

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, January 30, 2024

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106

Present: Melinda Smith, Chair; Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair; Andrew Norton, BOG Representative; Sue Doe, Immediate Past Chair; Marion Underwood, Provost/Executive Vice President; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Jennifer Martin, Agricultural Sciences; Rob Mitchell, Business; Sharon Anderson, Health and Human Sciences; Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Liberal Arts Christine Pawliuk, Libraries; William Sanford, Natural Resources; Michael Antolin, Natural Sciences; Zaid Abdo, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

Guests: Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee; Richard Eykholt, University Grievance Officer; Gamze Cavdar, Chair Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning; Tammy Hunt, Policy Office Manager

Absent: Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering (excused)

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

January 30, 2024 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

- A. Executive Committee Minutes – December 12, 2023
- B. Executive Committee Minutes – January 23, 2024

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any changes to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from December 12th or January 23rd.

Hearing none, both sets of minutes approved as submitted.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

- 1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on February 20, 2024– Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
 - a. The February 13th Executive Committee meeting is cancelled due to scheduling conflicts.

Chair Smith: Reminded members that the Executive Committee meetings will be held in a hybrid format. We will also not have our meeting on February 13th, because there will be a Cabinet retreat that day, as well as other events.

2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on February 6, 2024 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Provost Marion Underwood

Provost Marion Underwood: Have been working on continuing to get to know the University better. Expressed appreciation for all these opportunities to get to know CSU and share some sort of preliminary priorities while continuing to align those priorities with President Amy Parsons.

Provost Underwood: Have been working with the individual deans through email and in groups on their planning scenarios for the possible 2%, 4%, and 6% reductions in budgets. We hope that the full 6% will not be necessary, but we are asking colleges to plan for these possible reductions. We will have a meeting next week where everyone will come prepared to talk about their strategies for these planning scenarios to make sure that the planned reductions in one college do not undermine the progress of another college. We want to make sure we are coordinated in prioritizing student success, prioritizing graduate education, and prioritizing our ability to deliver the core curriculum. Expressed appreciation for how carefully the deans are planning to minimize the impact of these possible reductions and to work together.

Provost Underwood: Continuing to talk with various groups about the idea of looking at the Institutional Learning Objectives. Innovation in the undergraduate core curriculum will be a collaborative project led by the faculty. We are talking through some of the ideas and am benefitting from the input.

Provost Underwood: One of the President's priorities we are moving forward on is having more academic offerings at our Spur campus, both extending some of the programs already there, but also a consideration of offering a first-year curriculum at Spur as a possible pipeline to the Fort Collins campus for students in Denver. Am working with Jim Bradeen and James Pritchett, as the Vice President for Engagement and Extension, to convene a working group of faculty with diverse expertise. Have asked Chair Smith if Faculty Council would be interested in having a representative in this group, and believe an inquiry is being sent out. Seeing this as a positive development for all kinds of reasons. It expands what we are able to do in Denver. It invites urban students to have a way to start CSU Fort Collins by staying in Denver and then coming here to complete their program. There are some interesting possibilities there.

Provost Underwood: President Parsons is considering starting in Spring 2025, having one all-university commencement at the stadium in May. This would be in lieu of winter commencements. We would have the winter commencement this coming year, We want input from Faculty Council and the Associated Students of CSU on what that commencement would look like, because we want it to be special for the students. The all-university commencement would be accompanied by departmental celebrations where students' names will be called out and diplomas handed out, so this would be a combination of a big event in the stadium, likely on a Thursday or Friday, to be followed by departmental celebrations in whatever venue would be appropriate. Think this is a promising idea. Feel it would be special and meaningful event for the students to have an all-university event where they can graduate with their friends in the stadium

and couple them with these smaller ceremonies to give them individual recognition. Noted that it does cost money, so that is a consideration. This is under evaluation by the President.

Sharon Anderson: Asked if the common graduation ceremony is going to include graduate students as well as undergraduate students.

Provost Underwood: Yes, the idea being that there could also be special recognition of graduate degrees in other venues.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern that not everyone lives in Fort Collins, and it would make a lot of people who are graduating in the winter have to come back if they want to be recognized. That would be an enormous financial strain on those people. This could also be less personalized and do not think this will make up for a more intimate and meaningful ceremony.

