

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, September 12, 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; **William Sanford**, Natural Resources; Michael Antolin, Natural Sciences

Guests: **Susan James**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; **Brendan Hanlon**, Vice President for University Operations; **Sue VandeWoude**, Dean College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences; **Tom Siller**, Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs; **Stephanie Foster**, Director of Assessment; **Jessica Watkinson**, Administrative Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; **Richard Eykholt**, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty; **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee

Absent: Katriana Popichak, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences (excused); Christine Pawliuk, Libraries (excused)

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

September 12, 2023 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – August 29, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from August 29, 2023.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on September 19, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on October 3, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

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

No formal report today.

Vice Provost Susan James: There have been ongoing discussions around improving compensation for all our employees. Vice President Brendan Hanlon has been working hard on the budget this fiscal year and building compensation, and now the work is down to the details and drilling down to units. One of the goals was to bring administrative professionals up to \$50,000 as a minimum and then deal with the compression created by that. However, Vice President Hanlon can only work on administrative professionals who are on state appropriated funds, not ones on soft money or 5-3 sponsored funds or other non-state appropriated funds. Vice President Hanlon and Vice President Eric Ray have been going around to visit with individual deans about these plans. Thought it would be good to have a conversation about this.

Vice President Brendan Hanlon: We have spent the last ten (10) days with each vice president and each dean, because there are so many nuances with administrative professionals in different divisions and colleges. We met with each person and look at both administrative professionals who are state appropriated as well as those non-state appropriated with the state goal of the increase that needs to apply to all of our administrative professionals who meet these conditions. Stated that discussions clarified that some grants have the ability to pay while others do not, and because of that, we need input from each of the deans, vice presidents, and their Human Resources teams to indicate how they can get there and what problems exist. We would like this to apply to everyone and we want to get it out and communicate this to campus as soon as possible. The budget was approved in June and the clock is ticking.

Vice President Hanlon: We have two (2) dilemmas here. The first is the speed and pressure applied by administrative professionals who believe they are eligible and want to know what is going on. The other is the delicate process of listening to each dean and vice president about where they have their pressure points and how we try to decompress those. Our best next step is to figure out where that stress is, whether it is about the 5-3 funds or along particular service lines or areas and how we solve those.

Vice President Hanlon: We have been trying to get this answer as quickly as possible out to campus, but we need to take a bit more time to get this right. Know that employees are anxious. Want to know where the pain points are and how we can work through them together as a team.

Chair Smith: Think it is great that there is engagement with the deans. Noted that there are also individual investigators. Used personal situation as example. Have a postdoctoral fellow on a 5-3A grant where we budgeted a certain amount for the postdoc, and it is under \$50,000. We might be asking the deans, but you could also ask the individual investigators, who may tell you that there is no capacity in the grant to do this. Will have to let the person go earlier since we are paying them more, but the reality is that the funds are not available, and you budget a certain amount.

Vice President Hanlon: Those are the kinds of insights we have been trying to identify. We want to be mindful of these conversations because we do not know what all the solutions are and we do not want to mismanage expectations.

Interim Provost Janice Nerger: Indicated that each dean will have a spreadsheet and we can look at it and see where you might be short and see if the department or college can cover that shortage for however many years it is needed. Then, when grants are renewed, a higher number can be requested. If the department or college cannot cover the full cost, we need to figure out where we can get the remaining amount. This is a conversation with each person, but hopefully between the individual, college and department, we are able to cover most of these for the period of time that we will need to cover. Noted that this will happen before October 1st.

Vice Provost James: Asked if this meant that central will fund ones that the deans cannot cover.

Vice President Hanlon: The are funds that cannot be used to backfill in all circumstances, so that is the other thing we need to consider.

Provost Nerger: Each college does have some one-time funds that they could use to get us by until some of the grants can be renewed. There are other cases where we do not know what the solution will be. An example would be the Early Childhood Center.

Vice President Hanlon: We have some dilemmas like that where there might be options.

Andrew Norton: Asked: Do we have an estimate of how many millions of dollars we are short on 5-3 funded administrative professionals?

Vice President Hanlon: Would say it's in the 10s to maybe \$100,000 at the most. This is margins, which are very real in these individual circumstances, such as with Chair Smith's example. It has some particular trade-offs and that is what happens when you have a University-wide analysis, and you start cascading down the consequences.

