

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, December 12, 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; **Zaid Abdo** (substituting for Katriana Popichak), Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences; **Sybil Sharvelle**, Engineering; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Amy Hoseth**, Associate Dean for User Services & Assessment; **Michelle Wilde**, Head of Research Support & Open Scholarship

Absent: Katriana Popichak, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences (excused); Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant (excused); Janice Nerger, Interim Provost/Executive Vice President; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

December 12, 2023 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – November 28, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections or changes to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from November 28th.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on January 23, 2024– Location TBD – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on February 6, 2024 – Location TBD – 4:00 p.m.

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

Chair Smith: Interim Provost Nerger is out of office, and there will not be a Provost's report this week.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – December 1, 2023

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

Brad Goetz: No, nothing out of the ordinary with these minutes.

Chair Smith: Moved that the University Curriculum Committee minutes from December 1st be added to the consent agenda on the Faculty Agenda for February 6th.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the consent agenda on the Faculty Council agenda for February 6th.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: We sent an email to faculty from Faculty Council leadership to bring attention to the work we have done this fall and a couple of things that are coming up in the spring. This is a part of the strategic communication plan that I showed a draft of in an earlier Faculty Council meeting. We will continue to have those kinds of communications periodically. The next step is to invite faculty again in the spring to a Faculty Council meeting and continue to try and get engagement from the broader faculty to Faculty Council. Amy Barkley and I are meeting with Rachel Baschnagel from the Provost's Office next week to talk about the strategy for revising the Faculty Council website. We are going to get an update and refresh to that website which hasn't been done in some time and make it a little more user friendly. The plan is to call out the standing committees a little bit more and make the membership more accessible.

Chair Smith: Andrew Norton, Joseph DiVerdi, and I met with CoGen today and they brought forward to us a proposal from a task force to approach the road map for potentially forming a new standing committee that is focused on DEI. We were enthusiastic about this idea of forming a task force, but I'd like to add a discussion item because we have a document from them that we can look at as a group and it would be great to get everybody's input on this. I'd like to propose we discuss this proposal for forming a task force and modify the agenda so we can have a quick discussion about that. We don't need to do that in Executive Session, we will just add it as a discussion item.

Chair Smith: Tomorrow is the next Cabinet meeting, so there may be stuff that comes up in that meeting that I can bring forward to the next Executive Committee meeting.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Andrew Norton: Chair Smith, DiVerdi, and I met with the other Council leaders and had a discussion around some budget issues and some future work that we are going to do. I have been attending the open sessions for the Director of the Office of Civil Rights position, and those have been interesting. It is a short presentation followed by a lot of discussion and questions. Questions center around how to communicate accountability to faculty and staff, which seems to be a general theme, of how we hold folks accountable. We run into the same issues with the grievance process and the Grievance Officer in that a lot of those things are confidential, so we never really know whether people are being held accountable.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: With regards to the item of compliance, we should still be able to ask about follow ups once these things have been litigated already. For example, in the case of Spectrum, the company that was engaged in a Title XI dispute with one of our students. The Board of Governors ended up reaching an agreement with that person. I understand that we cannot deal with items that are being adjudicated right now, but we should be bringing it back to the table. I believe it would merit some conversation and follow up from administration.

Norton: For a lot of complaints or lawsuits against the university, the plaintiff always has the right to make that public. They generally choose not to, because it removes leverage and negotiating power. We may not like that things get settled silently, but it is always an option of the plaintiff to bring that forward. My guess is in that particular case, the person decided not to because they believed it to be in their best interest not to make that public. There are some that do become public but a lot of them don't. The accountability piece that I'm hearing about, is that it is a lot of complaints about faculty on faculty or faculty on student sexual harassment or assault, where we don't know what is happening to that. So, it is not so much an administrative problem, it is sort of more internal to faculty. That is where people talk to me about frustration around not knowing what is happening. I think that is something we can talk about with this new position, the Director of Civil Rights.

