

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, August 22, 2023
3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: **Melinda Smith**, Chair; **Joseph DiVerdi**, Vice Chair; **Andrew Norton**, BOG Representative; **Sue Doe**, Immediate Past Chair; **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; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts; **Christine Pawliuk**, Libraries; **William Sanford**, Natural Resources; **Michael Antolin**, Natural Sciences

Guests: **Susan James**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Absent: Katriana Popichak, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences (excused)

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

August 22, 2023 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

- I. Minutes to be Approved**

- II. Items Pending/Discussion Items**

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on August 29, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.

Chair Smith: Would like to discuss the format of the Executive Committee meetings. We are a relatively small group, so it may be feasible for us to meet in-person for the fall. Asked for feedback from members.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Expressed agreement that the human exchange is important. Think it is important to build up those relationships, and topics of discussion may be delicate and that being in-person facilitates those discussions.

Jennifer Martin: Fine with either format. Noted that some of us may have made class schedules and other schedules under the assumption that we would be meeting online. Suggested we start doing in-person meetings in the spring so that people can adhere to the commitments that they have already obligated themselves to.

Chair Smith: We could do hybrid meetings. Will work with Amy Barkley on whether we can make hybrid meetings happen, which would require a room that would allow us to do a meeting over Microsoft Teams. We will get back to everyone.

2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on September 5, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Smith: Reminded members that the accreditation visit will be occurring on September 18th and 19th. More information will be sent out about meetings that are relevant, particularly for faculty. We are encouraging faculty to attend those sessions because faculty input is crucial for the accreditation process.

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

Interim Provost Janice Nerger: Will plan to come to each of these meetings for at least the first 15-20 minutes. Would like to be available for any questions or comments and provide a report on what is going on from the Provost lens.

Chair Smith: Thanked Provost Nerger. Expressed appreciation for participation and input. Asked if there were any questions from the members.

Pedros-Gascon: Would like to discuss the situation of being an R1 institution with 3-2 teaching loads that was brought up in previous semesters. Would like to know if there has been any movement on this on the administration side.

Provost Nerger: Where the disagreement occurs is that this might be a college issue, not a Provost issue. The Provost does not set anyone's teaching loads. Did speak to Dean Ben Withers about this and am not sure why the College of Liberal Arts has certain departments with a 3-2 load and others with a 2-2 load. Did state that if your college says a 50% load is 2-2, then your department is not at a 50% load and is higher than that, it should be claimed as a higher load and be evaluated as such. That would at least make it fair at tenure and promotion time. Some people should then be brought lower than that and others brought higher based on productivity. Not sure why the dean or department chairs are not taking care of this, but it is not the role of the Provost to go to any department and tell them what teaching loads should be. Would be happy to receive help on this.

Pedros-Gascon: Am always happy to engage in this discussion. It seems clear that this is a financial situation, and understanding is that the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President holds the purse for these things. As the Provost, feels it is part of portfolio to try to advance equity. In this situation, there is discrimination of disciplines and faculty in the institution and feel this is more than just the chair's or dean's responsibility.

Provost Nerger: If it is a matter of budget, that is just a matter of priority, and the college has made other priority decisions. Trying to argue that your percentage is higher, because then we step in and say we are an R1 institution, and you should not be having a teaching load at that percentage. This is an argument to help you, not hinder you.

Pedros-Gascon: The offering that you seem to consider is to have administration acknowledge a bigger percentage than it currently does for our teaching. We are requesting to be treated as a part of an R1 institution, not to normalize the teaching loads of an R2 for us. That would be an

erroneous way of proceeding in this discussion. When we are asking for our teaching loads to be equated with the rest so that we can continue to be engaged and productive when it comes to our research, we are being told that rather than reducing our teaching loads administration would rather reduce our research expectations (when we were hired to work in an R1). That would continue singling us out with prejudice. We request equity.

Provost Nerger: We want numbers to reflect what you are actually doing so that we don't get the excuse that people are not being promoted on time because they are teaching too much or that you should be promoted and rewarded salary-wise based on what you are actually doing.

Andrew Norton: Noted that there are tenure-track faculty that have 3-3 loads around the University.

Vice Provost Susan James: Reminded Pedros-Gascon that Provost Nerger is not the Executive Vice President, so she does not have control of the budget.