Provost Nerger: It is not as big as you might think, but for situations like Chair Smith's, it is not small.

Sue Doe: Wondering if this has any relevance to non-academic units such as CEMML, where we have people scattered all over the world at quite varying salary levels, all of them on soft money.

Vice President Hanlon: Yes. So, we have situations like CEMML and the Early Childhood Center. We also need to understand that even if we think there is an ability to pay, there might be some exception areas where it is not about the ability to pay but the other market issues it creates. We have a mixture of challenges and we have been trying to work on methodology as well as to avoid market issues. Want to acknowledge that we have been trying to continue to refine how we deal with compensation.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: For future conversations, expressed hope that we will remember this when discussing CUPA data. When you compare CUPA data with the national average, there are some disciplines that are neglected. In this institution, because we follow the CUPA data, have a \$9,000 to \$10,000 difference in salary entrance. Think the kind of standards we are using need to be revised and be sensitive to the inequities we are introducing.

Rob Mitchell: The Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning just formed a subcommittee to look at some of these questions. Suggested keeping them in the loop so we are not working in parallel, and they can be supportive of the work being done. Last year, the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning were involved in some of the recommendations and getting people up to \$50,000. They had two (2) subcommittees, one around the budget model process and the other was on salary equity. Think this work flows from the task forces we had.

Joseph DiVerdi: Asked if this was something we wanted to bring for discussion at Faculty Council or if there is messaging we should be discussing.

Vice Provost James: Not at this point, because of Vice President Hanlon's statement earlier about managing expectations and having consistent communication. Once they are ready to communicate, bringing this to Faculty Council makes sense.

Vice President Hanlon: Would be happy to do that when we get farther along. Would like to decompress some of these issues and understand the breadth of the challenge we are facing and any exceptions.

Provost Nerger: This is not that big and we can handle a lot of it. It is just a matter of how long we can handle it, and maybe by the next fiscal year, we need a bridge, and some colleges help out other colleges. Have told the deans to get back to Vice President Hanlon by next week about how big the problem is and where they need help.

Vice President Hanlon: We are continuing to work on this. No one is ignoring this. It is unfortunately more complicated than we would like it to be, but we are taking it seriously and we have executive leadership across the University working through it right now.

DiVerdi: Suggested having a short statement prepared for Faculty Council in three (3) weeks.

Chair Smith: Thanked Vice President Hanlon for the time, as well as the information and communication around this.

C. Old Business

1. Faculty Council Task Force Request

Deferred to September 19th Executive Committee meeting.

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – August 25 & September 1, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding the University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Pedros-Gascon: In one of the minutes, there is a reference to LSPA 208. It has an edit that says “every”, but assuming this means “every semester.” Wondering if this needs to be edited.

Brad Goetz: Clarified that in the CIM system, it says “every.”

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, requested a vote to place University Curriculum Committee minutes on the Faculty Council agenda.

Motion approved. Will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for October 3rd.

2. Proposed Revisions to Section F.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Jennifer Martin: Indicated that Richard Eykholt worked over the summer on several of the recommendations that we will be presenting. The first of these is a series of revisions to Section F of the Manual. Last year, one of the task forces was focused on administrative leave. We met with Michael Antolin last year and we have a series of revisions that reflect some updated policies related to administrative leave.

Martin: The first, as we see in the agenda packet, is a revision to Section F.1., titled “Absences from Campus.” It gave the sense that employees were forbidden to not have regular office hours or unauthorized absences from campus. This was updated since it does not reflect current policy.

Richard Eykholt: This was brought to our attention by Vice Provost James, and it refers to a Board of Governors policy that no one can find. We clearly do not do this, so the simplest solution was to take it out of the Manual.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Requested confirmation that this would not negatively affect any existing faculty.

Eykholt: Cannot imagine how this would have any negative impacts.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions or comments, requested Martin make the motion.

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty move that this proposed amendment be added to the agenda of the next Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

3. Proposed Revisions to Section E.15 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: Requested that Eykholt speak to this motion.

Eykholt: Had initiated this revision through the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. We have not gone through a disciplinary hearing for many years. We have always come to some sort of resolution before the hearing. This most recent one almost came to a hearing, and in the process, it became clear that there were things that were unclear and not worded well. There were not explicit timelines in place. None of the suggested changes change current policy, they just are clarifications. It is important to get this section well-worded because Section E.15 is serious, and people need to know what to expect.