Pedros-Gascon: With this example, this is not an issue with one person and a student. This is an instance in which we have somewhere in administration that is not doing their homework. Title XI is a federal issue that is mandated on 24 hours. The very fact that we are hiring the same company and holding the same leadership position means that we may have learned nothing from that situation though the data seems to be very clear. This is a cultural issue, not an interpersonal one.

Norton: I think these are great topics to bring up with the new director when the person is hired. The search committee is meeting tomorrow to come up with the final choice.

Chair Smith: It would be great to have them come to Executive Committee.

Norton: That was part of the discussion with the candidates as to how they communicate and how they engage with Faculty Council, the AP Council, students, etc.

3. Budget Model Report – Jennifer Martin, Rob Mitchell

Jennifer Martin: As you all know, campus sessions for the fall wrapped up right before the break and Rob Mitchell and I have been spending quite a bit of time trying to summarize the feedback from those sessions so that we can provide that feedback to the committees. The most common questions are about the overall process such as timeline, why a hybrid RCM, who is making decisions, who is on the committees, how can folks provide feedback about the process, and general questions around the overall remodel process.

Martin: Across campus the general recognition, which was helpful through these sessions, is that resources in every unit across campus are relatively tight. We also saw a campus desire for interdisciplinary opportunities to be enabled in the model and finding ways for that to be a priority embodied in the model. We saw a lot of questions and comments around administrative costs, fee for service functions such as facilities and operations, and how they will be included, what parts of them need to be revisited or revised, and general interest in making that piece of our budget model more effective. Also recognizing that as we grow in enrollment, we also need to grow in resources for the administrative units, for example increasing staffing in procurement, enrollment, or student success.

Martin: Another common theme that we heard was the importance of equity being considered, specifically as it relates to conversations around compensation. That was a common theme that we heard and are interested in bringing forward to the committees and seeing how they address that particular piece of information around campus. There was also recognition that historically, CSU is not always open to changing and finding ways in which we can change our culture around change and around collaboration needs to be a priority. There was an overall interest in how we need to consider that as something to be a result of the model itself.

Rob Mitchell: Hopefully with these updates that we communicate to campus, people can feel comfortable with this process and see that there are some really neat opportunities and some real positives that can emerge from this and there will be a lot of opportunities to engage.

Mitchell: Both the Technical Committee and the Steering Committee are engaging in their work. The Technical Committee will have their third meeting tomorrow and the Steering Committee will have their second meeting next week. We are trying to do something fairly similar to the search committee process where there is confidentiality, and our conversations have a safe space to critique the issues. There will be a university rather than unit focus, it will be solution oriented, and diversity, equity and inclusion impacts will be considered through the process. We have leaned into shared governance pretty strongly in terms of who is on the committee so there are students, non-tenure track faculty, and lots of representation across campus in terms of this process. There is a Microsoft Team created for both committees where everything that happens needs to be brought in front of the team. Within the committees, these conversations need to be transparent. We are trying to preserve the process to enable the right kind of transparency that is best for the overarching university.

Martin: The one thing I would say relative to how folks can be informed of the process is that one of the charges of the Steering Committee is to communicate with campus. They are currently

identifying how they will do that and will likely seek the guidance of folks from the communication staff on what the best method is for getting information and updates to campus. I think we will see opportunities for feedback and on things as they occur sometime in the spring, even into early summer, and certainly once we go into the shadow budget year in the fall of 2024.

Mitchell: The Technical Committee have leaned into the idea of an overarching university focus and ensuring some confidentiality. With the Steering Committee, it is still early times, but hopefully they lean in as well. We would like the Executive Committee to help enable that process to move forward in a strong and robust way and help our colleagues not be overly worried and understand that the information will come out when the Steering Committee has enough to share. We also had some meetings with the Executive Sponsor Committee to set some boundaries in terms of what the committees will be working on. It is exciting to see people on campus willing to serve and put in some additional work above what they normally would need to do because they care about CSU and our values and vision and what we can accomplish.