Chair Smith: Wondering if there is a middle ground where there could still be small ceremonies, such as at the department level, as well as the big ceremony at the end of the year.

Provost Underwood: Think this is possible. This would be a good thing to bring up, because if this goes forward, would be insisting on a steering committee to be formed with faculty representation. See no reason why we could not do recognition ceremonies in December.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any other comments about graduation.

Richard Eykholt: President Yates did this many years ago and the motivation was so we could bring big-name speakers. Attendance dropped off steadily and after just three (3) years, we went back to having the college graduations. Would recommend talking to people who were around at that time to see why it failed.

Provost Underwood: Will connect with colleagues who have been here for longer. Have repeatedly suggested that there be a committee that offers suggestions for the speaker that includes students and faculty. Feel the students need a say in who the speaker is, and this may raise their interest in attending.

Jennifer Martin: Read an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education a few months ago about the declining attendance at graduations for four-year universities. Think it would be worth having an intentional conversation about what the role of graduation is for our campus and as we make changes, what population(s) we are trying to serve. The article alluded to the value of the experience is more for different people than the students, whether it is a large ceremony or smaller ceremonies.

Andrew Norton: Asked what the Spur courses would be directed toward. Asked: Would this be a dual degree method, a high school college program? Wondering if this will interface with community colleges. Having trouble seeing this if they are not students.

Provost Underwood: The idea is not dual enrollment for high school, but admitting students to do their first year at Spur and taking first-year courses offered by Fort Collins faculty that we would

hire to work down there. We would want coordination with community colleges for all kinds of reasons. We are thinking basic requirements classes that students could start there. Dual enrollment is another possibility. President Parsons wants more academic offerings at Spur and is open to dual enrollment, typical first-year curriculum, more certificates, new programs, etc. There is interest in enlivening the academic offerings there, and it is something that Jim Bradeen is interested in as well. President Parsons would also like a welcome center and admissions presence at CSU Spur so that people who go there and are excited about what they see can speak to an advisor about how their credits might transfer to CSU Fort Collins or how to apply.

Vice Provost Susan James: It has been true in student success for a long time, and certainly in majors like engineering, that you want students taking courses in their major in the first year and not just doing general education because it is vital for that first to second-year retention. We would need to consult experts on that.

Zaid Abdo: Asked if there were some market studies done on this demand, because if there is no demand, whatever resources you are putting towards this, no one will take.

Provost Underwood: Do not believe that work has been done yet, but we will need to do this. We need to know if there is an interest, and if we are going to offer new degrees or certificates, we absolutely need to do a market analysis to see if there is a workforce need.

Martin: Wondering if there is a desire long-term to host entire degree programs at Spur or if this is a starter campus and students ultimately move to Fort Collins to matriculate into a four-year student.

Provost Underwood: Believe it is both. Think there is an interest in programs offered only at Spur that take advantage of that urban Denver setting. A good example of something that is already there is the masters of social work program. If we were to offer whole degree programs there, we would want to pick those that need the benefit of that unique setting.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, thanked Provost Underwood for the report.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – January 19, 2024

Chair Smith: Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything to speak of regarding these minutes.

Brad Goetz: Stated that these were standard minutes.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote to place these minutes on the Faculty Council agenda for February 6th.

Motion approved. University Curriculum Committee minutes will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for February 6th.

2. Proposed Revisions to Section E.3.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: This change is to modify the language of Section E.3.1. This is reflecting a change in language to modify the term “emeritus” and “emerita” to add “emerit” as a gender-neutral option for those individuals.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions about these changes. Asked if this was a legitimate term.

Norton: Have read articles from academics that indicate you can just use the term “emerit.” We are providing options.

Vice Provost James: This gives them options.

Pedros-Gascon: If we referred to them plurally, as an “emeriti,” there is no gender attached.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions, requested a vote to place these changes on the Faculty Council agenda.

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

3. Proposed Revisions to Section E.12.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: This motion from the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty has language reflecting librarianship. This motion came from Dean Karen Estlund as they have gone through performance and annual evaluations for our library and faculty. This term is something that they see as needing to be reflected to adequately express and recognize the work of our librarians. The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty is proposing this be added to the February Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, requested a vote to place this item on the Faculty Council agenda.

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

4. University Grievance Officer Annual Report – Richard Eykholt, University Grievance Officer

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions about this report. Hearing none, thanked Eykholt for the service put forward and the work done in this position. Asked for a vote to place this item on the Faculty Council agenda.