Chair Smith: Expressed appreciation for the close read of this section and efforts put into this. Asked if there were any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: One of the additions being proposed is that the hearing committee decides what witnesses will be interviewed. Fine with this idea, but curious about the process. The faculty member may propose a certain number of people to be addressed, but the hearing committee may disagree with hearing them. Wondering if they need to produce a narrative about why some people are being heard. Expressed concern about the unilateral capacity of the hearing committee to decide who gets heard without having to produce an explanation.

Eykholt: We could certainly add language indicating that the hearing committee needs to explain their choice. Asked if it would help to have the statement include that the hearing committee will justify the decision in writing.

Martin: Think “explain” versus “justify” would make sense. Will make the modification in the document and send to Amy Barkley.

Chair Smith: Asked: Where would the written justification go?

Eykholt: Think it would go to the University Grievance Officer. We will make that edit.

Pedros-Gascon: Would also like to know that the information will be shared with the affected individual.

Eykholt: Will add a sentence clarifying that the explanation from the hearing committee will be shared with the tenured faculty member.

Norton: It is implied in this section that the hearing committee will consult with the faculty member and with the supervisor around calling witnesses. Asked if this is something we need to clarify.

Eykholt: The process is that both sides are asked to suggest witnesses and rationale for those witnesses.

Norton: Section E.15 is becoming complicated and is a tough read. Wondering what the most expeditious way would be to bring this in front of Faculty Council, given the last time we brought this section in front of them. It was a very long discussion.

Eykholt: The last time we brought this to Faculty Council, it was a long discussion about one particular issue. It could happen here with these changes.

Chair Smith: Thanked Norton for the comment. It is noted. Asked if there were any other questions or comments. Requested that Martin make the motion.

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty moves to add these revisions to Section E.15 to the October Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

Eykholt: Indicated that there were updates regarding Section J. The Office of General Counsel came back with suggestions, which were discussed with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. The committee made some revisions and sent them back to them. Eventually got a meeting after ten (10) weeks, and now it has been six (6) weeks and we are getting no response. Wondering if we should discuss moving forward without a response. The other revision we are considering is about administrative leave and putting on some guardrails and restrictions. The Office of General Counsel has stated that they oppose any guardrails, and it sounds like they want to have the absolute authority. They have not gotten back about a meeting regarding that. Again, at some point, we may want to just send this forward. Expressed frustration with the lack of response.

Pedros-Gascon: Stated that we need to embrace administrative silence as part of shared governance. It is unacceptable that we are being delayed. Think it is time to start moving documents forward if they are sent on a deadline. Feels having them put items on the back burner for months or years at a time is unacceptable.

Sharon: Have had little exposure to their unwillingness to communicate with people on campus but find it abhorrent that they can feel the freedom not to respond to issues.

Michael Antolin: With administrative leave, the task force sent the Office of General Counsel a series of specific questions, and then we put our report out and they indicated they would get back to us, which they have yet to do. Would like to come up with a plan for how to address this.

Martin: Indicated that Doe suggested in the chat that we bring the Office of General Counsel to Executive Committee. If we do bring items to Faculty Council, the Office of General Counsel still has to review them before they go to the Board of Governors, and it ends up in this cycle. It

is really a waste of time if we do not have a proactive relationship with them on the front end. Relative to Section J, they had made it clear that their desire was to wait for the new Vice President for Research to be in place, so by delaying, they are getting to do that.

Mitchell: Think it would be good for us to reach out to them and try to convey where we are coming from. There could be the intention for delay for the Vice President for Research, or it could be that they are running lean and have a lot on their plate. Know that a lot of administrative groups are understaffed, but making our expectations known could be helpful.

Pedros-Gascon: Understand the points being made, but if we present these items to Faculty Council and they have not reviewed them, there are consequences. Think we need to convey the situation and if they do not respond, we assume they have no issues with the item.

Eykholt: Do not want to equate the Office of General Counsel and administration. The administration is not necessarily putting up roadblocks, it is the Office of General Counsel that is not doing things. They are also not as understaffed as they used to be, so that is not a good excuse anymore. With regard to sending things to the Board of Governors, the Office of General Counsel cannot stop that. They advise administration on items to take to the Board, and they make recommendations to the Board whether to approve things, so they have power and influence. There is always the possibility of the administration being okay with something that the Office of General Counsel is not, because the priorities are different.

