is how we bridge these.

Chair Doe: Thanked Mitchell for the comments.

Jennifer Peel: Would like to encourage the discussions around shared governance to go beyond administration. There could be value to discussion around this happening at all levels on campus and asking what shared governance looks like at the department level, college level, and the different administrative levels.

Jennifer Martin: Echoed Mitchell’s and Peel’s comments. Stated that many of our unit leaders were previous faculty members, and often these principles and fundamental pieces of university operation or the principle of shared governance weren’t something they were exposed to. Awareness across the board and how these are linked together in the operations of the university would be helpful.

Christine Pawliuk: Want to mention the non-tenure track faculty topic. Stated that she is a continuing faculty member and comes from the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, where there is a lot of discussion and concern about the contract system and how it is working, and it’s intended purpose of making continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty jobs more stable. There has been a lot of work done on that that this task force could build off of but would be helpful for a task force to weigh in on. Would be happy to be a part of that committee.

Chair Doe: Thanked Peel and Martin for their comments. Thanked Pawliuk. This is a topic that Faculty Council has been involved with for a very long time. Efforts have been made, but sometimes in spurts. Feels it is important to revisit these things.
DiVerdi: Expressed appreciation for these ideas. This is an opportunity for us to be helpful in this institution, with this group of thoughtful, sincere, and intelligent people. Would be happy to participate in several of these task forces.

Chair Doe: Will send a query to everyone to see who is interested in what, and then if there are people you want to nominate, we want to get these off the ground quickly.

Chair Doe: If any members have an interest in assessment, we have a new Director of Assessment at CSU, and she is interested in having conversations around assessment. Stephanie Foster is the new director. Asked members to reach out if interested in participating in those discussions with Foster.

Chair Doe: Have asked the Committee on Faculty Governance to do two things that are time sensitive. The first is around representation for continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty who are not in academic units, such as in Honors or PLACE. Another question around this is whether we need to be thinking about representation of Extension faculty. Have also asked them about term limits, particularly for chairs of standing committees.

Anders Fremstad: Asked in the chat: Do we have term limits for Faculty Council members?

DiVerdi: Responded to Fremstad’s question in the chat. Believe three (3) years is a single term of service and that there is no limit on the number of consecutive or non-consecutive terms that one can serve.

Chair Doe: Confirmed that DiVerdi is correct about there being no limit on terms that someone can serve on Faculty Council. This is probably two (2) separate questions, and whether we should have term limits for how long you can serve as a member. We currently do not have term limits on chairs, so have asked the Committee on Faculty Governance to consider this issue.

Chair Doe: We have an item coming to us at our next Executive Committee meeting from the Committee on Teaching and Learning that has to do with the student bereavement policy.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: As far as the Presidential search, we have gone through five (5) listening sessions. Three (3) of them have been online, and two (2) have been in person. Feels the in-person ones have been impactful, because people are able to come up and say things directly to the search advisory committee. There is a wide range of opinions, perceptions, and realities about what faces CSU right now and what our priorities are. Stated that an additional session was added tomorrow, Wednesday, August 31st, to specifically connect with our Spanish-speaking employees. The search committee is taking copious notes and paying a lot of attention to what people are saying. The timeline is pretty aggressive. The intention is to announce to finalist candidate at the December Board meeting, and believe we are on track for doing that.
Norton: Another item that would be helpful is if Executive Committee could discuss what items Faculty Council will be working on over the next year to take to the Board of Governors for their next meeting, which is at the beginning of October. The October meeting will be in Fort Collins, so everyone is welcome.

Fremstad: Requested clarification that we will hear about a singular finalist in November.

Norton: We will hear about that in December, correct.

Fremstad: Wondering if there was any discussion about whether this is the right process to have a single finalist brought before us and to decide and vote on a single person. It seems like it should be a more interactive process that would have a few finalists that would come to campus, and we would talk with them.

Norton: This has come up at most of the meetings. The rationale comes from the firm, Parker Executive Search, who stated that the people who are looking to apply here already have awesome jobs and reputations at their current institutions. They will be high-level people, and according to the search firm, they will not be inclined to risk that job and reputation they have with their colleagues to apply for a job they are not sure about. If those candidates knew their names would get out, they may not apply.

Fremstad: Understand the rationale, but it doesn’t feel much different from the rationale around hiring faculty members. They are sometimes from great institutions and have to decide whether to entertain another job. Feels this is a double standard that potentially is at least partly responsible for our lack of real shared governance in the process.