F. Discussion Items

1. Athletics State Audit Report Summary FY22

Chair Smith: We are moving into the discussion items part of the agenda and the first one is the Athletics State Audit Report Summary. I sent this out to Executive Committee already, but I wanted to make sure that everybody is alright with the editorial change as well as get any feedback because now is the time that we could have them make adjustments to the report before we send it out to the full Faculty Council. The only edit that I got from folks is removing a repeated sentence in Section 1 under the Athletics deficit section. Other than that, no one else submitted any edits. Asked if there were any comments or concerns.

Norton: Think it is Athletics' call on what is in there and so that is why I didn't make any comments. Generally, people submit reports to us in a formal manner so hopefully this will answer the outstanding questions or will encourage further dialogue between faculty and Athletics on this.

Joseph DiVerdi: Noted that we don't have to ask Athletics for an edit on the repeated sentence.

Norton: Noted that at the end of point 1, it says many of them are female and should say many of them are women.

Martin: Agreed with Norton's comment.

Chair Smith: Will ask for this additional edit and will send it out as a report to Faculty Council before the end of the semester.

DiVerdi: Asked if this will appear at the next Faculty Council meeting.

Norton: Think this could be sent to Faculty Council members over email as a response to previous business.

2. Libraries Negotiating Priorities – Amy Hoseth, Michelle Wilde

Amy Hoseth: This is an important subject for us in the Libraries and is important for the responsible stewardship of funding and things like that. We wanted to run through some information about the Libraries licensing priorities. Ultimately, we are hoping to get support from Faculty Council for these licensing priorities, which are important for us in our negotiations with large academic publishers. I will give you a little bit of publishing context in terms of scholarly publishing for the Libraries and will share a bit of information about our current negotiations with Elsevier, which are happening right now through the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries, and then talk briefly about ways that faculty can help.

Hoseth: What we see right now in scholarly publishing is that about five publishers control more than 50% of all articles published, and this is largely the result of consolidation in that field. You used to have small associations that would publish a handful of journals. Now, many of those journals are in the hands of these large publishing companies. Specifically, there are a big five that tend to publish the largest number of journals in any field. The Elsevier contract is at the top of the pile for the annual expenses that the Libraries pays for access to these resources. We negotiate that contract in conjunction with the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries. The number of titles costs us \$2 million per year. Some of the other large contracts that we have are with Springer at \$1.2 million and at the bottom of the list, Wiley at \$1.1 million. We are negotiating these contracts in conjunction with other consortia, other large groups of academic libraries, so that we can make sure that we are getting the best pricing possible.

Hoseth: You can see the upward trend here over the last 30 years, what the expenses are for the Libraries versus what they used to be. The University of Virginia did an exercise to show that in 2001 it cost \$2.85 for a gallon of milk and in 2020 it was \$3.32. If milk rose at the same rate as the Springer Journal package, it would cost about \$14 per gallon. Unlike milk, we are paying a lot more for these resources and in many cases five, six, or even seven times more than we did back in the day.

Hoseth: There are different types of access for publishing such as an open access journal or a subscription journal. There are different flavors of open access, and gold open access is the preferred. It is the gold standard. That is where those articles are published by the publisher and on their website and they are openly available to whomever. Green and bronze are different levels of access to those resources. For example, in green open access, they can be archived in an institutional repository or on an individual's personal website. Subscription only journals represent the largest number of all journals and those are ones that you have to pay to see. This is the environment that we are looking at right now, and that segues into our conversation with Elsevier.

Hoseth: Elsevier is a Dutch publishing company. They publish Science Direct, or at least they host Science Direct, and Scopus. There are other large products that Elsevier produces and many of them are ones that you all have used in the past. Elsevier also has the dubious distinction of

being the publisher that seems to have the greatest amount of inflation on their collections and charges the highest number for libraries to have access to those collections. What we have seen very recently are these examples of big deal cancellations. For those who may not know, a big deal is a package of journals that are sold together. So, even if you are using a small percentage of those journals on your campus, Elsevier wants to bundle them as a gigantic bundle of resources that you pay a high amount of money for because that amount continues to increase. We have seen some cancellations in recent years at some significant institutions. MIT Delaware and Oregon State have cancelled their Elsevier contracts altogether. Both that large package and any individual title subscriptions that they had. Other institutions including in Texas, in a statewide negotiation, cancelled their package but did retain some title subscriptions.