DiVerdi: Asked: Where does the Office of General Counsel report to?

Vice Provost James: They do not work for the University, they work for the governor and the Board of Governors.

Chair Smith: Think there will need to be multiple strategies for this. Like Pedros-Gascon's suggestion that we provide a timeline for response and assume we can move ahead if they do not meet the timeline. There is also an issue of getting in a continuous circle, but not sure how else we can move forward with these items that need to be done. Would be happy to reach out to the Office of General Counsel to meet with them as leadership of Faculty Council and emphasize to them how important their engagement is and that we appreciate their involvement, while also indicating that we have our own priorities.

Martin: Want to also acknowledge the person cost with this process, with how much time Eykholt has spent going back and forth with them. Know it has affected Barkley as well. Think that is a piece that is often unseen by those of us in this space, with the amount of time that is spent just trying to solicit a response.

Chair Smith: Thanked everyone for the conversation.

Eykholt: Stated that Section J is on the agenda for the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty for this coming Thursday, September 14th. We will see what the committee says but believe something can be sent forward fairly quickly. The administrative leave revisions are still in the early stages.

Chair Smith: Think we have a way forward and we are looking forward to seeing Section J again. Thanked everyone.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Attended the budget retreat last week, which was basically a report on expenditures by each unit and college. They will be posting these slides and presentations on their website. Will let everyone know when those are posted. It is not clear what the next step is, but there was a lot of information. Encouraged members to go check out those materials. Will keep everyone posted on any other developments.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: Sat in on the Administrative Professional Council meeting yesterday, which was informative. Athletic Director Joe Parker spoke and provided a lot of information. We should think about inviting Athletic Director Parker to Faculty Council to talk about name, image, likeness, transfer portal, realignment, TV budget, the future of college athletics. It was an interesting presentation.

3. Budget Model Update – Rob Mitchell & Jennifer Martin

Martin: We are working collectively with Executive Vice President Rick Miranda, Vice President Hanlon, Angela Nielsen, and Vice President Kyle Henley, as well as Pam Jackson in the Provost's Office, to develop a communication plan to get information to a broader audience. Once we get that finalized, we will start announcing the series of listening sessions to occur over the month of October, and we will certainly have Executive Vice President Miranda come to Faculty Council next month. We will have a whole suite of communications to standing committees and the employee councils, as well as opportunities for listening and learning from the campus community at large. They are being really intentional and trying to provide multiple opportunities for feedback.

Mitchell: We are at the point of getting things coordinated, a lot of it coordination of meeting schedules. Something to expect soon is the overarching Executive Leadership Committee of this will be formed soon and then these other committees, which are being informed by what other universities have done. This will be forthcoming about who is on which committee.

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any sense whether they would have Faculty Council leadership on the Executive Leadership Committee.

Mitchell: It is likely you will be asked to participate. We have a meeting this week about that. We are advocating to make sure that Faculty Council is involved on these various committees. We have advocated for deans to be represented, as well as the financial officers. We want to make sure we have a lot of representation.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin and Mitchell for the updates and the time and effort being put into this. Thanked them for advocating for Faculty Council.

F. Discussion Items

1. Administrative Professional Salary Increase Discussion – Dean Sue VandeWoude, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

Chair Smith: Clarified that Vice President Hanlon was here earlier to provide context on this discussion.

Dean Sue VandeWoude: The synopsis from our meetings last week is that one of the biggest issues is that there is not obvious messaging that we should be using with our faculty. We have over eighty (80) faculty supervising different administrative professionals. We are still working through all the data of what this will mean for different accounts. Quite a few are on our Veterinary Medicine auxiliary accounts who were hired recently. Will be meeting with Vice President Hanlon and Vice President Eric Ray. We have not really communicated to our faculty and our business officers stated they cannot do anything about this, so the college will need to find a way to provide the resources on an abbreviated timescale. While in agreement with the concept that we need to raise these individuals to \$50,000, it has been nerve-wracking how this has been rolled out. Understand there may be stress on individual faculty members with specific grants.

Vice Provost James: Vice President Hanlon does want to hear from all the deans about what they can and cannot do. He is trying to be responsive and quick for all the administrative professionals who are asking where their raises are while also recognizing the difficulties.