Pedros-Gascon: This is why we have asked Executive Vice President Miranda to be engaged. Will engage with him on this at the meetings.

Provost Nerger: Am not ignoring this issue and believe in equity of effort distribution. Recognize that something is wrong.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed hope that this conversation will be happening more frequently. Intending to ask colleagues to support this discussion. Asked if Provost Nerger would be willing to come have this discussion with department.

Provost Nerger: Would be happy to sit with department.

Pedros-Gascon: Will arrange this meeting. Noted that there are three (3) departments that are experiencing this situation.

Norton: Not sure how often you get to see the budget of your college or even your department, but it does speak to that lack of transparency. Think the faculty in those departments don't see the budget and the decisions that are being made, but it might help inform the why.

Pedros-Gascon: The dean of the College of Liberal Arts inherited a situation where more departments were subject to a 3-2 teaching load and many departments have been transitioned to a 2-2. These are the last three (3) departments and due to the diverse nature of the three (3) disciplines and the financial constraints, this is something that needs to be addressed. Would be happy to engage with this at the next Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Smith: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Asked if there were any other questions or comments. Hearing none, will move on to our action items.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. Faculty Council Standing Committee 2022-2023 Annual Reports
 - a. Faculty Council Report to the Board of Governors
 - b. Committee on Faculty Governance
 - c. Committee on Information Technology
 - d. Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
 - e. Committee on Libraries (pending)
 - f. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty
 - g. Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty
 - h. Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education
 - i. Committee on Scholastic Standards
 - j. Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning
 - k. Committee on Teaching and Learning
 - l. Committee on University Programs
 - m. University Curriculum Committee

Chair Smith: Our first action item is our annual reports. Noted that we are still waiting on our report from the Committee on Libraries. Requested a motion to receive these reports and place them on the Faculty Council agenda.

Pedros-Gascon: Stated that the report from the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics is scarce and this should be stated to them. Stated that they also have John Slater's department listed incorrectly. He is listed as Economics, but Slater is from Languages, Literatures, and Cultures.

Amy Barkley: Noted that this correction will need to be requested of the chair of the committee, since we are not able to edit reports.

Norton: Recalled that we had similar issues with this report last year in its brevity. Expressed disappointment in this committee's approach to their duties, as there is an enormous amount of stuff going on locally and nationally around intercollegiate athletics that it is important for faculty to pay attention to and engage with. Think that this committee should be helping work on those topics. There is also an indication that they are taking on additional duties but not sure it is the role of the standing committees to make that decision around what their duties are.

Chair Smith: Thanked Norton for the comments. Stated that she has a meeting scheduled with the chair of this committee. Requested that these points be emailed to her.

Martin: In the spirit of fairness, suggested that we create a rubric or framework for the standing committee reports since there is turnover in chairs, because there may be people who do not know what they are doing. This could be something we could do to ensure some level of consistency among standing committees, so they are aware of what they are required to put into their reports. It would be much easier for us to hold them accountable and point out when they are operating outside their charge or not following through on their charge. Do not think this is

something unique to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. We have seen this with other standing committees.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin. Stated that there is a rubric in the Faculty Council Procedures Manual that outlines the key elements of any reports from the standing committees. Expressed agreement that there are reports we can continue to emphasize that this rubric be followed and that it is a crucial part of the role of the standing committees to provide this report to the Faculty Council.

Chair Smith: The other point raised was about what these committees are doing and whether they fall within the purview of their procedures and charge. Happy to engage with each of these committees as the chair and remind them of their charge and have a conversation about why or why not they may be doing all the things within their purview or outside their purview.

Martin: As the chair of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, this is something we are struggling with right now. When we think about how people are put on these committees, they often do not know the work they are signing up to do. There is an inherent challenge in this. There is service to Faculty Council and the standing committees, and many enjoy it, but there are others that may view this as a sentence versus an opportunity. We often see people becoming chairs of these committees that may have been on the committee with a chair that hasn't kept them on task. Have experienced this personally during turnover on committees. They rely on the chair to express the charge and we are seeing some challenges.

Norton: Asked if the issue with this particular report from the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics was brought to their attention last year.

Sue Doe: Yes, this was communicated to the chair of the committee. Reminded members that at the time, they had also submitted a letter of complaint about the perception that Faculty Council is anti-athletics. There was an effort to discuss this. Given all that is happening with intercollegiate athletics, such as name, image, likeness, and the transfer portal, having a report on these topics from this committee seems appropriate.