Hoseth: We are not the first to explore this and to have this kind of possibility raised on our campus. Specific to our local environment is our big deal with Elsevier which runs through December 31st, there are examples across the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries plus the University of Wyoming. About 26% of the journal titles in that package represent 80% of usage. More specifically on our campus, about 11% of the journal titles represent upwards of 70% of usage. We are paying for a lot of resources that get very little use on our campus. Karen Estlund, the Dean of Libraries, is in conversation with Elsevier on a weekly basis at this point. Our current contract runs through the end of 2023. We do already have an extension to the end of January because the negotiations are continuing and nothing has been determined yet. There are a couple of possible outcomes here for how this negotiation will go. One is that we continue to have access to the Freedom collection and all the subscribed-to titles that we currently have, so nothing would really change. Those contracts are typically three years. What that would mean is that we negotiate a new three-year contract through the Alliance with Elsevier, and everything continues as it is.

Hoseth: Option two would be that we keep title specific subscriptions and that could be either a shared list of titles for all the institutions in the Alliance, or a list that we work on together with CSU and Wyoming, since we are the large R1 institutions in that group. We have a tool also through the Alliance called Gold Rush, that lets us do in-depth analysis on use on our campus. We can figure out cost per use in some ways that have been incredibly helpful for us in assessing these kinds of deals.

Hoseth: The third option is if negotiation doesn't go well, we might not sign a contract with Elsevier. In that case, we would fill journal requests through a direct article request service that has a quick turnaround time and would probably also use interlibrary loans.

Hoseth: We created the Libraries Licensing Priorities document recently that echoes similar licensing priorities used by other major institutions. The main way that we can have Faculty Council and faculty support us in this work is by supporting those licensing priorities across publishers. Obviously, Elsevier is the big one that we are focused on right now in the Libraries, but next year it will be a different publisher as those contracts continue to roll on. Additionally, if we don't reach a deal with Elsevier, a statement from Faculty Council would be incredibly helpful to us and strengthen our negotiating position with Elsevier and others. If you are on a society or editorial board, faculty support for open access and fair publishing and pricing models in all these ways is incredibly helpful to us as we consider the financial implications for libraries

on our campuses. We discussed the mission of the Libraries in our fiscal responsibility as stewards of our research budget. The largest amount of the Library budget is dedicated to the cost of subscriptions to academic books and journals. We have developed these collection development priorities to help us make these decisions. We did that through a task force in the Library that looked at evolving contract negotiations. Then, we also take advantage of best practices and what other institutions have done in the same kind of situations. Finally, we highlight the fact that we are working closely with our faculty during these conversations, knowing that these are difficult decisions that have an impact on faculty research. We are committed to providing the resources that you all need to do your work, but we want to make sure that any contracts that we sign are going to align with those licensing priorities and that they consider things like pricing and fair negotiation.

Hoseth: Our list of priorities includes being able to negotiate fair and sustainable prices for resources, resources that meet accessibility and universal design, and transparency because we want to make sure that we have licensing terms that allow us to share information about the deals that we are signing. That is incredibly helpful to other libraries who are facing similar conversations. Lastly, giving Faculty Council support for these licensing priorities is incredibly important to us. At the University of Colorado at Boulder, their Boulder Faculty Assembly issued a statement supporting their university libraries on October 5th, and more recently, the University of Wyoming faculty backed their libraries in ongoing negotiations with a number of different publishers on December 1st. We are seeing other faculty in the area supporting their libraries in this way.

