

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, September 19, 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 Neger**, 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; **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Richard Eykholt**, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty; **Jessica Watkinson**, Office of the Provost

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

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

September 19, 2023 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Faculty Council Minutes – September 5, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from September 5th.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

B. Executive Committee Minutes – September 12, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from September 12th.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on September 26, 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.

3. [Budget Open Forum](#) – October 18, 2023 – Lory Student Center
386/Zoom

Chair Smith: Another budget open forum will be held on October 18th in the Lory Student Center. Directed members' attention to the SOURCE article.

Andrew Norton: Asked if the open forum would be about the budget model or an incremental budget update.

Jennifer Martin: Clarified that this would be on the incremental budget and not related to the new budget model.

Rob Mitchell: It will be helpful for people to understand how the incremental budget works, so they have an idea of our current system and how these conversations are emerging with respect to the current system.

Vice Provost Susan James: Part of why this is important is that with the incremental budget, we now have to reassess what we planned now that we know our real enrollment numbers and what tuition revenues are.

Martin: There are plans we will be announcing soon for opportunities to provide feedback relative to the new budget model and that process. We are working to finalize some of those dates, hopefully in the next week or so.

Chair Smith: Requested that it be considered to have these announcements not rely completely on SOURCE for dissemination. There is a possibility that some people will not get this information. Suggested the utilization of email as well to get this information out to the campus community.

Mitchell: We just had a meeting with Pam Jackson, who is helping with communications there. Jackson has a vision for this and has met with the CU people who did communications to see what they did there. Expressed confidence in Jackson's ability to make sure the communication is well done.

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

Interim Provost Janice Nerger: We turned in our reports for the first Board of Governors meeting, which is taking place the first week of October. Part of that report is an enrollment report. Total enrollment is down 0.4%, so slightly down, with our total resident instruction enrollment at 27,833. Our non-resident instruction is up 5.5%. If we look at our first-year students coming back to their second year, we often lose 15-20% of those students. When we look at a breakdown of racially minoritized, first-generation, and non-resident students, we lose more. We have been putting a lot of effort in the past few years into these populations and trying to improve that second-year retention, and we have found great results this year. We are overall 1.4 points higher in our retention rates, which is the largest single-year increase on record for CSU. With our racially minoritized, we see the gap as actually 2.5 points up. For non-residents,

the gap is 1.7 points, and first-generation is 1.1 points. Although we still have the gap, we have seen those gaps decrease.

Provost Nerger: The size of the entering class was 5,300 students, which is about 200 less than last year's class, which was the largest class in our history. We had hoped we could retain that high level, but we are down. This does mean that the tuition levels that we counted on being higher are lower. Indicated that Vice President Brendan Hanlon was conservative with estimates, so we will not see a huge hit with that reduction. We will be asked by the Board of Governors why we think we are down, because this is a 5% decrease from the Fall of 2022. Indicated that the demographics of the class are relatively the same, with 60% resident, 29% racially minoritized, 25% first-generation, and 9% rural Colorado students, which is up from 7%. Graduation rates have increased overall. We will also have a student success presentation, which will be presented to Faculty Council in November.

Norton: The increase in rural students seems huge, almost a 20% increase year over year.

Provost Nerger: It is good news. The Board of Governors focuses on rural students, so we will be highlighting this information. We will also be highlighting our student success metrics to closing that gap and getting first-year students to their second year, which is an achievement as well.

Norton: Asked if there was information on which colleges or majors the rural students were going to.

Provost Nerger: We do not have the breakdown yet, because we are working off preliminary census data. The college that brought the greatest in overall enrollment, not just in new students, was the College of Business, with an increase of 8%, which is 237 students. We do not have the breakdown by colleges yet, but we will soon.

Chair Smith: Asked if there will be information on what counties the rural students are coming from.

Provost Nerger: Yes, we will have that, but this is just preliminary data. We do not currently have it broken down that way, but we will get that information.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Asked if there was any way to track how many of these students are native speakers of Spanish.

Provost Nerger: Not sure if we track that, but that is a good question. The report does not indicate we do, but this is a summary, so cannot say with certainty that we do not. Will make a note of that and suggest we collect that information. We do collect it for international students, but we could collect it for all our students.

Pedros-Gascon: Feels it would make sense to start tracking that data, given our aspirations to be a Hispanic-Serving Institution.