Norton: One of the ways that they were trying to compensate for this was to create this large search group, which now consists of thirty-one (31) people trying to represent all facets of the University, as well as the community and the state. These listening sessions are important for that, and happy to talk as your representative and will bring items to the table. The search advisory committee will deliver three (3) or four (4) candidates to the Board, and then the Board will make that final call.

DiVerdi: Expressed appreciation for the standard consideration of confidentiality, a confidentiality that is certainly exacerbated at this higher level of position. It should be recognized that that’s an issue and that it lends some awkwardness that is introduced into a process that requires some sort of representative democracy. May not be the right time to discuss process, since we are already in the middle. Stated that conversations are happening about what happened over the summer and what happened with our last search and what was wrong with that process. We have a process now and people are doing their very best and we hope that we are actually getting something representative and good for the institution. Most of us have our hearts in the right place and want to see it successful. This is an important part of the success, who we get in there, and it just feels a little distant.
Norton: Completely understand. This is the process we have based on expert recommendations. Based on their recommendations, we just will not get the people we want if you have it open for public interview.

DiVerdi: Not sure if we can all agree on the kind of people we want.

Norton: After the listening sessions, there are a lot of people who feel very strongly about access and affordability, while others feel strong about compensation and living wages for faculty. Sometimes those two things run in different directions. There are different opinions out there.

DiVerdi: You always have to ask the question about how much efficacy that single role has on all of those or any of those particular items.

Martin: Have participated in all of the virtual sessions. There have been a lot of questions about what happened, and there is a lack of trust in the process from the campus community because it is the same search firm, and the same process did not yield a candidate that was here for a long time. Think there is a sense on campus of a lack of transparency and that this is the system trying to pull a fast one and there is a person already in mind. Given that we are coming out of a pandemic, we have recently had massive turnover in administration and there is a risk of losing the trust of the campus community even if a successful person is identified. Believe the search firm will do a good job of finding the right person. The process itself and the lack of transparency around the process and why this process has been imposed on the search committee and the campus community is a concern.

Martin: Have heard a lot of feedback from faculty and staff on campus that they held these listening sessions during one of the busiest times of the fall semester as classes are getting started and they feel they are not genuine in wanting input because it does not seem to resonate with all of the processes that we would want to embody if we were hiring a department head or a faculty member. We can’t change the process or the pace with which they are moving but do think that there is an opportunity for the Board to view this as a critical point and maintaining trust with campus. By not doing that and not recognizing how fragile that relationship is right now, they are setting the stage for a potentially awesome President to come to campus and fail because of the broken trust across the system. This might be an opportunity for Faculty Council to put forward a letter or a request to the committee or the board that they owe it to the campus to explain the process transparently, even if it cannot be changed.

Chair Doe: Thanked Martin. Any feedback we can give to Norton and the search committee that this need to reestablish trust is a high priority. The listening sessions are one thing that can be done but they can look at what else can be done.

Norton: Thanked Martin, these are great suggestions and feedback around how the Board could manifest trust and regain trust from the campus. Noted that we have had standing invitations for Board members to attend Faculty Council meetings. Not sure how much this would have shed light around the reasons for President Joyce McConnell and the University parting ways. Was not privy to any conversations but get the sense that the Board and Chancellor took no pleasure in how it ended.
Sybil Sharvelle: Would like to participate in these processes in a meaningful way but feel unable to do so in the absence of the transparency that has been in place. It is difficult to contribute in a way that is meaningful and to make any recommendations without understanding what has gone wrong.

Chair Doe: Thanked Sharvelle. It was mentioned earlier that people are unsure how they are supposed to interact with the current administration when they do not know what happened to the last one. It is a good reminder of the lasting ripple effect of this large change.

Provost Nerger: Asked Norton: Is this the same search committee we used last time?

Norton: Believe so.

DiVerdi: Wondering if this is a question that can be asked. There could be an innocuous answer to this but is an interesting question.

Norton: It could be because the search firm was selected by Chancellor Tony Frank and Board members Jordan and Valdez, or because they wanted to work quickly. It could be that their assessment was that the problems had nothing to do with the search firm but rather other aspects of the search. It could even be something completely different.