Chair Smith: Thanked Doe. We could consider pulling this report and not accepting it and can meet with the chair to talk about these concerns.

Martin: There is a notion that there is a negative perception of athletics across Faculty Council, as well as knowing the impact that has on our student athletes if there is this perception that the campus governing body does not support their activities. Think it would be helpful to address this perception, because we know that we do not have a negative view of athletics. Even this perception is harmful to students, so finding ways we can improve this relationship is important.

Chair Smith: Expressed agreement. Asked Executive Committee members what the best way to move forward with these reports would be.

Norton: Suggested deferring all the reports to the October meeting. Noted that we may be more time-constrained in October.

Chair Smith: If we defer, that will give us time to get the Committee on Libraries report as well.

Norton: Moved that we do not accept these reports and that the Chair communicates with those committees that have reports that need to be amended. It does not serve our goals to have these reports in front of Faculty Council, because we are tacitly accepting them, and if we don't deal with it now, feels it wouldn't be appropriate to have it happen on the floor of Faculty Council.

Joseph DiVerdi: Seconded Norton's motion.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Eight yes, one no.

Motion to defer annual reports to October Faculty Council meeting approved. Chair Smith will communicate with those chairs whose reports require amending.

2. University Benefits Committee Annual Report 2022-2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any discussion regarding the University Benefits Committee annual report. Hearing none, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda for September 5th.

Martin: Moved.

DiVerdi: Seconded.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

3. Approval of Degree Candidates

Chair Smith: Requested a motion to place this item on the Faculty Council agenda.

DiVerdi: Moved.

Sharon Anderson: Seconded.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

4. Proposed Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Admissions Requirements and Procedures, "Application: U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents" – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – William Sanford, Chair

William Sanford: Will speak to all three (3) of these motions. These are related to what students need to turn in for their applications. The changes include making the option of only including two (2) references, as well as the option of making decisions based only on the unofficial transcripts. The other major change was to let those people with GPAs lower than a 2.8 GPA to be admitted. A final change was to add Duolingo as part of the language test. Directed members' attention to the white paper attached describing these changes.

Sanford: It appears that the two (2) references and the unofficial transcript are relatively common in other places. Departments can also make their own decisions and state that they want the three (3) letters of reference and official transcripts.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: In the second memo, on page 71 of the agenda packet, it talks about scores of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and International English Language testing systems, etc. Question is whether when the CSU graduate program is taught in the student's native language if the requirement for this testing will be waived.

Sanford: Understanding is that this language was there before, so not sure of the details of that.

Chair Smith: If this gets approved for the Faculty Council agenda, am sure that Dean Colleen Webb will be attending the meeting, and this could be asked then.

DiVerdi: Asked if Pedros-Gascon could ask this question directly from Dean Webb prior to the Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Smith: Indicated this would not be a problem.

Sanford: Would be happy to forward concerns from Pedros-Gascon. Requested that Pedros-Gascon send him an email clarifying concerns to be passed along.

Doe: Thanked Sanford. The rationale was provided for all three (3) Graduate and Professional Bulletin revisions. Requested a motion to place this first proposed revision on the Faculty Council agenda.

Martin: Moved.

Chair Smith: Reminded members that no second is needed for items coming from standing committees. Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will appear on the Faculty Council agenda for September 5th.

5. Proposed Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Admissions Requirements and Procedures, "Application: International Students" – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – William Sanford, Chair

Chair Smith: Asked for a motion to place this second proposed revision on the Faculty Council agenda.

Norton: Moved.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

6. Proposed Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Admissions Requirements and Procedures, “Access Admission Pathway” – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – William Sanford, Chair

Sanford: Noted that an updated version of this motion was sent by email earlier today.

Chair Smith: Thanked Sanford. Asked for a motion to place this third proposed revision on the Faculty Council agenda.

DiVerdi: Moved.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Have had the chance to attend the Cabinet meeting, the Provost Leadership Council, and will be attending the Executive Leadership Team. Will plan to provide an overview of key takeaways from those meetings next week.

Chair Smith: At our Executive Committee retreat, we discussed some priorities for Executive Committee for this year. One of the priorities we can possibly put forward fairly quickly is this idea of term limits on committees. Would suggest that we talk to Steve Reising to explore this idea of term limits. Not sure if we want to discuss this as an Executive Committee or just have the Committee on Faculty Governance discuss this amongst themselves and bring their thoughts back to us.

