

**MINUTES**  
Executive Committee  
**Tuesday, September 26, 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; **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Jessica Watkinson**, Office of the Provost; **Shane Kanatous**, Chair Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics; **Ganze Cavdar**, Chair Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning; **Theo Reese**, ASCSU Director of Academic Affairs

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

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Chair Smith: Introduced Jessica Watkinson, who will be taking over for Amy Barkley while she is on maternity leave. Expressed appreciation for Watkinson for stepping up to do this.

**September 26, 2023 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. Minutes to be Approved**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes – September 19, 2023**

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections or changes to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from September 19<sup>th</sup>.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

**II. Items Pending/Discussion Items**

**A. *Announcements***

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on October 10, 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***

Interim Provost Janice Nerger: We had our budget hearings a few weeks ago, and although the attendance seemed good, it was filled with people providing the presentations. Think it was not very well advertised and it was only sent out via a SOURCE story. We have asked that all future budget forum information be sent out by email as well as a SOURCE story, and more than twenty-four (24) hours in advance so that people have advance notice of when these forums will occur. The recordings from the first budget presentations are posted.

Provost Nerger: The first incremental budget will be presented to the Board of Governors next week, so that will become public information beginning next week. This will not be a balanced budget but will have various scenarios. Vice President Brendan Hanlon will be providing presentations to campus, and we will see this budget change as we get more information.

Provost Nerger: The administrative professional compensation plan, which is bringing all administrative professionals up to \$50,000, is moving forward and will hopefully be reflected on October paychecks for those individuals. There is also some additional compensation to assist with compression issues for those who are at \$50,000 to move them up slightly. We are working with the deans and vice presidents to make sure we have the right people on the list. It has been a difficult process because people are being paid through different funding sources and we want everyone to benefit from the \$50,000 floor.

Provost Nerger: An email went out regarding the accommodations for students with disabilities, as many faculty are seeing students without accommodation appointments for months, and these accommodations are still being requested. We have added three (3) new positions that they are hiring for that will hopefully help. Indicated that freshman are being asked to provide accommodation letters from high school to help provide information in the meantime, and we are working as fast as we can.

Provost Nerger: The first Vice President for Research candidate was on campus today. Encouraged members and colleagues to participate in the interview process, since there is more to come.

Provost Nerger: We are also having discussions around the potential of having an all-university commencement ceremony in the stadium, starting in spring 2025. We are wondering whether the University community would be interested in something like this. There would still be the individual ceremonies. Wondering if this is something faculty would be interested in doing. The second question is whether people would be in favor of eliminating the fall commencements.

Pedros-Gascon: This would be a good use of the stadium, but many may not be interested in attending that graduation. Would not recommend getting rid of the fall commencement option, as not everyone can afford to come back to Fort Collins if they are from out of state.

Provost Nerger: Will be meeting with the deans tomorrow and may pass along these questions for feedback down into departments and faculty. We are not looking for a consensus, necessarily, but more of a general straw poll to see how people feel about this.

Chair Smith: Suggested contacting the alumni association.

Rob Mitchell: Expressed agreement that we should keep the fall commencement, but information about the cost should also be included, given our conversations around budget and where money is going. Recommended having a commitment of having the University presented at the smaller ceremonies as well, since the handshake and pictures are important.

Chair Smith: We will capture these comments and others to pass along as this is being considered.

***C. Old Business***

***D. Action Items***

1. UCC Minutes – September 15, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything in the University Curriculum Committee minutes to bring to Executive Committee's attention.

Brad Goetz: Indicated that there was nothing of note in this set of minutes. Moved that the University Curriculum Committee minutes from September 15<sup>th</sup> be added to the consent agenda on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the consent agenda on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

2. Election – Faculty Representative to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Smith: This ballot is for Ryan Morrison on the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education. Requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda.

Joseph DiVerdi: Moved.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

3. Election – Undergraduate and Graduate Student Representatives to Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Smith: The next ballot is for undergraduate and graduate student representatives for Faculty Council standing committees. Requested a motion to place this ballot on the Faculty Council agenda.

Sharon Anderson: Moved.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

4. Election – Undergraduate and Graduate Student Representatives to University Policy Review Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Smith: The final ballot is for undergraduate and graduate student representatives for the University Policy Review Committee. Requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda.