Chair Smith: Thanked Hoseth for the presentation, and asked if there were any questions or comments.

Michael Antolin: Asked out of the potential scenarios that were presented, which one we are headed toward.

Hoseth: What we are hoping is to get Faculty Council to issue a statement that would support those licensing priorities broadly, regardless of whether we are talking about this specific situation with Elsevier right now or next year with another publisher. We have identified those licensing priorities as guiding principles for how we want to handle our negotiations with these publishers going forward. They are not specific to Elsevier; they are meant to be broader for our connections and discussions with all our vendors. I don't know yet how Elsevier will go, but what we are interested in is broad support for those licensing priorities.

Antolin: Asked what happens to those other big universities who back out or buy things ala carte.

Hoseth: It is a mix. We have information on what has happened behind the scenes for some of those institutions. In many cases they are providing the same level of access at a much lower cost because they are not doing that large deal on the surface. Often for the faculty, there isn't a massive change in terms of the research materials that they have access to. What typically changes are the Library workflows on our side have to change to accommodate the different steps that we are taking to get those materials.

Michelle Wilde: Agreed with Hoseth. Think that one thing Faculty Council can do is make a resolution of support.

Pedros-Gascon: Indicated support for this request. Think it is very important that you continue encouraging faculty to try as much as possible to engage in open access. Hope that down the line we can continue having access to some resources and that the Library consider becoming a member of a database for Spanish literature. I have had to do all my research at CSU without having access to that database. Hope that people like me can also be a part of the discussion and the databases that we are using are also considered.

Martin: Think this is something that we often don't realize as faculty, is just how burdensome negotiating these contracts is. Asked if there is any information around the publishing rates that faculty pay and how that aligns with the increasing contract prices for folks like Elsevier. Think that all faculty feel the pressure and pain of publishing and paying high costs for publishing that seems to be going higher.

Hoseth: Agreed that faculty are being asked to pay more. I don't have more specifics. I assume you're talking about the APCs; the author publishing charges.

Wilde: Think that the sciences are really different from the humanities. There is a tradition of paying page charges in the sciences that can be very expensive and on top of that, if you want to make your article openly available, there is usually about a \$3,000 fee. If you are looking at a nature journal, it can be more than that. We do have some transformative agreements that are in place. For instance, if your journal is published by Wiley, we have an agreement that it is made openly available. If the author wants it to be openly available there are also some agreements that we have. The whole landscape right now is really in a change moment. Last summer, the White House issued a resolution saying that all federally funded research should be made freely available to the public immediately and right now the NIH just had that provision in place. There is a six-month embargo as a lot of government programs or resolutions seem to play out. There was no money attached to that, but I think that a lot of publishers are looking at that and thinking how they are going to make as much money if that becomes a reality.

Wilde: It is evolving right now, and we do have some programs and can help faculty select publications with the publishers that we have agreements with right now. Unfortunately, we tend to have multi-year contracts, but when a contract is up it can change the landscape as far as what is being offered as a part of that contract.

Wilde: Please have faculty reach out, we have a scholarly communication librarian, Khaleedah Thomas, who is fantastic, and she can help folks navigate what their options are for publishing support.

Martin: Recently in my department, we have removed the impact factor requirement for certain publications. I think with those sorts of conversations, especially for junior faculty and scientists, where those publishing costs are so high, if we are able to support other ways to meet your publication requirements that are more financially stable for the faculty member or the university. My concern is that if we create it where faculty members can't get access to the

resources they need, but they are also continuing to pay high publication charges, then that isn't a sustainable model for the success of our faculty. Asked if there might be a way in which we can alleviate both of those tensions.

Wilde: Agreed and think that in addition to the financial part of this, there is a strong equity component here across disciplines and across what different areas researchers are working in. I think that there is some work being done on that within the ADVANCE grant and the Faculty Success program, but I do think that it's a very appropriate thing for Faculty Council to get involved in for a number of reasons. I want to be clear that if the contract negotiation is not successful, faculty will still have access to resources at no cost to the individual. It will come through a different channel, on the Library end.