Martin: Think there are questions around what happened to make this massive transition. Do not think we are likely to get that information because of agreements signed and so forth but do think it benefits us moving forward whenever we hire this new person that the process has been trusted by campus. In the spirit of wanting this search to be successful and wanting to move forward with the idea of continuous improvement, this is an opportunity to help stack the deck in favor of putting some trust and transparency in the process itself, even if we cannot change it. This is an opportunity for the Board and Chancellor Frank to be transparent of why this search firm was selected, what they are looking to do, the facts around the fast-track timeline, and the strategy. This way, the faculty have the facts in front of them to decide what they want to do with that information.

Norton: Encouraged Martin to attend a listening session to state this to the search committee, along with the Board of Governors members that will present. Think this was powerful and well-said. Will also take the minutes from this meeting and bring them to the search advisory committee meeting when we work on finalizing the description.

Mitchell: It seems like there is a misalignment of strategies. Have often wondered if the System strategy for CSU was different than the prior President strategy for CSU, which may or may not have been aligned with faculty strategy in some senses. Faculty Council doesn’t really have a strategy, just local decision-making about various issues. Asked: As a Faculty Council, do we have the vision, given the changes that will happen in the next ten (10) or twenty (20) years? Looking at our strategy to keep the University viable and making sure that it is explicit, and then making sure the System level has their strategy explicit so there is some alignment.
Chair Doe: Thanked Mitchell. Will capture this feedback in the minutes. Feel this will be helpful to the Board of Governors in general and the search committee in particular. The faculty are weighing in, and we are not always invited to weigh in in the ways or degree we might like.

Martin: Wondering if the candidates will be asked to comment on items like the strategic plan we brought to the Board in May and that was approved. There may be an opportunity here for alignment and strategy. If Courageous Strategic Transformation is going to be our guiding document from a strategic perspective, it would be helpful if our new President was at least in line with those priorities. Think doing that again in 2024 would frustrate the faculty and we would lose time by not strategically and intentionally moving in a certain direction, as well as perpetuating this misalignment of strategies across the system.

Norton: It is important to note, even though there is a subtle distinction, that the Board received the Courageous Strategic Transformation with one member requesting that additional attention be placed on DEI and student success but did not approve it. Think the question of whether the candidates would be asked to comment on the Courageous Strategic Transformation Plan is a good one. Not sure what that question would be but we could ask the search advisory committee to include a question asking candidate’s views on the Courageous Strategic Transformation plan. Not sure if people think it would be a good idea to choose a president that will stick to that plan, but maybe questions around the aspects of the plan.

Mitchell: Think a critical point was made by Norton about the nature of framing that question. Can ask what they like about the plan or what interests them about it. Would love to see the candidates’ answers to that question, but also the System’s answer to that question and make sure there is some alignment there. If we focus less on the plan and more on the actions and try to understand what actions a new President would want to engage in, as well as what actions the System wants the new President to engage with. That is where we can minimize the risk of misalignment. We want a President who is engaging really well with the System as well as the faculty.

Norton: Requested clarification. When saying what excites the System about the Courageous Strategic Transformation plan, wondering if the System is being referred to or the Board.

Mitchell: Think there are two pieces there. When discussing System, thinking of Chancellor Frank and his influence and interactions with the Board to be sure what is happening is made explicit as it relates to the nature of the action. If we can get the System and the Board to be more explicit about what they want, in addition to faculty, then the new President can actually be in a position to manage up and down. Want to make sure that we are in a position to allow our new President to fill their own shoes because they know exactly what the expectations of all the different players are. The more explicit we are, we can make sure that there is better alignment.

Norton: Thanked everyone for the comments. Invited members to the public comment session of the October Board meeting, which will be in the Lory Student Center. Feels it will be more impactful to have open testimony rather than just a memo.
Mitchell: Suggested putting something together that Executive Committee and Faculty Council could vote on. Would maybe articulate some of these items and that it is mainly around process and the possibility of what can happen. Think the weight of Faculty Council behind it might be helpful as well.

Chair Doe: Thanked Mitchell for the idea. We have a history of doing that and making statements. Can maybe work on this after we get the minutes together.

Norton: Stated that the next Board meeting will be October 6th and 7th here in Fort Collins. Not sure of the room number yet.

DiVerdi: Echoed Mitchell’s suggestion for a statement. It would also be good to find out from the Board of Governors what their vision for the System is, and whether there is a vision at that level.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for the conversation. Thinks a letter would be constructive, positive, and helpful. We can work from meeting minutes to write up a statement. Asked members to let her know if they want to be involved in that.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further business, will call this meeting adjourned.

F. Discussion Items

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

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