Provost Nerger: Expressed agreement. Will pass this idea along.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions, thanked Provost Nerger for being here.

C. Old Business

1. Faculty Council Task Force Request

Chair Smith: This is a request that we have received from Courtney Schultz, who is the Director of the Climate Change Initiative, Provost Nerger, Executive Vice President Miranda, and interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs Tom Siller. The main question they are hoping this task force will address is what kind of models we could employ to create interdisciplinary undergraduate majors. Right now, there are limitations because we can only house majors in single colleges, given the way to do business at CSU. Would like to have a discussion about this and potentially envision the makeup of the task force, so we can move forward with getting people appointed.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern about moving faculty out of departments, such as what is happening with PLACE moving out of the English department. Expressed concern about the reduction of faculty rights that occurs when we move people out of the protection of departments.

Provost Nerger: We could look at this and come up with a solution that does not require faculty to move around, such as creating an interdisciplinary college or having a structure similar to the Graduate School. As part of this task force, you could speak to what you are talking against here. Understand that many colleges have interdisciplinary colleges, but that was not necessarily what we had in mind.

Vice Provost James: Think the whole point of the task force is to discuss all these things and determine what structures make sense to avoid disenfranchising and disempowering faculty, among other things. Do not believe there are any preconceived notions, which is why we encouraged Schultz to bring this to Faculty Council. Think we need Faculty Council to decide what makes sense for doing these types of interdisciplinary undergraduate degrees from a structural point of view. We know that our future holds more of these types of interdisciplinary degrees, so we want to work through how we do that and hold on to our principles that are important to us.

Provost Nerger: We want to make it easy for faculty to come up with these ideas and encourage them. Love the idea of the Office of the Provost working with Faculty Council to form these sorts of committees to get people thinking and talking together in the early stages of the process. Members do not necessarily have to be on Faculty Council, but we want to get Faculty Council on right away thinking about these things.

Mitchell: Think getting these conversations going soon as we are revisiting the budget model will be helpful, because you cannot separate the budget component of this. Some of the tricky issues around this will be how these kinds of programs are budgeted and where the money flows.

Chair Smith: In previous conversations, believe there was agreement among Executive Committee that we should form this task force. Would like to discuss potential members and

who we think would be good to include on this task force. The letter suggested three people, which are the Director of the Honors Program Shawn Bingham, as well as Courtney Schultz, and then Sarah Badding, who is involved with the proposed Design Thinking Degree, which is an interdisciplinary program. Think it would make sense to have representation from all colleges because we want to be able to think holistically. It might also make sense to involve someone from the Graduate School, given their experience doing this at the graduate level. We could also think about dean representation. We do not want to make this task force too large, but we want to make sure that stakeholders are present and able to represent their constituents.

Sharon Anderson: Nominated Kelly McKenna from the School of Education. McKenna has training in adult education, as well as being the code director for the Center for Analytics of Learning and Teaching with James Folkestad.

Mitchell: Suggested Scott Shrake from the Institute for Entrepreneurship. They do a lot of cross-campus initiatives.

Norton: Suggested either the director of the Cell & Molecular Biology program or the Graduate Degree Program in Ecology, since they may be familiar with what is working well and not working so well with their interdisciplinary programs. Suggested keeping the task force to nine (9) or ten (10) people so that it does not become challenging.

Martin: There is a lot of work and interest in this space across the entire campus. Want to be mindful of including people who are not as necessarily well-connected as others who have been mentioned so that we can have new voices introduced into this conversation.

Provost Nerger: Suggested thinking of this as a launching committee and get people together to think about the big issues and then widen it to people who are interested in designing these programs. Expressed agreement that this is a campus-wide issue, but do not think we want thirty (30) people discussing this at the initial stages. We see this as a staged approach and the task force would be a first step.

Chair Smith: Asked if Sue Doe could speak to experience creating task forces and what is the most effective way of getting good representation for these task forces.

Sue Doe: The earlier task forces might have been more managed or considered by faculty as opposed to people serving in other roles, but not sure if there was something distinctive. The basic strategy was to seek out faculty first to get some interest from faculty members with expertise in the areas that may have something to offer. Those were largely either self-nominated or nominated by other people. Expressed agreement that there should be people in the room who understand these obstacles and there has also been a fair amount of interdisciplinary effort.