Norton: It was mentioned that many of these people were hired recently. Wondering about messaging to the faculty that hired them, because we have been hearing about the \$50,000 minimum granted on Executive Committee for a few years.

Dean VandeWoude: We are looking at our A1 level and people being paid at that level are often recent graduates and move on to a different level after a year. Do not think there will be pushback from people if we say the floor needs to move, but there are going to be some compression issues with that. Want to emphasize that it is not the concept we are discussing here, it is not moving on it so quickly that the repercussions are not anticipated. Indicated that the messaging around this was not very helpful.

Chair Smith: When first hearing about this, had questions about people on grants, which did not seem like a consideration at the time. We want people to be at \$50,000, but there are also the limitations of individual grants. It seems there are still a lot of unknowns about how this will be handled. Have a suspicion it will be individual faculty members and grants that will need to absorb these costs, which will take away from other aspects of the grant. Think they will need to message this carefully or that there will be some other bridge funding, which may be a burden on the departments or colleges.

Provost Nerger: There might also be money that can be traded because there is an issue on what kind of money can be used. A grant could potentially cover it, but then a department could give different kinds of money to help purchase some of the things the grant would have been able to cover.

Dean VandeWoude: That does put the burden back on the department. It is not an insignificant amount. If we had known six (6) months ago in July, we could have been doing some planning and figuring out how to cost share amongst us, and now it is very sudden.

Provost Nerger: Wondering if you should come back and indicate that you could make this happen in January. Then we can come back and work to get you to January somehow, but they will want those raises at the same time as everyone else. Also noted that even if some colleges have the money, they may not have the Human Resources capacity to do this.

Vice Provost James: Think one of the lessons learned is that the communication needs to be earlier, even if we are controlling the communication to a small group, such as the deans.

Dean VandeWoude: Think there is limited understanding of the accounts and how it all works, as well as the culture.

Mitchell: Think that communication moving forward will be helpful. Part of the conversation should also be articulating that there are some elements here of shared governance and that we want to do this and work together and collaborate as best we can.

Dean VandeWoude: Think it is important to get to the Human Resources people in the college level, because they are the ones we go to for salary ranges for positions.

Provost Nerger: This started with the AON project that attempted to put administrative professionals into categories and figure out what the salary structure should be. It took years and it did not go anywhere. There was always this promise that we were going to do something with administrative professional salaries, so now we are thinking that we could at least do something for those at the lowest end. It is the end result we want, but working on how we get there.

Chair Smith: Thanked Dean VandeWoude for coming and sharing perspective.

2. AUCC 1C Discussion – Tom Siller, Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs & Stephanie Foster, Director of Assessment

Interim Vice Provost Tom Siller: We wanted to visit Executive Committee to discuss some of our plans our AUCC 1C. AUCC 1C exists now and we have had some committees put together that provided good recommendations for us. What we are trying to do now with the Office of the Provost is to implement these recommendations in a reasonable manner. We also want to make sure that it is consistent with the Faculty Council objectives with all this.

Vice Provost Siller: The report recommended that we put together a committee that will review courses for AUCC 1C, in parallel before it goes or while it is going through the University

Curriculum Committee. The University Curriculum Committee looks at the integrity of the course in terms of content, and the report indicates we should create a committee that will review these courses to make sure the content is consistent with the learning objectives set out by the Faculty Council for AUCC 1C. We are working to arrange this committee. Do not believe this should be another subcommittee of Faculty Council. We would like several of the college curriculum committee chairs to be on the committee for their expertise on curriculum review, as well as individuals who are engaged with DEI efforts on campus.

Vice Provost Siller: What we have done so far is draft a webpage that will include resources for faculty members in the implementation, such as examples of syllabi. We will also provide a submission location for faculty so they can submit their materials for review by this committee. The goal is to have a template form so that if the committee approves it, it can show that the course is approved for AUCC 1C that will be documented in the CIM system. When the University Curriculum Committee approves the course, they can see that all the documents are there and it can be approved for 1C and moved forward.

Vice Provost Siller: There are also recommendations that courses in AUCC 3E that are being moved into 1C be reviewed at some point to ensure they are consistent. Goal is to put together a schedule to go through those in some manner. We want to walk through those carefully to make sure they stay in 1C and after that, we will look at the education abroad components to make sure they are consistent.