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

Eykholt: Indicated he will be present at the Faculty Council meeting to respond to any questions.

5. Salary/Compensation Equity Report – Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning – Gamze Cavdar, Chair

Gamze Cavdar: The initial intention of this report was the review the previous reports and work that has been done in the University, because we realized that there were so many reports and initiatives produced at different levels. After reviewing them, we wrote this report with a number of recommendations, as well as appendices that will hopefully be helpful.

Chair Smith: Thanked Cavdar. Asked if there were any questions about this report.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked Cavdar for the work. Only comment is that the 2019 figures presented are a little outdated. In the case of the College of Liberal Arts, which has a higher percentage of female and international faculty, there seems to be a much more reliable correlation of salary inequities. These inequities are something that the current system is trying to assess. Maybe we need to consider other fixes to the variations.

Cavdar: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. We should think of this document, this report, as part of a series of attempts to fix various types of inequities.

DiVerdi: Asked where faculty off the tenure-track are examined.

Vice Provost James: The committee that started this started with tenure-track and then tried to do non-tenure track, but it is a much more heterogeneous population, and they could not come up with the statistical models to do it. What we are look at does not have it for that reason. If you go to the Institutional Research website, they do non-tenure track and tenure-track for CUPA comparisons. Understanding is that Human Resources does non-tenure track faculty and administrative professional salary equity analysis every year, whereas Institutional Research does the tenure-track analysis. Suggested having them come to Faculty Council to explain this.

DiVerdi: Easily 50% of our faculty are off the tenure-track, so at this point, it should be treated similarly.

Vice Provost James: They tried to do it. Not saying that we should give up, but they spent several years trying to come up with a model and could not do it.

Doe: It is telling that the model, regardless of where it comes from, does not work. The whole point of the model is to explain away the differences, so if you cannot explain the differences, then you have a problem.

Vice Provost James: Mentioned the Colorado law of equal pay for equal work. Am sure that the Office of General Counsel thinks we do not do enough of these analyses to know that we are in compliance, if nothing else.

Pedros-Gascon: The problem, however, is the existence of enormous discrepancies between what the national standard is and what occurs at CSU. If we are going for the market, we should go for the market, and we cannot have a situation where it is a separated situation between disciplines and still use the idea of market. Asked: Is the accurate one that we should be aspiring to the CUPA data or the national standards? This is something that should be considered.

Chair Smith: Thanked everyone for the conversation. Thanked Cavdar for the report and work of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. Requested a motion to receive this report and place on Faculty Council agenda.

Zaid Abdo: Moved.

Pedros-Gascon: Second.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

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

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: We have a request from Provost Underwood about a task force on curriculum at the Spur campus. Wondering if anyone on Executive Committee has a burning desire to be involved. This is an important task force, and it would be great to have expertise in that realm and think about developing curriculum at a different campus. It will be a little different than what we think about here in Fort Collins. Will open this up to Executive Committee and will take suggestions for potential representatives for this task force. Requested any thoughts via email.

Rob Mitchell: Asked if there was a sense of the nature of the commitment. In terms of developing a whole new curriculum, this could be huge, as well as something that prompts conversations. Thinking about bandwidth would be helpful.

Provost Underwood: Understanding is that the meetings will all be virtual since there will be people from multiple campuses. Think they will also create subgroups to address different types of programs. Think there is a consideration that this will be a spring activity with a report in early summer. This is something that President Parsons is eager to move forward with. This is a planning group. These programs and responsibilities will need to be handed off to deans and department heads where appropriate.

Chair Smith: Will be happy to receive any suggestions for Faculty Council members that might be good for this particular task force.

Chair Smith: Received an update on the task force on interdisciplinary undergraduate degrees. They have been busy. Will report more at the Faculty Council meeting after speaking with Shawn Bingham, one of the co-chairs, prior to that meeting. The plan is to get us a report by May.

Joseph DiVerdi: We have been struggling with the question of B.A. versus B.S. in computer science for some time. Asked if this group was thinking about those sorts of issues.

Chair Smith: Do not believe that is part of their portfolio.