Chair Smith: It sounds like we could use a hybrid approach with these. We know some people who have expertise, like the Office of the Registrar, but we could put out a call to the different college representatives. Like the idea of drawing upon not just people in the know.

Chair Smith: We will form this task force. We have recommendations for people that should be included. Will write up a summary of this, as well as who we have determined should be

included, and will send to Executive Committee to make sure we have not missed anyone and get additional nominations or suggestions. Then we can put out a call to faculty members from different colleges and ask for people to self-nominate.

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – September 8, 2023

Brad Goetz: Move that we place the minutes of the University Curriculum Committee from September 8th on the Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Smith: Thanked Goetz. Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will appear on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3rd as part of the consent agenda.

2. TILT Annual Report 2022-2023

Doe: Last year was the first year that the Institute for Learning and Teaching produced an annual report that looks like this. When we completed this report a few weeks ago, it was sent to a variety of offices on campus, including Faculty Council. This is for informational purposes.

Chair Smith: Thanked Doe. Hearing no further questions, requested a motion to place this report on the Faculty Council agenda.

Mitchell: Moved.

Norton: Seconded.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3rd as a report item.

3. Proposed Revisions to Section E.10 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: This came from Richard Eykholt in role as University Grievance Officer. Some of the biggest changes to this section reflect changes in committee size relative to the promotion and tenure committee, as well as election of a chair of that committee. Asked Eykholt to speak about the changes.

Richard Eykholt: In the last tenure and promotion process, there were several issues that came up, and it became clear that the Manual was not clear enough about policies. It is not clear who

writes reports or whether the minority and majority reports are separate or combined. It was clear that clarification was needed.

Eykholt: The most significant change was around the statement that says you have to have a committee of three (3) people, and that led to some two (2) to one (1) votes, and it was not clear what this meant. The feeling was that you should have at least five (5) people on the committee.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked why certain positions, such as Provost, Board, or President, are capitalized, while deans and chairs are not capitalized.

Eykholt: The Board of Governors is capitalized because it is a title. The Provost and the President are individual people, while the deans and chairs are many. We tend to capitalize a word in the Manual when it is specifically defined as a particular person. This does not mean we cannot capitalize dean or chair, but when we do it, it tends to refer to a specific person, such as the Chair of Faculty Council,

Pedros-Gascon: Think it would make it more equitable if we capitalize all of these titles of people who are in equitable positions of power, even if they are different ranks.

Eykholt: Do not have feelings about this and will yield to the will of the Executive Committee.

Vice Provost James: Suggested this be added to the list of housekeeping updates for the Manual.

Chair Smith: Mentioned that we have both chairs and heads of departments at CSU. Reading this, wondering if it makes a difference or not.

Vice Provost James: Would like to have that cleaned up, because the Manual is clear that chairs and heads means the same thing, but people will explain that they are not. Would like to get out of that ambiguous space.

Eykholt: If Executive Committee decides they want to do a global change and capitalize chair and dean throughout the Manual, that kind of change would not need to go through the Board of Governors.

Chair Smith: Suggested we revisit this suggestion in the spring and work on it over the summer. Asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, requested a motion.

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty move to place the modifications to Section E.10 on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3rd.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

4. Proposed Revisions to Section E.13 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Eykholt: This involves one important change that did not come up in Section E.10, and that has to do with early promotion. The Provost website used to indicate that early promotion was not common, and now they indicate that there are more and more people coming up two (2) years early. People have tried to apply three (3) years early, so there have been requests to limit applications to being one (1) year early. Other changes are similar to what we saw in Section E.10.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions.

Mitchell: Wondering if we can articulate the mechanism in terms of the effective date, since you already have a lot of people planning and having internal conversations and permission from department chairs to do this. Want to make sure that if we are doing this that we stage it and that it is not changing anybody's professional plans that are already agreed upon based on the current Manual.

Eykholt: It is possible that this could be held back to be approved by the Board of Governors after this year's cycle. In the past, we have put in language with an "effective" date.

Vice Provost James: As far as when this would take effect, it is not just about this cycle, since there might be people planning to go up in the Fall of 2024. There is also language in the Manual somewhere about the 10-year promotion process that says to follow the directions on the Provost website, so that might be a way to handle this without having to put dates in the Manual. We could indicate that this applies for anyone who is going up Fall of 2025 and beyond, depending on when the Board of Governors approves it.