Anderson: Moved.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

5. 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
  - 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: We have all the standing committee reports, which now includes the Committee on Libraries report and an amended Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics report. Asked if there were any questions regarding these reports.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Would be interested in having the Committee on Teaching and Learning revisit one of the discussion points in their report, specifically with regard to language and their discarding of the possibility of languages. Suggested that this committee speak with the faculty in Languages and understand the multilingual history of this state. Think the monolingual approach merits better-informed discussion on the part of the committee. Asked how to proceed

with this discussion. Directed members' attention to the discussion point being referred to in the agenda packet.

Chair Smith: Since this is not necessarily a change to their report, this could be brought up at the Faculty Council meeting. The chairs of these standing committees are invited to the Faculty Council meeting to respond to any questions or comments regarding their reports. That could be a potential pathway to bring this up for further discussion. Another option would be to reach out directly to the committee. Lumina Albert is the new chair.

Andrew Norton: Indicated that the discussion being referred to is referring to feedback given to the guidance committee for what AUCC 1C should look like. Believe this is now with the Office of the Provost for implementation. Indicated that there was no discussion with the guidance committee about what languages could or could not be used in teaching AUCC 1C. The terms for that are in the General Catalog, and the guidance committee would not have the ability to change what is there. That is something Faculty Council would need to decide as a whole.

Sue Doe: Expressed agreement that the notes in the report for the Committee on Teaching and Learning does not reflect where the proposal ended up or what the guidance committee recommended. Norton is correct that this is sitting in the Office of the Provost. Am a member of the Committee on Teaching and Learning and would be happy to take this back to them. However, not sure what they would do about it, but it could be pointed out to the members.

Pedros-Gascon: Understanding is that the discussion is about the possibility of taking language courses as part of diversity, equity and inclusion requirements. Interested in having this point discussed again.

Vice Provost Susan James: Do not believe there are any rules that prohibit a course being taught in any language. This came up at the Hispanic-Serving Institution Advisory Board meeting the other day because we would love to see more courses taught in Spanish across our curriculum as we become a Hispanic-Serving Institution as well. Asked about Pedros-Gascon's specific issue with the discussion in the Committee on Teaching and Learning report.

Pedros-Gascon: Have requested the possibility of creating courses in AUCC 1C that are taught in languages that are not English, but there is a clear understanding that courses that deal with language are not being considered. Would like to have a follow-up discussion with leadership and members of Languages, as well as people who have a more sophisticated understanding of these issues.

Norton: Believe the interpretation of the General Catalog is that a course can be taught in any language and be eligible for AUCC 1C. The language is not referenced and as long as they address some aspect of diversity, they would be compatible with AUCC 1C. It is possible that some committee members a year ago did not fully understand the catalog language and what the guidance committee was going to do when having their internal deliberations. Stated that this information did not make it to the guidance committee, and it is not anything in our catalog or is actionable.

Pedros-Gascon: Believe early discussions included suggestions that the spirit of AUCC 1C would not be met through learning a language and that language courses would not add diversity.

Norton: That was not brought to the guidance committee and was not brought forward by the chair of the Committee on Teaching and Learning. The guidance committee had no power or desire to change the catalog language. Expressed agreement that the statement in the report from the Committee on Teaching and Learning is contrary to our sense of what AUCC 1C is, but do not feel it would serve the needs of Faculty Council or even the current Committee on Teaching and Learning to reopen that discussion.

Pedros-Gascon: Requested to receive the guidelines that were eventually advanced to ensure there is no gap or prejudice in the text.

Doe: The guidelines that were advanced are not necessarily what is going to happen, because it is sitting with the Office of the Provost. Believe there is opportunity to speak into that document as it takes form, because it will almost certainly be different from what the task force put forward. This would ensure there is an awareness of this as a priority and that you are not alone in representing a particular argument here that you would like to see represented in the guidance, or at least not excluded within the guidance.

Pedros-Gascon: So far, it feels that we are excluded, so would like to have a conversation with leadership and the Committee on Teaching and Learning to make sure the prejudice will not withstand the process and will not continue.

Chair Smith: Understanding from this conversation is that it is no longer in the hands of the Committee on Teaching and Learning.

Doe: Confirmed. It is with the Office of the Provost.

Vice Provost James: Would recommend speaking with Vice Provost Tom Siller.

Doe: Would also recommend contacting Vice Provost Siller. Do not think there is anything wrong with contacting the Committee on Teaching and Learning about the misunderstanding but noted that they do not have a role in AUCC 1C at this point.

Chair Smith: Think the path forward would be to contact Vice Provost Siller, because this is now under his purview. Right now, only four (4) courses have been approved for AUCC 1C, so there is an opportunity to engage on this because we are early in the process.

Pedros-Gascon: Stated that he would contact Vice Provost Siller and request a meeting with department.

Chair Smith: Thanked everyone for the discussion. We also have Shane Kanatous, chair of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, here to discuss their report and updates from the committee.

Shane Kanatous: Before getting into report, stated that it has come to our attention that study abroad is not accessible to graduate students, because the stipend does not cover CSU Online. There has been a request to start a conversation about whether there is a way to accommodate graduate students, because currently they have to pay for it out of pocket. It was suggested that this be brought up at this meeting to figure out where we can start this conversation.

Chair Smith: We could speak with the Graduate School about this, so Dean Colleen Webb might be someone to bring this up with to discuss the policies and why this is not accessible to graduate students. Asked for William Sanford to speak to this as the chair of the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education.

William Sanford: Expressed agreement that Dean Webb would be the right person to talk about this with. Offered to bring this up with her, or Kanatous can.

Kanatous: Am fine to do it, just wanted to see if this was the appropriate way to initiate the conversation.

Kanatous: As for the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, our main charge is protecting the student and the student athlete. We make ourselves available to the student athletes and are sounding boards if they feel they are not getting fair or equitable treatment across campus, both on the academic and athletic side. We have also increased our messaging to student athletes and coaches and trying to act as advisors to help students understand what they can do with their degrees.

Kanatous: We started a program to connect students with faculty to help around their difficult schedules to help them get experience and learning within their discipline. This was created by Albert Bimper, and since he has moved on, would like Faculty Council to consider reviving this program to give those students opportunities. We are mainly doing this with STEM disciplines but would like to expand.

Kanatous: The main function we do is to meet with administration to hear what is going on. One of the main discussions happening right now is around realignment. Stated that past realignments have been done by university presidents, not athletic directors, and now athletic directors are being consulted on the realignment and this sets up difficult situations with the student athletes. As an example, we see schools leaving Pac-12 and joining the Big 10, which means more traveling to the East Coast and spending more time as they do a cluster of games. Football may only miss one day of school, but the smaller sports that do not have the funding and time to go cross country will have to spend more time away and still somehow get their schoolwork done. This is something we are in active conversation about to make sure the student athlete is protected. This is not something the Mountain West is currently facing, but we are in the conversation to make sure the student athletes come first and protecting their academics. These realignments may cause major potential academic issues for some students, so we are engaging in active conversation with both administration and the athletes.

Chair Smith: Thanked Kanatous. Asked if there were any questions.

Norton: Asked if Athletic Director Joe Parker or the committee has discussed the implications of the transfer portal and name, image, likeness and whether this will have a negative impact on students, either wanting to leave for a better offer or students being dropped from sports as we transfer others in. Expressed concern about name, image, likeness since it allows the student to profit off their name and image, which is a one-on-one agreement with the business or coalitions of wealthy donors and that driving who we admit and not the University.

Kanatous: This is an issue going on at the biggest schools with some of the name, image, likeness coalitions. Here at CSU, we have support and advice on how students can work the system, Most student name, image, likeness deals are about \$500. It is not at the same level as offers being given to students at places like Florida, Texas A&M, and others, because we do not have those types of boosters. Right now, the issue of name, image, likeness is difficult for the NCAA and the bigger consortium to deal with because every state has their own rules and there is not yet federal oversight. There are state laws in Colorado regarding this, and direct payment is legal in the state of Colorado. Stated that there are three (3) lawsuits that are actively being pursued, and once those lawsuits are resolved, there will probably open up a need for federal oversight, since these lawsuits may open up the NCAA and universities for financial repercussions. There are big donors are influencing where some students will go, but contrary to popular belief, this does not supersede the university's ability to accept or not accept the student.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked Kanatous and the committee for their work for the student athlete. Directed members' attention to a story from this past summer about a former CSU football coach that was fired from Temple. Indicated that there was an understanding that CSU knew what was happening while the coach was at our institution. Asked what the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics is doing to proactively ensure situations like these are reported so people are aware, and it does not happen again.

Kanatous: The important thing to understand is that most Title IX issues in the institution happen outside of athletics. Having said that, any situation involving a student is serious. There was a President's committee, as well as a website and reporting tools put in place that allow students to report incidents. These do not get reported to Athletics. They get reported to the outside committee, which includes Title IX and other employment stakeholders on campus. There is a way for both faculty and students to report any incidents of these situations without repercussions.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions, thanked Kanatous for his work and the work of the committee does to support student athletes.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further discussion on these reports, requested a motion to place these on the Faculty Council agenda.

Anderson: Moved.

Norton: Seconded.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.



Motion approved. Standing committee annual reports will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

6. Budget Model Goals and Values Report – Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning – Gamze Cavdar, Chair

Gamze Cavdar: The last time this was brought to Executive Committee, we were provided with three (3) pieces of advice. The first was that a paragraph describing our goals be included. The second was that we provide some background explaining the process, and the third was that the committee determine whether to send this back as a resolution or a report.

Cavdar: The recommendation was to send this item back as a report, which the committee agreed with. This decision was made because it is our role to make recommendations and input, which is what we are doing in this process. Both President Amy Parsons and Executive Vice President Rick Miranda have been receptive to our feedback, so we did not see any reason to go forward with this as a resolution.

Chair Smith: Thanked Cavdar. Asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mitchell: Expressed appreciation for Cavdar and the work of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. Know this has been a big lift.

Jennifer Martin: Have a minor suggestion for clarification. Think the language should reflect that it is Colorado State University Fort Collins, so we do not confuse this with the other pieces of CSU. Referring to the statement about “effectiveness of all CSU employees” in the goals statement.

Cavdar: Agreed to make this change.

Chair Smith: Expressed agreement with this edit since we are not necessarily representing the System. Asked if there were any additional questions.

Chair Smith: Hearing none, thanked Cavdar and the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning for their work on this report. Requested a motion to place this item on the Faculty Council agenda.

DiVerdi: Moved.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed as a report on the Faculty Council agenda for October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Chair Smith: Indicated that there appears to be subcommittees of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. Excited to hear the outcomes of those discussions.

Cavdar: We have a subcommittee on the budget model, as well as one around salary equity.

Chair Smith: Thanked Cavdar. We are looking forward to seeing the deliberations on the budget model.

### *E. Reports*

#### 1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Tomorrow, September 26<sup>th</sup>, is a Cabinet meeting, as well as the Provost Leadership Council, so there will be more to report on those next time.

Chair Smith: The Provost search committee had their final deliberations last Wednesday, and it is now in the hands of President Parsons. Expressed hope that we will hear the outcome of that soon.

Chair Smith: Met with Jannine Mohr yesterday. We had a productive discussion. Mohr asked that it be conveyed that she had heard about our discussions regarding our interactions with the Office of General Counsel and that Executive Committee should know that it is not the intention of that office to derail the course of action by Faculty Council on Manual changes. Mohr wanted to make it clear that delaying is not the intention, and she understands there have been delays in the Office of General Counsel and is hoping those can be avoided in the future.

Chair Smith: One of the discussions we had with Mohr was around workflow and how to prevent these delays from happening. A suggestion Mohr provided is that whenever there are Manual changes regarding administration, it would benefit us to reach out to the Office of General Counsel earlier in the process.

Chair Smith: We also discussed Section J. Mohr indicated that it is possible we may see this on our November Faculty Council agenda, pending work from the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, and then it would be in front of the Board of Governors in December.

Chair Smith: Encouraged committees and their chairs to engage with the Office of General Council to deal with any changes regarding administration. Expressed hope that we can have an efficient way of getting these things done without requiring chasing her down or having the Provost's Office intervene.

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty had initial feedback regarding Section J from the Office of General Counsel. The committee went through the feedback and sent comments back but have not heard anything since then. Stated that Richard Eykholt will be meeting with the Office of General Counsel tomorrow, so we hope to have more updates regarding the edits. The plan is to have the committee vote on the final edits soon and send this forward for consideration at the November Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Smith: There was an argument that the Office of General Counsel was waiting for a new Vice President for Research to come on board, and Mohr indicated that this is no longer on the

table, given the timeline. Mohr was optimistic that Section J would be seen by the Board of Governors in December.