Doe: Stated that this idea of term limits was discussed several years ago, and we were discouraged from pursuing this idea. The rationale was that there is difficulty in getting people to serve. Expressed agreement that this can sometimes mean people are there too long.

Chair Smith: For example, Faculty Council leadership has a term limit, so we can be proactive and figure out what the next steps are. If our committees had a similar set-up, they would find a way forward.

Pedros-Gascon: Believe we can also make the distinction between being a member and being the chair. We want to have this institutional knowledge transmitted, so chairs of these committees can continue being members as a way of facilitating transitions.

DiVerdi: Expressed agreement with Pedros-Gascon. Suggested putting longer limits or proposing a time limit that balances the difficulty in getting someone to serve versus the need for rotation and institutional knowledge.

Chair Smith: Think we could try again.

Chair Smith: Have been approached by Executive Vice President Rick Miranda with a request that Faculty Council create two task forces. The first would be addressing the idea of interdisciplinary undergraduate degrees, and the second task force would be around the program proposal process.

Rob Mitchell: Stated that he and Martin were selected by Executive Vice President Miranda as Presidential Fellows around these very topics. We have had conversations around this. If the budget model is changing to be more innovative and dynamic, but we do not have the systems to enable that, it is not worth doing anything to change and try to understand it with a better budget model. One of the values expressed by CU at the meeting where they brought us their process was being more nimble, dynamic, and innovative. They had seen a number of new programs and opportunities after going through their budget model. When we start talking about big changes and responding to the market, we need to make sure that our systems support that. Think we were invited to sit in on these discussions as members of Executive Committee and Faculty Council so we can provide voices to those perspectives.

Martin: Think this is just part of a larger conversation in the ways we can address infrastructure challenges to innovation and nimbleness that we currently do not have.

Mitchell: Think a lot of people are assuming that there is something baked within the budget model. There will be lots of listening and engaging, but we need to make sure that multiple conversations are going on, so we have the information, opportunities, and engagement around lots of topics, such as the course/program approval process.

Chair Smith: Think this is a key place for faculty to have a voice in these curricular decisions. Will be advocating for a task force to look at best practices around these topics. Feels it may also be good to have Martin and Mitchell update Faculty Council on this.

Martin: Regardless of where we land on budget, the CIM process should be evaluated, because we have seen the length of time it takes to get programs approved. A working group or something to examine the opportunities or efficiencies we may gain would be helpful. Things we

might see from these budget conversations is the identification of pain points with the current model and exploring other models out there and figuring out where we land.

DiVerdi: Think it is very important for Faculty Council to be front and center in these discussions. Expressed concern about Executive Committee members being used as Presidential Fellows and becoming less responsive to Faculty Council.

Martin: We will see working groups come out of this budget remodel process and certainly Faculty Council will be involved in those.

Chair Smith: Asked if it was possible to have an additional report from Martin and Mitchell around the budget model, even if it is short.

Martin: Noted that Executive Vice President Miranda is coming to Executive Committee next week to give an update on the process. We have had some listening sessions with other universities and consultants over the summer, but now that everyone is back here, the listening sessions on campus are just beginning.

Chair Smith: Maybe we could start after the next Faculty Council meeting.

Mitchell: Would like to address DiVerdi's statements. Given our interactions, the way we view this is that there are a lot of changes in higher education and the underlying rationale for doing this is to ensure CSU's viability and success in the future. This happens collectively. It isn't an administration versus faculty situation. We are all dependent on students coming every year and filling the seats.

Anderson: There are parts of CSU that seem financially healthy and other parts that do not. Wondering if there is an overall CSU issue.

Norton: Asked: Do you mean just CSU Fort Collins, or the CSU System?

Sharon: Talking about CSU System.

Norton: Not sure about the system level. At the Fort Collins level, there are some places that are healthier than others, but everybody is pretty strapped. We have also seen CSU Global revenues go down, and System reserves are down. It is a constantly changing picture, but at the last budget forum, Vice President Brendan Hanlon seemed to imply that the CSU System budget was separate from CSU Fort Collins, even though that could change any time. There are certainly flows to keep an eye on.