Chair Smith: Prior to this meeting, met with Andrea Duffy, interim Vice Provost Thomas Siller, and Goetz. Duffy came to us in the fall to discuss standalone certificates. There was a policy proposal sent to the University Curriculum Committee and in that process of evaluation, there were some concerns raised. Think we have found a way forward with how we ease into this idea of CSU offering these standalone certificates. At the time, we discussed that the idea of these standalone certificates represents a complex problem, meaning we should be strategic about them. For example, we should probably be treating them in the same way we treat new programs, and we do a market analysis. The thought is that we might want a standing committee under Faculty Council that reviews these proposals for standalone certificates before they go to the University Curriculum Committee to be evaluated for curriculum. To get to the point of having a standing committee, we should form a task force to think about the policies we would have in place to guide people who are developing these certificates. Would be good to get feedback from Executive Committee about the format of this task force.

Mitchell: Asked: Are these standalone certificates being thought of as independent of any existing certificates we have at the undergraduate level?

Chair Smith: Yes, these certificates would not require enrollment.

Mitchell: Requested clarification that these certificates would need to go through the same process as existing ones.

Chair Smith: Yes, that is correct.

Mitchell: See the value in task forces, but expressed worry that too many layers of approval does the exact opposite of what some of these certificates are intending, which is to have a way to engage potential stakeholders. Wondering if a conversation was had about how to do this in a way that is still robust while not slowing it down, so it defeats the purpose.

Chair Smith: Think that will be part of the conversation that this task force will have, about how we streamline this. We want to be intentional and to meet market value for these.

DiVerdi: Requested clarification. Asked if the idea was to have a task force study the problem and then consider a possible standing committee that receives these proposals.

Chair Smith: Unsure, but the task force could discuss that.

Martin: Have been working with Duffy through the Department of Higher Education on a grant that we have with them to develop some standalone certificates for our degree-seeking students. To Mitchell's point, we can get into the weeds and cripple ourselves quickly in this space. The Colorado Department of Higher Education has been helpful in outlining best practices and processes for universities who are looking to expand in this space.

Chair Smith: These are great points. Could see the role of the task force as asking how we do this or how can we learn from other people to do it even better.

Chair Smith: Hearing no other questions or comments, concluded report.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: Indicated that Section J and Section K are both on the consent agenda for the upcoming Board of Governors meeting. There is not much else to update on besides the budget conversations around 2%, 4%, and 6% and what that means for individual units. People are talking long-term and what the game plan is here. Will talk for ten (10) minutes at the Board of Governors meeting about what that means to look at those budget cuts when we are not in a financial crisis in the state.

Norton: We met with the leaders of the Classified Personnel Council and the Administrative Professional Council last week. Something that was discussed was that although the state and COWINS contract guaranteed state classified positions 3% raises, because they are step increases, we do not fully know the implications and we are thinking that is probably about a 6.5% increase to our state classified personnel budget. None of that is funded in the governor's request, so when state classified personnel get a raise, that has to be listed as a line item. This is something the Classified Personnel Council is aware of, and they have sent an email to university leadership and COWINS negotiating team asking about this.

Norton: Chancellor Tony Frank made a presentation to the Joint Budget Committee a week or so ago. We do not know what they will come back with, but we will see how that plays out. Mentioned an article that indicates there is a clear strategy by the governor on trying to make the higher education institutions more efficient by not giving them as much money. This is not unique to the state of Colorado. They want to come up with \$70 million in savings over three (3) years, which is a lot.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any additional questions.

Sue Doe: Requested clarification. A year ago, we had roughly a \$4 million deficit. Now we are at a \$19 million deficit.

Vice Provost James: Part of that is debt service and then there is also the first part of debt service coming for the Veterinary Teaching Hospital.

Norton: Part of that is probably COWINS for the increases there.

Chair Smith: Other additional costs might increase, such as insurance or utilities.

Norton: To answer Doe's question, those are incremental and the big ones we are talking about is debt service and some salary corrections.

Chair Smith: Vice President Brendan Hanlon is coming to Faculty Council, and we could ask him about that.

Doe: Feels that the change is astronomical. It does not feel like that the narrative should continue to be spending on certain things and taking away from others.

Chair Smith: Think there is a desire to think more strategically about how we are spending that money.

Pedros-Gascon: Wondering if part of this is also the debt deferment related to the stadium. Understanding is that they deferred the payments specifically and now they are coming back in 2024. It would be nice to know how many millions per year are specifically for the stadium deferment.