Chair Smith: Thanked Vice Provost Siller. Asked if there were any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: On the day we discussed AUCC 1C in Faculty Council, one of the points we discussed was around the word “domestic” and that it was considered to be inappropriate. We also discussed the possibility of having courses taught in Spanish for 1C. Would like to know whether that is still the understanding. Offered himself or a colleague to be on the committee.

Vice Provost Siller: Was not present for these discussions since it was prior to appointment in this position. Noted that they are working off the official document that was approved by Faculty Council, which does include the “domestic” piece. We are also not trying to change anything regarding the request for courses being taught in a language other than English. That is really a Faculty Council and University Curriculum Committee decision. If they decide that CSU can offer courses taught in other languages, we have no problem with it. There is nothing prohibiting that, so we will not stand in the way.

Stephanie Foster: Stated that only four (4) courses have gone through the process and been approved for AUCC 1C. There is not currently any momentum on course development. Have been speaking with Doe as Director of the Institute of Learning and Teaching about creating some opportunities for peer support through community of practice so faculty can have the opportunity to develop courses specifically for AUCC 1C or adapt courses from 3E to meet the 1C learning outcomes. Think there is a lot of interest in that. We would like to create enthusiasm and to support faculty development in creating or adapting robust courses that would fit in that category.

Vice Provost Siller: A motivation for creating the website is because we want to have the connection to the resources that will exist on campus. Have been working with associate teams to encourage them to have their faculty start developing these courses, but we have not had the resources around for them to support them. We are working on that.

Norton: Noted that in the motion that passed in Faculty Council, a guidance committee was included. The guidance committee would only guide, and the University Curriculum Committee would go through the regular process, and the standards they use are the standards in the catalog. Do not see any prohibitions around language that the course can be taught in. Wondering if the timeline of 2024 is still the plan for rolling all of this over.

Vice Provost Siller: We do have a plan for the website to be live this semester, with links to all the resources so that we can move forward as quick as possible. We also have a draft of the committee and am working with Andrea Duffy around putting this committee together around the guidance. In terms of 2024, we would like to see this happen, but as Foster pointed out, we have very few new courses. Everything is existing pushovers from 3E, which is not a healthy approach to 1C. What we need to do is get the mechanisms in place that will encourage faculty.

Norton: The implementation committee really emphasized that the guidance committee would provide formative feedback and guidance to faculty as they moved forward.

Vice Provost Siller: Think that is still the case, and we will work with Foster and Doe to make sure there are resources for them.

Chair Smith: Know a lot of people are happy to see that this is moving forward. Thanked Vice Provost Siller and Foster for coming and providing this information.

3. Active Shooter/Emergency Preparedness Discussion

Martin: We talked about this last year after the Michigan State shooting and now there has been a more recent shooting at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. Have been having conversations in department and college about what we are doing as a campus, especially as faculty on campus, to prepare our colleagues for an active shooter situation. While most of our students have been in a generation where they have received this training, the average faculty member has not. Think this is something people are increasingly wanting more support, guidance, and preparedness around. Know that it was mentioned that CSU Police offers active shooter training. Wondering if we want to engage with them about doing this again for our campus community. Think we should be proactive in having conversations about this.

Vice Provost James: Wondered if they offer this training anymore.

Martin: Believe you have to request it on an individual basis. Suggested leaning into this and working with the Office of the Provost to encourage deans to have trainings for their colleges, as their capacity is limited, and the CSU Police Department does not have enough to train the entire campus.

Vice Provost James: Suggested that we start with the Campus Safety Office, because it is true that the capacity is not there. The active shooter training also only covers if you are in a room on campus and not all the other stuff.

Martin: Would like to make sure that any training be inclusive of graduate students, because of their work in late-night labs and proctoring exams and other high-stress situations where faculty might not be present.

Vice Provost James: The other group we might contact is the Public Safety Team with Marc Barker. This might be a good agenda item.

Martin: Offered to reach out to these groups.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin for reaching out to those groups. We will wait to hear more about what we can do with that.

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any other business for the good of the order. Indicated that the Chancellor's Office has agreed to fund the Presidential survey, so we are working on next steps for that.

Pedros-Gascon: Requested that we have a discussion about teaching loads based on the document from the University of Kansas previously shared with the committee.

Executive Committee determined that this discussion should originate with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty first before coming to Executive Committee. Martin agreed to connect with Pedros-Gascon to discuss this in October.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

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