Chair Smith: Believe the first paragraph indicates that the guidelines on the Provost's website should be utilized. Wondering if that might cover it.

Eykholt: If people are worried about this, we should put language in because department codes and the Provost's website cannot override the Manual. We could insert language indicating when this would be effective.

Chair Smith: Asked for clarification on the process for submitting these for approval. Understanding is that these revisions can be submitted to the Board of Governors agenda at any time during the academic year.

Amy Barkley: Correct. If we wanted to hold this for the May Board of Governors meeting, for example, we could do that. It would still need to go through the Office of General Counsel, but we would track this for a specific Board of Governors meeting.

Eykholt: The language says promotion may be considered, so the key thing is when we consider it, which is when packets are put forward. As long as the Board of Governors approves this after the packets are put forward for this year, wondering if that would be okay.

Mitchell: Thinking about the credit served. Provided example of colleague and wondering why they did not give any service credit as part of the offer letter.

Vice Provost James: Stated that service credit can be fixed after the fact, because some people do not negotiate for it or chairs are not aware of it.

Mitchell: A faculty member could look in the Manual to see when they go up and not even ask the service credit question because they may misread what is here. An average faculty member might not understand service credit.

Martin: There is a paragraph that indicates that we recognize prior service. Think it does a good job of stating that the offer letter shall indicate whether or not prior service counts toward time and rank here. Think if we included time and service in that paragraph, it would make it more confusing.

Mitchell: We do not necessarily need to add the language there, but part of this might just be educating chairs to make sure the offer letters are correct. Want to make sure we are educating and that the templates are clear on this. We would need a period of time, given that the tenure clock is a six-year clock, to make sure that this is communicated really well so that chairs and deans can convey the appropriate messages so that people do not miss out on this.

Norton: Expressed agreement that a lot of communication could go on between the Provost's Office, department heads, and tenure and promotion chairs, as well as anybody trying to go up about what the process looks like for service credit. Looking at approval, the Board of Governors does approve things throughout the year, so this would need to be held back.

Chair Smith: Asked how the one-year rule might impact retention.

Vice Provost James: The Provost's Office started getting people applying to go up two (2) years early, and then three (3) years early. This throws off the rank and time in rank, and there are other ways to reward excellent performers.

Michael Antolin: Expressed agreement that this has implications on how to reward excellent faculty. Indicated that there are limited ways to reward excellent faculty at this University. Think we need to find a way to make this usable without being abused and it is worth the time to think through this carefully.

Vice Provost James: We are working on retention guidelines, especially proactive retention and trying to put out best practices for deans and chairs to think about how to reward people. The other issue with this slippery slope is that it tends to be majority identity privileged people who end up going up early because they are in a place to make this happen. This is an equity issue as well.

Eykholt: On the flip side of this, we could be talking about people who are exceptional and should go up early, but if the Provost's Office is uncomfortable with that, these people waste their time putting packets together when they have no chance going forward. Reminded members that in the end, the Provost and President decide on tenure.

Vice Provost James: Have mentioned this before but would like to see more ranks for faculty. When we look at people we lose on retention, it is those people who can go to places with higher ranks that they can achieve. This would also help with salary compression. Would like us to look at models around the country.

Provost Nerger: We have those post-tenure reviews, and if these are taken seriously, there could be salary bumps after they are completed.

Chair Smith: Thanked everyone for the discussion. Requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda.

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty move to add the revisions to Section E.13 to the Faculty Council agenda for October.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

5. Proposed Revisions to Section E.14.3.2 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: These changes are similar, which is changing the size of the committee structure to five (5) people. Previously, only three (3) members were required for the Phase II Review Committee, which created challenges if the votes were close.

Chair Smith: Hearing no comments or questions, requested a motion.

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty move to add the modifications to Section E.14.3.2 to the Faculty Council agenda for October.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote,

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

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

Martin: Section K specifically deals with the grievance process. One of the pieces of this amendment is to increase the appointment of the University Grievance Officer from 25% to 50%. The other part of this amendment is to remove the mediation piece of the grievance process. Eykholt has found that the process is not very effective or efficient, and in the role of the University Grievance Officer has generally been able to serve in that space rather than the University Mediators.