Norton: I support a resolution, and ask who the target audience is, the libraries, upper administration, Elsevier, etc. Thanked Wilde for bringing up the White House policy, that plays into the sustainability argument for some of these journals, that some of them may not be sustainable if they are not going to become open access in an affordable manner.

Zaid Abdo: Asked if we can have a copy of your presentations. Also, I know that there is some support funding for us to pay for open source as well. Asked if that is a model that we need to be looking at in terms of switching the idea about how things are being done instead of paying Elsevier.

Hoseth: Wilde may be able to answer the second part of the question. We are happy to work with you on the wording for a resolution and we can look at what some of our peer institutions have already done. Dean Estlund and others on our end can work with you to prepare something to be shared for the February meeting.

Wilde: Shared a link in the chat to information about different programs that the Library has right now. I think that the comment about looking at tenure and promotion is important. It is all over the board as far as what departments are requiring. There are some departments that require you to publish in very specific journals, and that can sometimes be problematic, especially for our non-tenured faculty or graduate students when they are looking at building a career. There are usually key journals that you have to publish in to help advance your career. I think we need to look at if there can be other options, and it's a moving target. Right now, there are some very good publishing opportunities for journals that make that research openly available. I think in the sciences there is more of a tradition of paying, but I want to make sure we don't forget the folks in the humanities and social sciences who don't tend to have those big grant funding pools of money, and that it would also be great if their articles could be made openly available. We had a fund for about ten years where we would help subsidize the open access charges for faculty, but we were reaching a relatively small number of faculty and the last time we had it the fund was completely tapped out in less than a month. I think that open access is a part of the DNA of a lang grant institution, and that our whole purpose is to make information available to the public, so I think it's an easy sell from that standpoint.

Antolin: Would also appreciate some wording on what exactly it is that you are asking us to resolve, so those examples would really help.

Hoseth: Thanked everyone for this initial support. I'm still optimistic that we will come to a resolution with Elsevier. We will continue to do our best to make those good faith negotiations and get good outcomes, and we will work with you on some language that Faculty Council could consider supporting us in the priorities that we have identified.

Chair Smith: Pedros-Gascon offered to help with wording the resolution. Asked if anybody else would like to work with Hoseth and Wilde for an initial draft resolution on the licensing priorities.

Martin: Volunteered to help.

Christine Pawliuk: Offered to help, as well.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin and Pawliuk for volunteering. Noted that we would draft this resolution and Executive Committee would consider that and potentially vote to put in on the agenda for Faculty Council's consideration. Th soonest the Faculty Council would be able to see such a resolution would be the February 6th meeting, and our next Executive Committee meeting is on January 23rd. We would probably need to have it by January 16th to circulate it.

Hoseth: That will be no problem, and it may come from Dean Estlund. We will work with you all to get engaged with the folks who volunteered to help. We have some great examples that we can use as a starting point and Dean Estlund may already have something drafted. We would appreciate getting this on the agenda for the February meeting, that would be really helpful.

Chair Smith: I will follow up with an email connecting you to Martin, Pedros-Gascon, and Pawliuk.

3. Taskforce for establishing a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee in Faculty Council

Chair Smith: The mission is creating this standing committee in Faculty Council is to address and prevent issues on systemic sexual harassment and gender bias and the promotion, recruitment, retention, development, and protection of gender, ethnic, and racial minorities, and their intersectionality. The justification is that despite all of what is happening at CSU, more faculty of color are leaving CSU due to a lack of support from leadership. We are also seeing faculty with marginalized identities being denied promotion and leadership opportunities even when their qualifications and accomplishments are exemplary. These effects reflect what is being referred to as 'diversity washing' by scholars and practitioners wherein organizations make diversity statements and introduce programs without legitimate and meaningful change to further the goals of gender and racial minorities. Moreover, there are no effective formal channels for advocacy and shared governance to address these issues in Faculty Council.