Pedros-Gascon: Think there needs to be a holistic understanding of the institution. Provided example of format of delivery, which might be helpful for some disciplines and not for others. If the revenue is not helping the institution as a whole, then there are big impacts because not all areas of the institution can relate the same way to a situation. Expressed concern about the new budget formats and that a new one might try to reward areas that are thriving financially and produce a big detriment for departments who have specific needs for teaching that do not have

the capacity. Expressed concern at the impacts these kinds of decisions will have on our academic units down the line.

Mitchell: Executive Vice President Miranda will talk more about this, but currently there is talk about principles and understanding the underlying principles. There is one term called subvention, which is understood as being that the cost of delivering programs that are important to the university are going to be higher than the revenue that is associated with it. A lot of these listening sessions will be helping to understand how we want to do this, and that is why there is value in looking at the overall university. It comes to down to having a system that enables us to make things better for the whole university, which then makes things better for the individual departments, faculty members, and students.

Martin: Want to acknowledge that the concerns we are hearing are valid. That is why it is important to engage in this process. This has the opportunity to be transformational for our university and the only way that works is if we all come to the table with the benefit of the entire university in mind.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed hope that the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning will play an active role in these discussions.

Mitchell: That has been the case so far and will continue.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: We mentioned that the accreditation meetings are coming up. It is important that we participate in that. We also have the Provost interviews coming up, where Executive Committee will get to meet with the candidates.

Norton: We had a Board of Governors retreat in August. We are finishing our strategic plan for the next five (5) or 6 (6) years. We have topics under student success, which is broadly defined as not just graduation rates, but also graduation rates by traditional and non-traditional gaps. We are also looking at campus collaborations, which is largely focused on increasing the efficiency of our operations. WE also discussed land-grant and accessibility, which is both agriculture and the traditional land-grant mission. We are focused on accessibility in terms of keeping campus affordable as well as accessible. The fourth area is around innovation and how we promote innovation on campus as well as the system to embrace the changing landscape both with teaching and our research mission. With the changing landscape, we are also looking at how we deliver and how we remain financially stable with external pressures. The fifth area is around healthy campuses, which encompasses the mental, physical, and financial health of our students, staff, and faculty.

Norton: We also got the changes approved for shared governance language in the Manual. Expressed appreciation to all those that worked on that language over the last several years, as we now have a bit more definition on what shared governance actually means. We talk about shared governance with the Board of Governors at every opportunity. Believe they are beginning to understand what the concept means.

Norton: We have also discussed some money things. CSU Global is not bringing in as much money as they used to, and they are set up as a non-profit that generates revenue for the Board of Governors. In their charter, they have a target percentage of the revenue that they will return to the Board of Governors from the tuition that doesn't go to paying instructors, administrators, or software, etc. This goes to the Board of Governors reserve, which is different from the CSU System reserve, and the Board spends this on student success, covering deficits, and other initiatives. CSU Global has to constantly make new programs and are very nimble based on what is popular and in-demand.

DiVerdi: Asked if enrollment had dropped or expenses risen for CSU Global.

Norton: Stated that enrollment has dropped and in some cases, expenses has risen because they are starting new programs and bringing new instructors on. Their President, Becky Takeda-Tinker, has been charged with analyzing their students and finances on a granular level. We are still a pioneer in the field, but there are now many other online programs.

Norton: Stated that there is nothing wild going on with the reserves, which goes up and down each day depending on what is happening with the market and investments.

Norton: We also approved the final budget in June, which included the 5% salary exercise. Expressed appreciation for everyone that worked to get that through and brought this to the attention of the Board of Governors repeatedly. One of the things that was added at the last minute was Governor Jared Polis' overall increase for higher education, and the Joint Budget Committee came back with an 11.4% increase. We had discussions late last year about how the salary exercise would be conducted as far as merit and equity. We may want to pick up that conversation again before March.

Norton: At the Board retreat in early August, a financial plan was approved for bonding for \$230 million in renovations, which includes the Veterinary Teaching Hospital. More discussion around that will be coming up.

F. Discussion Items

Pedros-Gascon: Shared [wording from University of Kansas on teaching loads](#). Requested that Executive Committee consider wording on teaching loads to ones existing at other institutions at a future meeting.

Chair Smith: Reminded members of the meeting of Executive Committee with the first Provost candidate next Monday, August 28th at 1:15 p.m.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Melinda Smith, Chair
Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair
Andrew Norton, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant