

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, November 28, 2023
3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: **Melinda Smith**, Chair; **Joseph DiVerdi**, Vice Chair; **Andrew Norton**, BOG Representative; **Sue Doe**, Immediate Past Chair; **Jessica Watkinson** (substituting for Amy Barkley), interim Executive Assistant; **Jennifer Martin**, Agricultural Sciences; **Rob Mitchell**, Business; **Sharon Anderson**, Health and Human Sciences; **Christine Pawliuk**, Libraries; **William Sanford**, Natural Resources; **Michael Antolin**, Natural Sciences; **Sybil Sharvelle**, Engineering; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Janice Nerger**, Interim Provost/Executive Vice President; **Gaye DiGregorio**, Executive Director for University Academic Advising and Advocacy; **Robert Gudmestad**, History Department Chair

Absent: Katriana Popichak, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences (excused); Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant (excused); Zaid Abdo (substituting for Katriana Popichak), Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

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

November 28, 2023 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Faculty Council Minutes – November 7, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections or changes to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from November 7th.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

B. Executive Committee Minutes – November 14, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections or changes to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from November 14th.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Noted a correction to the adjournment time to account for Executive Session. Noted we should indicate broadly the reason for Executive Session.

Chair Smith: Indicated that the time will be corrected and note the reason for Executive Session as “personnel”.

Hearing no additional changes, minutes approved.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on December 12, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on December 5, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Pedros-Gascon: Noted that the President may be attending a MSFN meeting scheduled at the same time as the Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Smith: Acknowledged that President Parsons was not planning on giving a report at the Faculty Council meeting.

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

Interim Provost Jan Nerger: This week is the Board of Governors meeting. There is a report from the Provost which is mainly consent agenda items. There is the academic calendar, new and revised academic degree programs, the sabbatical request summaries, and the program review summaries. Final enrollment reports are the same as at the last board meeting. There was no change there since it occurred right after census and there were no changes to the student success report.

Provost Nerger: The Faculty Manual revisions did not get in for this meeting, they will be in the next Board of Governors meeting in February. These had to be submitted to the Board by 4:00 p.m. on November 9th. The Faculty Council meeting was on November 7th, and everything went to OGC on November 8th. There was some confusion about Section J. Not a concern about content, but they wanted to make sure of what was passed versus the other versions that they had to compare to. By the time they got that done it past the 4:00 p.m. deadline, and it was denied. They were not accepted so those will be on the agenda for the February Board meeting. Regarding Section E.6, there was a question raised by OGC to EVP Miranda and me which we could not answer. It is sitting with the OGC who are conversing with the President, so that conversation needs to take place before it will move forward. Believe that will be brought back to the Executive Committee before it moves forward. Don't know exactly what the issue is, except that President Parsons needs to approve. There is an approval process for a change in the HR policy, so President Parsons had not seen it and she wants to review it. That one did not make the deadline either. There was no way for that one to make the deadline because President Parsons needed to look at it. The other changes are ready to go and there is not going to be a problem with them.

Chair Smith: Asked Jennifer Martin whether Section E.6 had been viewed by the OGC before coming to Executive Committee.

Jennifer Martin: No, not that I know of. Asked if the state policy will override the Faculty Manual, since the change in E.6 was to reflect the new state policy.

Provost Nerger: Clarified that the state policy is a permission to do that, not a requirement. OGC and President Parsons hadn't seen Section E.6 and it caught them off guard.

Martin: Know the intention was to ideally get this through the Board and the request to revise the offer letters. Those were the immediate things following the state policy.

Provost Nerger: Think the misstep was that the OGC and President Parsons hadn't seen it.

Martin: CoRSAF operated with a bit of urgency on Section J and made compromises relative to the timeline. Think we would have spent more time deliberating if we had been informed about the lack of flexibility with that timeline. Would probably have liked to have spent more time trying to reach some resolution on timelines versus taking them out completely to satisfy the OGC's request to do so. Think that we will come right back to the version of Section J that will go to the Board in February, because our intention was to reassess the timeline in Spring with a new VPR in place.