Eykholt: Indicated that the rationale would need to change, because we decided not to embed the change from 25% to 50% in the Manual and instead put it in the Faculty Council Procedures Handbook. What it says now is that it will be negotiated.

Eykholt: The main change with this is the mediation. The process right now is that people come to the University Grievance Officer, which may or may not be grievable, and the University Grievance Officer tries to help resolve the problem. Sometimes we can work through things through discussion. If that does not work, we go formal, and a formal complaint is submitted and there is an official response. At this point, we do not go directly to a hearing but instead go to mediation, and we hire mediators at \$100/hour to try to mediate. Noted that the mediators do not necessarily have any more training than the University Grievance Officer, and it tends to delay the process. Think it is time to get rid of paying University Mediators and change what the University Grievance Offices does from conciliation to mediation.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions.

Mitchell: Expressed concern about a situation where the University Grievance Officer might not be successful, and we have no backup stated in the Manual.

Eykholt: This was considered and is a reasonable point. Since this was written, we have created a University ombuds and faculty ombuds, which are full-time positions. These people are often brought in to mediate instead of the University Mediator. Think they are much better trained at mediation and would bring these people in when a conflict needed to be mediated. The flexibility remains to bring in other people to mediate a conflict, but right now, it is a requirement in the Manual with a timeline attached and it just gets in the way. Not all University Grievance Officers will be good at mediating, but they can bring in additional people to assist.

Pedros-Gascon: Noted a typo in the document. Expressed agreement with Mitchell and concern that not everyone in this position will do as good a job as Eykholt. If we are skipping this process, that is fine, but this option should exist for other people. Expressed concern about getting rid of this option. Stated that we rarely hear what the ombuds are doing and there has not been engagement with Faculty Council.

Eykholt: Clarified that this is not an option, it is a requirement as it currently states in the Manual. It has been something that has delayed grievance processes and getting action on grievances. If we take it out, we have the option to use whatever kind of mediation we want. It also makes it complicated because it requires the person to file a formal grievance, which is an aggressive step and can get in the way of mediation. Think this section is actually doing damage to the mediation process.

Chair Smith: Requested clarification on timing. There is a section that states that you have five (5) days to respond, but then there is a part that says ten (10) days. Think it would be worth having a table, but not sure there is a precedent for that in the Manual.

Martin: Expressed agreement that there is a lot of confusion among faculty who are not familiar with the process. It is an intimidating process to file a formal grievance, and then once you have done that, you need to navigate the timeline. Like the idea of a flowchart or some sort of timeline that outlines the process. This does not necessarily need to be part of the Manual, but we could prepare it to go into the Faculty Council agenda to help people familiarize themselves with the process, and we could post it to the University Grievance Officer's website.

Antolin: Having served on a grievance panel and a grievance hearing, the mediation process could potentially be redundant to that, since both sides are offered the opportunity to present their side, including witnesses.

Joseph DiVerdi: Asked if we are prevented from including anything besides text sentences in the Manual.

Chair Smith: Believe it is convention to only have text in the Manual.

Vice Provost James: Suggested that these kinds of changes be communicated by Executive Committee members to their deans and chairs to make people aware before the meeting. Cascading some of this information ahead of October might be helpful.

Chair Smith: Thanked everyone for the discussion. Requested a motion.

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty moves to include the modifications of Section K on the October Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

Martin: Indicated she would send an updated version with the fixed typo and rationale.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

No report at this time.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: The report for the Board of Governors needs to be in by the end of this week. Asked members to send along any items around faculty activity that we want the Board of Governors to hear about.

3. Budget Model Update – Rob Mitchell & Jennifer Martin

Martin: The communications plan is coming, so be on the lookout for information about open forums and meetings across campus for the month of October.

F. Discussion Items

1. FCCIA Annual Report and Committee Discussion – Shane Kanatous, Chair

Deferred to Executive Committee meeting on September 26, 2023 due to scheduling conflict.

2. 2016 Resolution on Budget Cuts to Academics – Antonio Pedros-Gascon

Deferred to Executive Committee meeting on September 26, 2023 due to time constraints.

G. Executive Session

Mitchell: Moved to have Executive Committee enter Executive Session.

DiVerdi: Seconded.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Executive Session concluded at 5:17 p.m.

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