Michael Antolin: Asked about the process. Wondering if we should be channeling items through the Faculty Council chair to the Office of General Counsel. It seems as if we are headed toward having a procedure that tells us how to engage and interact with them in a way that elicits a response.

Chair Smith: Yes, we are hoping to get an effective channel, so things are not ignored. Mohr is committed to trying to find an efficient path, including engaging with us on the front end of Manual changes as well as the back end so that we can get things through the Office of General Counsel smoothly and to the Board of Governors.

Chair Smith: Stated that we did speak to Mohr about the paid administrative leave Manual changes suggested. They are working with Eykholt on this, and Mohr is optimistic that this could also be approved at the December Board of Governors meeting.

Antolin: Thanked Chair Smith. Think it could be agreed upon that the chair of Faculty Council is the person who specifically reaches out to the Office of General Counsel on issues.

Chair Smith: Expressed agreement. We do need to be more vigilant on the standing committee side in being proactive with the Office of General Counsel, especially with administrative policies, and engage with them early. Mohr indicated that we do not necessarily have to go with their recommendations, but knowing what their potential sticking points are can help get Manual changes through more easily.

Vice Provost James: Eykholt plays two (2) roles, both as the University Grievance Officer and a committee member on the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. We may want to consider an overlap or a trainee for the University Grievance Officer. Eykholt also plays a unique shared governance role where he is trusted by both faculty and the employee councils as well as administration. Once we have a new Provost, maybe we can talk about some kind of shared governance official position that would make that work more official.

Anderson: Think getting something formalized between Faculty Council and the Office of General Counsel would be helpful.

Doe: Think there is value in codifying this process and having communication with the Office of General Counsel restricted to the chair.

Chair Smith: Expressed agreement. Thanked everyone for the conversation.

## 2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: The Board of Governors meets next week, so there will be more updates from them. We also have the investiture of President Parsons next Wednesday, October 4<sup>th</sup>, and there will be a

processional at 11:00am and other fun events. The Board meeting will be Thursday and Friday on campus.

Norton: Have submitted report to the Board of Governors, which is basically a listing of the task forces and priorities determined by the Faculty Council Executive Committee so far this year. The report discusses the participation in the Provost search, the Vice President for Research search, and the CSU Fort Collins accreditation, which we participated in last week. The report provides an update on ChatGPT because they have requested information on that as it arises. Some of the information comes from the Institute for Learning and Teaching, where people are looking up what a syllabus should look like.

Norton: The Board of Governors has also requested that Associate Vice President for Inclusive Excellence Shannon Archibeque-Engle provide a report on CSU's status and preparation to be a Hispanic-Serving Institution.

Chair Smith: Asked if there have been any more discussions about Faculty Council or Executive Committee members meeting with Board of Governors members.

Norton: We have not had that conversation. Suggested that we could try for something for spring, potentially a Board of Governors and Executive Committee get-together at the Magnolia House.

### 3. Budget Model Update – Rob Mitchell & Jennifer Martin

Mitchell: A lot will start happening following Faculty Council next week and the investiture. There will be a harder launch that will come with meetings being scheduled. Indicated that a SOURCE story would be coming out tomorrow, September 27<sup>th</sup>, that describes some of the process and how it will roll out. We are trying to get a lot of input and transparency around this and a lot of engagement throughout October and November across campus. There will be many opportunities. We did communicate that we want to see more than SOURCE stories announcing these events and asked for emails as well, so we will make sure there are multiple avenues. A webpage will be launched as well.

Martin: The bulk of our work right now is trying to organize meetings as well as the campus sessions. The committees are being organized, and once they are pulled together, they will be given their charges and be doing much of the work. We are working to set it up so these committees can immediately begin their work without losing progress.

Mitchell: We are meeting regularly with Pam Jackson on a communications plan to ensure there is communication both ways and there is a lot of engagement. The transparency piece is really the goal to make sure that people have their voices heard. To do this, we need the communications piece to be robust.

Mitchell: The first committee that will be charged will be the executive committee, which will be an overarching group and the hope is that Chair Smith will lead the faculty perspective on that committee. Then we will have the other committee, the technical committee, which will include

fiscal officers from each college and the deans, as well as other voices across campus and individuals with expertise in this.