Provost Nerger: Recommended keeping with that plan. Otherwise, you'll potentially open up other pieces of conversation that compromise what has already been done.

Martin: Think that will be what CoRSAF prefers to do. Specifically, Richard Eykholt was willing to compromise on a lot of the things that he held firm to. He may have a difference of opinion, but I think the committee as a whole will probably let it go.

Provost Nerger: Asked if they understood the time constraint for when it was due to the Board.

Martin: Yes, think his concern was that he had a conversation and had shared it with OGC the week prior, and had talked about what CoRSAF passed. After the Faculty Council meeting, he sent Jannine a note to say that everything they had discussed last week was approved by Faculty Council. Think he feels that OGC had advance notice of the version that was then approved by Faculty Council.

Pedros-Gascon: In the past, we have complained about the very delayed engagement of OGC with many items. Even though we had a recent conversation with them, we are back again in the same place. We have a situation that got stalled by them, so I perfectly understand the concerns from Eykholt and many other members. It seems to be modus operandi for that unit.

Andrew Norton: Noted that to make it on the February agenda, it would have to make it through Faculty Council at the next meeting a week from today.

Martin: Noted that CoRSAF won't make changes to the version that was already approved by Faculty Council.

Norton: Asked Provost Nerger if they have figured out where exactly the roadblock lies at the System Office. Noted the deadline seemed harsh.

Provost Nerger: Agreed, noted that Jannine thought it would be able to go through the next day.

Norton: Maybe we should chat about that.

Provost Nerger: Agreed. Understand that we are two days away from the Board and it needs to be in the packet in advance, but we had it in advance and missed the deadline by only a few hours.

Martin: Another thing that CoRSAF has been talking about via email was a comment from Eykholt that OGC, from our understanding, offers advice but doesn't decide what goes on the Board agenda or packet. Think some clarity around what the process is by which OGC has to approve Board agenda items, or if they are offering guidance on agenda items that have been placed there by the President.

Martin: The assumption that seems to have come from conversations with Jason and Jannine, is that offered guidance on agenda items to the Board but weren't in the space of checking off items before they went on the Board agenda which seems to be the role that they've played this time. Think it would be helpful to have some clarity as to their role as it relates to Board agenda items and the agenda setting.

Provost Nerger: Agreed. The way the Board meeting runs, this would be a part of the Provost's portion and they do not vote on or discuss each of these individually. Think once it has been submitted from the University, it will be passed by the Board, unless it is something controversial. Think that in that sense, the President would want to make sure that the uncertain items have been seen by legal or HR. I thought this would have just gone through as part of the packet.

Chair Smith: Noted Martin's point, that it seems like OGC has to approve it before the President approves it for the agenda.

Provost Nerger: Will see if I can get some clarity on what the role of OGC is for these. Know that I do not move something forward until they approve it.

Sue Doe: Added that many years ago, there was a moment when Tony Frank was still President that there was an item that the Faculty Council wanted to have appear in the Board of Governors packet, and the bottom line was that the President did not want to include it. The way it was explained to us was that he was not going to expend social capital on anything that hadn't been fully embraced or endorsed by OGC. Remember that moment because it seemed like something that should have been allowed to move forward.

Pedros-Gascon: Following up on that comment, want to point out that we cannot have OGC become some kind of purgatory where things go to die. That is really the situation right now where they are stalling things. Think that is extremely inappropriate and that it has happened over and over again. We cannot continue accepting their lack of engagement. This is a body that deserves some respect from that office and believe that so far, the engagement has proven anything but respectful.

Chair Smith: Thanked Pedros-Gascon, asked if Provost Nerger had more to report on.

Provost Nerger: Noted the recent news that Dean Withers is leaving the university, so there will be a national search for that position. It will wait until Provost Marion Underwood is in town. Want to make sure that the Faculty Council and the faculty in general are given some sort of reassurance on the Clark project. Asked how Executive Committee recommend that be done. Think it is important to be stated. Confirmed that President Parsons is not coming to the next meeting, so that should come from me.

Chair Smith: That would be great if you are ok doing that.

Provost Nerger: Yes, think it is important that assurance be made because that is high in the mind of CLA and campus in general. I don't have details, will try to get what I can by next Tuesday. It's not going to be slowed down by Dean Withers' departure and it is still a high priority project.

Chair Smith: Provided context that Tara Opsal and Tracy Brady who spoke at Faculty Council, sent the Clark Revitalization petition to President Parsons, EVP Miranda, and Provost Nerger.

Pedros-Gascon: It was sent to the Board of Governors as well.

Chair Smith: Yes, they have gotten acknowledgment from Provost Nerger and others, but not from the Board of Governors. They still feel that there is a need for action and are requesting that Faculty Council take some action, but it would be great to get more clarity about this.

Provost Nerger: These processes move rather slowly. The big thing is, when are these things going to occur and where are people going to be placed. That's not an easy solution. Noting the problem is important, but there was no solution offered either. There are solutions on the table, and I think they are looking at what is the most effective and cost-efficient solution. Think they need to know that people are working on it, and it is going to happen. Will try to find out when a solution is going to be identified and who is working on it.

Norton: Asked to clarify what they are asking the Board of Governors for. Asked if they are looking for funds to put up temporary structures or if they are just asking for the Board to say they need a place to be while the construction is going on.

Chair Smith: Think they were hoping for some commitment or response, but not sure.

Provost Nerger: Think it would have been appropriate for the Chair to respond that they received it and are aware.

Doe: Asked if Provost Nerger could provide any insight on this. It seems astonishing that we would be at this point in a construction project and not have thought about where the people are going. It seems like that would be the first thing you would do, not the last.

Provost Nerger: That is part of it, that is astonishing to me as well. Part of it is a reasonable explanation that there was a complete change in scope that occurred. Dean Withers had been working on an assumption that the C wing was going to be the major renovation, and he was working on moving C wing folks. It turns out they are not doing C wing and they are working on B wing, and the B wing folks have asked for something very different because they want to move as groups. They do not want separate offices in different places and moving the departments is a very different problem. Can appreciate that it is a different situation that he is faced with, or the university is faced with.

Doe: Thanked Provost Nerger, that is helpful.

Pedros-Gascon: Shared the email that was sent to the Board of Governors with the committee, so that all of you can have an idea of the wording being used. That was signed by the faculty representatives at large for the College of Liberal Arts.

Pedros-Gascon: Indicated that in addition to that, would like to thank the engagement from the interim Provost Nerger and EVP Miranda. In his announcement email, Dean Withers indicated that the 2/2 load was one of the priorities he intended to have addressed before he leaves. Hope that can be included in the discussions that need to happen before that transition. Very thankful for the chance to have this discussion advanced.

Provost Nerger: Have offered to open my calendar for that meeting, unsure when his departure date is.

Pedros-Gascon: Think it is in April.

Provost Nerger: The start date is in April for Iowa State, don't know beyond that. Some of these things I have talked to Marion Underwood about, so she is aware of it.

Norton: Confirmed that the Clark petition is in the Board book, under correspondence.

Provost Nerger: Very good, that might mean that they have discussed it too.

Provost Nerger: Noted that President Parsons is not going to be at the Faculty Council meeting on Tuesday. Asked if there were other items Executive Committee would like addressed. Will find some clarity on Clark and will mention the searches that will be ongoing and the transition of leadership.

Chair Smith: Asked if Jennifer Martin and Rob Mitchell would be willing to give an update on the budget remodel process, think it would be worth having some comments about that.

Rob Mitchell: Agreed, happy to jump in.

Martin: Also happy to provide an update.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – November 10, 2023

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

Brad Goetz: Noted a new degree in the minutes. That is a little bit different than previous minutes and we just record the date that we approved it. You all will receive the special action item and the Faculty Council will act on the special action item, so the minutes don't approve the degree.