Chair Smith: The goals are to establish this task force and for the DEI task force to explore this idea of a new standing committee in Faculty Council, with that new committee possibly being established in Fall 2024. We wanted to bring this to Executive Committee to get feedback.

Martin: I want to voice my support for the importance of this effort, whether it be a task force or as a standing committee. I support the idea of a standing committee but wonder how we embed this principle into the work of the existing standing committees. I think about the work of CoRSAF, for example, where it is important that all of the things we consider are through a lens of DEI. Think what I would like to see more of is the principles that would come from a task force or standing committee would be fundamentally part of all the other standing committees in the work that they do. I would like to see both if that is possible.

Chair Smith: An idea was brought up in our meeting with CoGen, of this maybe being modeled similarly to the Committee on Non-Tenured Track Faculty. That started out as a way to integrate non-tenure track faculty into Faculty Council. I think that was effective and that committee still exists, but I also feel like we have integrated it into all facets of Faculty Council. I think it could be a way to help facilitate a more complete integration of DEI into all of the committees that we have. There are many other issues that this kind of committee could take on, that might be harder for other standing committees to do when they have many other priorities to deal with.

DiVerdi: Seven years ago, when we began the process of building CoNTTF, the work that was done over that period of time has been successful. The various activities that CoNTTF has participated in over those years have been education, enforcement, communication, and others. Education of the faculty of Faculty Council and of the Administration and awareness, and the chair of that committee has been responsible for fielding complaints of failure of the principles to be upheld. That has been a way of troubleshooting the systems around the university, and I see this a parallel to this.

Antolin: I'm in favor of forming a task force but would ask what aspects of governance or day-to-day running of the university this committee is going to cover that isn't covered other places. I would like to see a very specific statement of both how this eventual committee would be able to interact with current standing committees and then with other parts of the university administration. Those would be two key things that I would want to see covered in this task force.

Chair Smith: That's a great point. I think that is one of the things that they are going to address. Those two things are crucial and need to be addressed.

Antolin: Think that if it is going to make an impact, we need to know what duties they are going to take on and who they are going to interact with, both with the Faculty Council and otherwise.

Chair Smith: That's why we encouraged them to propose this task force, because we did not feel they were ready to be able to move to a standing committee but could get there with work.

Norton: I'm strongly in favor of moving forward with this task force and have been thinking about why we don't have a group within Faculty Council specifically working on DEI. Think the comments about the mechanics of how it will work are the job of the task force. Encourage Chair Smith who will be selecting the members and charging that group to think about folks that

have stronger ties within the Faculty Council governance structure whether it is Executive Committee or CoRSAF.

Abdo: Noted that there are resources available within the colleges, for example in CVMBS we have an associate dean for DEIJ. Think it is important to know what we already have to go with before reinventing the wheel.

Chair Smith. I think there is still a piece missing in the DEIJ puzzle that is more bottom up. For example, how faculty advocate in a way that isn't necessarily advocated from the top down.

DiVerdi: One of the other things we talked about that an eventual committee could be helpful with is effectively drafting Faculty Manual language.

Mitchell: Think we should go into it with a fairly open perspective. It may be that a standing committee is the appropriate response, but there might be some other better response. I think they should be encouraged to lean into the task force piece and do so with an open perspective, not necessarily that your job as a task force is to get a standing committee.

Chair Smith: It sounds like we have consensus that this is worthy of our support. I will move forward with forming the task force and welcome any suggestions on membership. I will try to get it going before the end of the year, but they probably won't meet before the end of the year.

Chair Smith: The rest of our agenda is devoted to Executive Session, asked for a motion.

DiVerdi: Moved that we go into Executive Session for the purpose of evaluating the presidential survey and Faculty Council Chair evaluation.

Abdo: Seconded.

Motion passed, moved to Executive Session.

G. Executive Session

1. Finalize Presidential Evaluation Survey
2. Faculty Council Chair Evaluation

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Executive Session concluded at 4:50 p.m.

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