### *F. Discussion Items*

#### 1. ASCSU Syllabus Bank – Theo Reese, ASCSU Director of Academic Affairs

Theo Reese: Thanked Executive Committee for allowing time on the agenda. ASCSU President Nick DeSalvo and ASCSU Vice President Alex Silverhart ran on the campaign promise of a syllabus bank, and we are working on implementation.

Reese: The syllabus bank will be a place where students can see syllabi for upcoming classes. ASCSU President DeSalvo and ASCSU Vice President Silverhart identified three (3) main purposes for this syllabus bank. The first is that it will enable students to have more detail about the courses they register for, as well as being more prepared coming into the class on the first day. The overall vision we have for this syllabus bank is to have students who are informed about the courses they are taking while ensuring professors retain as much academic freedom as possible. With students being able to see the details, professors will be able to hit the ground running and not take the first few sessions or weeks drawing out the basics and setting the groundwork. The other benefit is that students will have a greater understanding of what their overall course load will be and can plan their semesters more efficiently. There is also a hope that this will lead to less excuses for late work and requests for extensions and projects because they have been able to prepare themselves.

Reese: We also recognize the difference between lower-level courses and upper-level courses. The fundamentals of the lower-level courses tend not to change, just how they are taught. With the upper-level courses, there is more nuance and complexity, so those will have more flexibility in regard to what the syllabus will actually entail. Indicated that this does not mean that the syllabi cannot change from year to year, but it can provide students a more grounded view of what the class will entail.

Pedros-Gascon: Am fine with this request. Noted that even if we are teaching the same course number, these classes may vary extremely from one professor to another. Would like this to be transmitted, since it may be misleading from some people who assume the class will look a certain way and it does not. Stated that it is unlikely to change the amount of requests for extensions, so that may not be a selling point, but overall supportive of this idea.

Reese: We are aware that different professors teach these courses differently, so we would have a syllabus for each professor so students could see what topics are taught between the different professors across this course. We do also acknowledge that it is unrealistic for all excuses to be eliminated but our hope is to have students more prepared so that these excuses will be less frequency. It is not guaranteed, but it is our hope.

Vice Provost James: Suggested contacting departments, as many of them keep banks of all their syllabi. It might be worth starting at the department and college level when thinking about the logistics, because you might be able to get all the syllabi in one fell swoop.

Reese: Indicated that they have a meeting with the Biology department because that was the one syllabus bank we found on campus, so we will be discussing how that is implemented and what challenges they see. We will work closely with all the departments.

Mitchell: Suggested having a caveat at the beginning that these syllabi may change from semester to semester, because they will not be the current semester's syllabus.

Reese: This is a key point we have discussed, about how these will not be future syllabi, but we will have the previous three (3) or four (4) semesters available. Students will be able to see any recurring topics, but also items that might be switched. This preamble is something we will include when we pitch to Faculty Council.

Antolin: Indicated that Ross Madden from information technology helped create the syllabus bank for the Biology department. Suggested that Reese contact Madden.

Martin: When the conversation around syllabi come up, we think about copyrights and intellectual property, especially as faculty are becoming more innovative and what they include in their syllabi. Wondering if this has been considered at all. It makes sense for a student enrolled in the course to have access to the syllabi, but for someone just perusing courses, or guests in the CSU system, am wondering how we protect that intellectual property.

Reese: This is something we have discussed because we know how important it is for faculty to feel that their work and their intellect are protected on campus. We are hoping to have these materials strictly on RamWeb, so only CSU students can gain access. The more we work with Information Technology, we will ensure this is at the forefront so intellectual property is protected. We will also include some sort of preamble to state that these materials should not be distributed outside of the CSU campus.

Martin: When we think of a traditional syllabus, we think of learning outcomes and the calendar, but more faculty, especially post-COVID, are posting materials and links on their syllabi and are more innovative. Expressed appreciation that intellectual property is being considered.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further comments or questions, thanked Reese. Asked what next steps for this would be.

Reese: We would like feedback from Faculty Council, and with their approval, take this up with administration and Information Technology.

Chair Smith: Think bringing this as a discussion item would be a good start before we bring it forward for a vote. We will need to know the full scope of this. Suggested coming to the next Faculty Council meeting as a discussion to receive feedback and more perspectives, and then you can return with the full scope to receive Faculty Council's endorsement.

Reese: Would be happy to present to Faculty Council. Will work with the ASCSU President and ASCSU Vice President to get a more focused version and vision for this.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

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