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any discussion for the minutes. Hearing none, moved that the UCC minutes from November 10th be added to the consent agenda on the Faculty Council agenda for December 5th.

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

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if the committee should also advance the new degree program.

Goetz: Clarified that Executive Committee won't do that until it gets cleared through the other committees. It will come up as a special action item, just like code changes and other things.

2. Election – Faculty Representative to University Benefits Committee– Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

3. Election – Faculty Representative to Parking Services Committee– Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Approved, the ballot for faculty representatives to standing committees will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for December 5th.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Mentioned that Joseph DiVerdi, Andrew Norton, and myself met with Joe Parker and Matt Klein last week as a follow up to the November Faculty Council meeting. We had a

very fruitful discussion with Parker and Klein. We discussed additional clarity for the questions around the state audit and the audit of the athletics budget. We discussed how the presentation tried to address that and may not have fully addressed the questions that people have. We asked them if they could provide an additional one or two page document that would address some of these questions about why the audit is potentially different than what we know about the budget. I reached out to Matt Klein to follow up with him and he is working on that now. The idea is that we will send that out to Faculty Council members and see if that helps to clarify some of the questions that people have around that issue. We asked Joe Parker if he is going to continue to come to Faculty Council meetings. He is more than happy to and thinks it is good that we have Athletics come talk to us on an annual basis at least. Thought that was very encouraging. He recognized that there could have been things said differently in the meeting. I feel that is a good step forward with continuing to communicate with Athletics. I got the sense that they want to continue to be as transparent as possible and try to answer questions that Faculty Council has. They will continue to try to help us understand the budget and priorities. Asked if DiVerdi or Norton wanted to add anything.

DiVerdi: Nothing to add, I think that captures it.

Norton: Agreed. I suggested that maybe presenting to us annually may not be the most fruitful thing for us all, and he said that he wants to do it.

Pedros-Gascon: Believe that I'm not the only person who thought that his performance was not appropriate for a person who holds that kind of office. That was very diminishing. That also speaks volumes about the current President's understanding of shared governance. The fact that the President never addressed the situation or tried to stop it speaks poorly of the shared governance commitment. Am happy that he made those comments to you but would rather have him make those comments to Faculty Council. I'm just one person, it was multiple people. Think that it is not the first time that has happened and as I indicated, students came to speak with Faculty Council members and were talking about how difficult it had been for them to deal with him and how hard it had been to try to bring any point to discussion. He behaved exactly that way. For that reason, I cannot really say I'm fine with that. Think it speaks more about a personal trait than just one instance. I want the President to also think about how representative of her cabinet this situation was, the fact that she was in that room and did not say a work speaks volumes about her understanding of shared governance.

Chair Smith: Understand what Pedros-Gascon is saying. Think that something Faculty Council in the future, is that we want to hear from Athletics, but they are not the ones setting the budget. The President is setting the budget and so that is who we should be asking questions to about Athletics.

Pedros-Gascon: Agreed that we should go for that. For the record, I'm very happy about the commitment to diversity in recruitment and so many other things like student success. I'm less in when it comes to other stuff and agree that the budget should be addressed by the President. We can't have a situation where allocation of resources goes unchallenged or aren't discussed. That is the reality of what has been happening.

Doe: Am sympathetic to what Pedros-Gascon is saying about the meaningfulness of to whom one apologizes. Unless you say it to the people who are harmed, it means little. In my opinion it wouldn't have to be in a public setting, but at the very least it seems like a couple of people were directly harmed.

Chair Smith: Noted that we encouraged him to reach out to them.

Doe: Am glad to hear that. Noted that it seems we have an opportunity to not only ask for clarity around the difference between the audit and the report that was given, that seems to be a reasonable request, but the also the new budget model and where Athletics appears on it. If it doesn't appear, then can we have an explanation as to why that is. If it is one of the auxiliaries like Housing and Dining or Parking and pays for itself, that is one thing. If it is only partially an auxiliary that pays for itself then it would seem to me that there is a need for some degree of transparency around where in the budget that is. Think it causes confusion and ultimately suspicion.

DiVerdi: Agreed with Doe. We need to ask about finances from sources aside from the Athletic Director.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: Provided highlights for what is going to be reported to the Board of Governors. APC wanted to report on the new employee volunteer service hours program that they devised. There will be a brief update on the budget model redesign. There will be another update on generative AI and ethics, highlighting the Provost's symposium. There are a number of board members that are fascinated by generative AI and want to know what its implications are for us.

Norton: I will bring up the subject of Sections J and E.6 just to let them know that it will be brought to the next meeting. I've got a paragraph about the Athletics department presentation and will bring up that faculty are concerned that there is a state authority that says we have a \$28.2 million deficit more than twice as large as the other schools in Colorado. Will also bring up the Clark remodel issues and will reference the petition when I talk about that.

Norton: There is a new incremental. The incremental is a simple document compared to the whole budget that talks year over year change. In that model that VP Hanlon reported to the Board at the October meeting, we were looking at a 3% undergraduate tuition increase, a 5% state allocation, and 3% SALX. There is another scenario in there of a 0% resident undergraduate tuition increase, 5% state increase, and 3% salary increase. Both of those put us in the red by the end of the process. We have added a couple of new scenarios, and these are for the 2% resident undergraduate tuition increase and 3% state, because the governor's budget request for higher education is 3%, then 2% SALX for faculty, AP and graduate students, and 3% for State Classified because that's state mandated. There is another scenario of a 4% undergraduate tuition increase and 6% increase from the state. That is hoping that our lobbyists can make some progress there, and a 3% SALX for faculty and staff. Those scenarios put us in the red of \$19-20 million.

Norton: We went from a 1% budget reallocation exercise in the October presentation to now a 2% budget reallocation. Essentially what we are doing is to pay for a 2% or 3% SALX. We are telling units they need to cut their budgets by 2% to cover that.

Pedros-Gascon: Indicated that in the past, when EVP Miranda was Provost, we had year after year reallocations, and that was highly contested and controversial. Don't know if you can transmit how unpopular that kind of measure tends to be at CSU. For departments like mine, 2% of our running budget is \$40,000. It's a situation that affects everyone unevenly.

Norton: Agreed that can be brought up. Requested that Mike Antolin, who is a representative on the Committee for Strategic and Financial Planning now, perhaps transmit that message to that committee that they need to keep their eyes on what's going on. There are not a lot of dials to turn in our budget.

Chair Smith: Noted that if there is an opportunity, I can ask about it in Cabinet tomorrow. Did not realize that it had been increased recently.

Norton: It's an ongoing process and the budget does not look nearly as positive as it did last year.

Martin: Asked if there would be updates from the lobbying team at the Board meeting about how things are going in Denver.

Norton: There will be a state budget update given verbally.

Michael Antolin: Asked to clarify what Norton wanted addressed to the committee. I've been elected to that committee, but nobody has reached out to me in any way.

Chair Smith: I will reach out to the chair of that committee and let her know.

3. Budget Model Report – Jennifer Martin, Rob Mitchell

Martin: Not much has happened in the last week relative to the budget model. We finished the Fall campus engagement sessions the week prior to Fall break. We collectively had over three hundred unique engagements across the series. Think every session in the last week was full, so it was great to see such campus participation. Am working with Mitchell to summarize all the notes that we accumulated through those sessions and will be providing those to the committees. The Technical Committee met once and the Steering Committee meets for the first time next week. The Executive Sponsor Committee has met a couple of times, so a lot of work is happening, and it is good to see such engagement from across campus. The thought is that we will have more campus engagement sessions, perhaps not at the frequency that we had them this Fall. There are no finite plans on how frequent they will be or how they might be structured for this Spring, but we want to maintain that engagement with campus moving forward.

Rob Mitchell: Noted that Athletics is an auxiliary unit, but there are some nuances around that that are critical to understand. Some of the other auxiliary units have some funding directed to

them, so it won't just be a conversation about Athletics. Think it will be a critical conversation in terms of that balance between auxiliary administrative units and where that comes from.

Martin: One of the things that came out during the campus sessions is that there are a lot of terms that are used regularly or used differently across units. We are working on a glossary of terms so that it is clear what is meant when we say auxiliary units, student credit hours, primary major cycle, and all these different terminologies that are used across campus. It is important that as the committees begin their work there is common language and a definition for how terms are intended to be used or what they mean in the context of the budget model.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if it would be possible down the line, to stop treating the Athletics budget as a Freedom of Information Act demanded action. Asked that it be treated like the budgets of the rest of the academic units. It is a very peculiar situation that in order to understand this we have to file a Freedom of Information Act request while the rest of the budgets are open. It merits at least some explanation given that we are treating them as an academic unit.

Mitchell: Noted this will be put in the feedback form. One of the reasons to engage in this kind of process is to enable some additional transparency in terms of how decisions are made. Will make sure that gets in the feedback notes that we pass along.

F. Discussion Items

1. Finalize University Grievance Officer Survey – Christine Pawliuk

Christine Pawliuk: Updated all the dates and added the question about whether you have interacted with other offices.

Martin: Noted the need to think in the future about Richard Eykholt and the institutional knowledge that he has relative to this process. Think we should have a back up plan in place or at least begin to identify someone who can start working alongside Eykholt to get prepared for the future.

Provost Nerger: Noted that certain things are not responsibilities associated with the UGO, such as working on Section J. Have been working out how to compensate Eykholt for that. Noted that people should not expect to get that with the next few UGO's. These are two very distinct roles.

Martin: Wonder how many people reach out to him through his UGO role with non-UGO issues because they don't know who else to reach out to.

Provost Nerger: All the time. Think in the survey that should be separated in some way.

Chair Smith: Asked if we could have a question about whether people have engaged with the UGO in ways not listed above in the survey.

Norton: Noted it may be worth having a conversation with Marion Underwood when she gets here about maybe hiring someone to shadow Eykholt.

Pedros-Gascon: Understand the concerns about the future but also want to indicate that the idea of identifying the person that is going to take over is not really the most democratic process. Concerned about the optics and that we should have a more open process.

Provost Nerger: Noted that this is volunteer work.

Pedros-Gascon: Concerned about having someone shadow, and how that person is identified.

Chair Smith: Asked if we should include a new question about whether people have engaged with the UGO in other ways to get a sense of how much people are utilizing his role in that way.

Martin: Think it would be helpful to put a survey question. Know that the percentage of time Eykholt spends on non-UGO inquiries is high and he does a good job of tracking his meetings. Think he has good records, but also think it would be helpful to capture that in the survey if we can.

Provost Nerger: Noted that we also increased the percent time of the UGO recently.

Norton: Expressed concern that it would muddy the survey, and it would become a survey about Eykholt rather than a survey about the UGO. Would prefer it just to be about the UGO.

DiVerdi: Agreed with Norton.

Mitchell: Suggested discussing at some point in the future, some way of capturing that institutional knowledge.

Chair Smith: Asked if we want to vote on whether to put in an additional question.

Provost Nerger: Don't think we should.

Pawliuk: It sounds like Eykholt has good data on that percentage anyway, probably better than what we would get in a survey.

Chair Smith: Then, we just need to finalize the dates for when it is going to be sent out. Thanked Pawliuk for her work on this.

2. ASC/Advisor and Faculty Student Success Framework – Gaye DiGregorio

Gaye DiGregorio: We are going to give you a condensed version of our presentation for Faculty Council, and then we would like to have some discussion with a couple of questions and any feedback that you have. We are going to talk about the Academic Success Coordinator and Faculty Student Success Framework. This was developed with a subset of the Advising Student Success Working Group. In 2023 we got feedback from the Student Success Leadership Group from Associate and Assistant Deans and the Committee on Teaching and Learning. Then we

revised the framework and shared it with the Provost, Student Affairs, and Faculty Council leadership this summer. We are at the point that we would like to share this with Faculty Council, acknowledging that it is not a fully developed implementation plan but is at a place to get input from faculty.

DiGregorio: The purpose of this framework is to recognize that the professional advisors focus on academic advising and the role of the faculty in mentoring roles to support student success, which has a broad impact for students. Also thinking about an inclusive and equitable student experience with both professional advisors and faculty throughout a student's experience and a way to highlight approaches and practices that amplify the faculty mentoring that we know is already happening.

DiGregorio: The academic advising model that we developed in 2007 is basically a 2 + 2 that students would be advised by a professional academic advisor for the first two years and then a faculty advisor the last two years. Currently, this intended faculty advising role isn't practiced for the most part. There are a few exceptions, but currently 97% of all students are assigned to a professional academic advisor throughout their career at CSU. This new model is talking about the student experience in which the academic advisor and the faculty would work with students throughout the four years. Faculty mentoring would be integrated into the existing teaching effectiveness. This structure focuses on the expertise of professional advisors and faculty. For example, we know that professional advisors have expertise and support the student with their transition to the institution. Figuring out what they're going to study, their academic plan, growth success, academic success, and obviously faculty have a lot of expertise in their understanding of the discipline and involvement in high impact activities such as research.

Robert Gudmestad: We believe that currently faculty student mentoring doesn't work very well at CSU, at least in a broadly consistent way. Those students who are going to seek out a professor are those students who are high academic achievers because they really want to succeed. It doesn't seem to be happening as much in the first two years, especially when we are thinking about retention of students and those students who are in categories of high numbers that are leaving the university. It seems to a certain extent that the students who really need mentoring are not getting mentored earlier in their college career.

Gudmestad: Part of it is to figure out how to come up with at least a common framework for what mentoring is and potentially embed it into the TILT Teaching Effectiveness Framework. There is difficulty in assessing mentoring because from the perspective of a lot of faculty, they aren't going to get credit for it. It is not just a one size fits all solution, and it is not a one-time effort. It is especially incorporating it into the classroom and thinking about mentoring students earlier in their degree program. There are important experiences and experiential learning that have students sticking around campus and make their education important to them, and two of them really involve mentoring. It is creating a relationship rich environment for students within the university.

DiGregorio: The purpose of bringing this to Faculty Council is that we want to introduce this framework of advising happening through the whole four years. Asked what the initial reactions are and any recommendations for next steps.

DiVerdi: Asked how many advisors are currently employed at the university.

DiGregorio: About 116.

DiVerdi: Asked what is the single biggest reason why faculty don't advise as much as you'd like.

Gudmestad: Advising is different than mentoring. We've split them at this university and so most people see advising as academic advising and mentoring as different than that.

Norton: Appreciate the framework and had similar questions as DiVerdi, such as how we can incentivize people to do this. Noted that in Section E.12 of the Faculty Manual, it does include mentoring activities in the evaluation of teaching, advising, and mentoring. Think that socializing the framework is a great idea and that there are a lot of faculty who do this and who would lean into it if they could see it in their annual evaluation.

Mitchell: Think it is important for us to be clear about why it isn't happening and would encourage us not to use the term invisible labor when we are talking about it. Particularly when we look at how many students need to be mentored and how much work it might take for all of us to collectively do that. The perception of invisible labor is that it's unpaid, when in reality this is our job. It is our job to train, teach, and mentor students and we need to be doing it better. Would like to see part of the conversation be about how we can be efficient doing this because there are more students than faculty. We don't want to get to a point where the teaching and mentoring load becomes huge. I see this as a critical part of our job for us to continue to create value as a university moving forward.

Sybil Sharvelle: Shared the experience of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering because we've gone through several iterations of mentorship and academic advising. When I first started, all faculty were assigned to do both academic advising and mentorship. We all had a number of students every semester that we did this for, then it was recognized that the faculty just didn't understand the rules and policies of the department but wanted to still have engagement and mentorship. We moved to a model where they met with an academic advisor and had meetings with faculty for mentorship. That was not very successful either, the students thought it was really forced and most of them didn't make their appointments. Think it felt very forced for everyone to be assigned to certain faculty and there were only a few students that the department felt had benefited from that, so we moved away from that too. From those experiences, a lot of these mentorship roles really develop organically. Think we need to find ways to incentivize those organic relationships that develop and for faculty to have credit for doing that.

DiGregorio: We have heard that from others as well, so that is why we're thinking of mentoring broadly. We spent a lot of time talking about whether to use the term mentoring because it means so many different things to people. We are not necessarily talking about assigning mentors but think there needs to be a lot more work to flesh this out.

Gudmestad: We've talked about how faculty can be more proactive because the students who want mentoring are going to get it because they are going to seek it out. There are a lot of students who are unclear what their path is through college, who probably need mentoring, so how are faculty able to recognize those students who really need it.

Martin: Noted that when Section E.12 of the Faculty Manual was modified, we focused on mentoring because faculty were actively being discouraged from advising because of not having the bandwidth and not having the institutional knowledge to suggest which courses to take for graduation. One of the challenges was that mentoring wasn't recognized in evaluations. It is not recognized in the promotion and tenure dossiers, and it is difficult to assess. There wasn't a framework by which mentoring is recognized in all the different ways in which it can occur, whether it is through research, career guidance, or student clubs. That challenge came up during conversation, but the language is there, and the work left to be done is how it can be encouraged and effectively recognized.

Chair Smith: Think there needs to be a significant educational piece with the students as well. It's not just faculty and the burden on them to instruct, but also giving the students the kind of information about how that contributes to success.

Gudmestad: To add to that point, it doesn't just have to be a mentor. The best thing is to have several mentors. Somebody could advise in this way, and somebody could provide mentoring in another way.

Norton: Noted that the Graduate School created the Graduate Center for Inclusive Mentoring, and they have a process of essentially badging individuals who have gone through a training, signifying that those people are aware of mentoring issues around graduate education. It is a very different interaction at the undergraduate level, but that might be something to check out.

Sharvelle: Noted another resource on this for graduate students. A lot of them do an individual development plan. Modeling something like that could be very beneficial because it puts ownership of gaining mentorship in student hands and helps give them tools to understand how to get the mentorship that they need.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any final thoughts. The way we can proceed with this is to bring it to Faculty Council as a discussion item to get further feedback from the broader community. It is not an endorsement, just a discussion item.

Provost Nerger: Think it would be good for the Council of Chairs to discuss it, possibly before Faculty Council.

Antolin: Think this would require a bit more thought about ways to implement it because most of us realize that we have way more students than we have bandwidth to mentor in the way that is being suggested here. Think it is premature to bring it up. Agreed that it is something that we should be working on and try to develop, but problems without practical solutions don't move things forward.

Chair Smith: It seems like if the Council of Chairs hasn't seen this, it might be worth going to them before Faculty Council.

DiGregorio: We have put together a draft of some next steps that we've gotten from the feedback so far. One of them is to go to the Council of Chairs. Appreciate Antolin's comment that if we come to this group without enough structure, then maybe it is not ready to move forward.

Mitchell: Rather than coming with the full plan that looks like it is a framework, maybe come with less and use it as an opportunity to put out a call. For department chairs, maybe present and have them provide some input. We might be able to get to the point that Antolin's alluding to. Think you would get a lot of people who might be excited about it.

Chair Smith: Think that is a great idea but would say that the Faculty Council monthly meeting is not a place to do that. Would recommend more of a forum type of environment because then you get the time for feedback and input.

Mitchell: Maybe it could be a Faculty Council announcement instead.

DiGregorio: We are also open to go to the chairs first as Provost Nerger mentioned.

Chair Smith: Then we can help facilitate a forum, if you are interested in organizing that.

DiGregorio: Noted that it sounds like we should wait on the December meeting, work with the department heads, and then think about this in the Spring.

Chair Smith: Agreed. Thanked DiGregorio and Gudmestad for presenting.

G. Executive Session

Executive Committee moved to Executive Session to discuss the topic of personnel.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

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