Norton: That is a reasonable question. Will ask this.

Martin: Noted that the governor also has a 2% tuition increase cap. We also usually see a 10% or 11% increase in the governor's budget, but this year it was a single digit increase. The governor's budget is lower, plus the 2% increase, and the 2% cap on tuition increases as well as relatively flat enrollment numbers. Collectively, as our costs increased, the money coming in from tuition because of the cap, as well as the projected enrollment numbers, that is where the gap got bigger. Noted that the cap is included in the Joint Budget Committee's proposal.

Mitchell: Related to the story we are telling and Norton's point about efficiency, we are getting more efficient. If we can do more on our end to back up the fact that we are already efficient, that might be helpful from a state money perspective. There is also a point at which those efficiencies start to eat into our ability to be effective and work well. Want to circle back on other conversations such as around standalone certificates and other ways that we can be more innovative and engage the market and drive revenue. We are at the mercy of all kinds of different factors. Being able to be efficient is good, but being able to find new opportunities quickly is also important. We are constrained in our revenue from the state, but we want to make sure we are enabling conversations across campus for people to talk about how we come up with new opportunities and new ways to create value to a broad set of stakeholders.

3. Budget Model Update – Rob Mitchell and Jennifer Martin

Mitchell: Indicated that he and Martin are advisors across the committees. There is a subcommittee on the steering committee and their responsibility is to communicate to campus. After each steering committee meeting, they come up with some bullet points and talking points around what is happening with the budget model redesign. At their last meeting, they evaluated and reviewed some other budget models from other universities and looked at commonalities and

uniqueness in terms of considering the provisions of a budget model redesigned for our institution.

Martin: We have a lot of people who are very engaged and asking good questions and having thoughtful conversations. Think we will see more substantive updates for this committee as well as to the larger campus moving forward.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, thanked Mitchell and Martin for the report.

F. Discussion Items

1. University policies in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Tammy Hunt, Policy Office Manager

Tammy Hunt: There are a lot of university policies in the Manual. A lot of it is academic, and the Manual is the appropriate location for those. Some of the policies are university-wide, such as Human Resources policies, such as the revamped supplemental pay policy, which is completely different from what is currently in the Manual. We do not have a good process for updating faculty on these. Expressed hope to discuss a process to start considering how to replace the language in the Manual with a link directly to the new policy and policy library. Asked what concerns members have about moving forward with this kind of process and how we can make this work for both, because right now we have conflicting information between the policy library and the Manual.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern about delegating the power of Faculty Council to an outside source. We may end up with that outside source producing some changes that may not be in line with our values and expectations without having them discussed.

Chair Smith: Asked Hunt to speak to the University Policy Review Committee.

Hunt: The University Policy Review Committee includes two (2) faculty members. They are part of the policy process review, and we meet once a month. We review all the policies currently being worked on and what their status is. The committee has the opportunity to look at these policies and to put them out there to socialize and collect feedback. Part of their responsibility is to bring any concerns forward to Faculty Council so they can receive feedback.

Pedros-Gascon: It is not the same having two (2) people representing the whole of Faculty Council as having these presented to Faculty Council and being voted on, which is usually how we go about changes to the Manual and other similar items. The idea of delegating this to two (2) people on a committee is concerning because it is not representative of shared governance.

Chair Smith: Requested a point of clarification. Believe the university level policies being referred to are mandated by either the federal or state government. Asked: Is that correct?

Hunt: Confirmed. There are things that are mandated by the federal government, such as managing conflict of interests or grants.

Vice Provost James: What we do not have clarity on is what does not necessarily need to be there and could instead be linked so we can update.

DiVerdi: Would like to follow up with Pedros-Gascon's questions and concerns. Expressed agreement that it is inappropriate for Faculty Council to delegate its legitimate authority to other entities. In some cases, using a link takes that away from us. It is in the Manual; it has been voted on by Faculty Council and that has to be where it lies. If there are some things that do not belong in there, we need to work through it.

Doe: Expressed appreciation for the option of the commenting period for feedback for policies being developed in recent years and having access. Asked if these periods were announced. Would often route these to the University Policy Review Committee and request that they chime in or bring in some other faculty or people knowledgeable on the topic. Not sure if the comment period as a mechanism solves everything we are discussing here, but it could be one way to address this issue. At least we would know whether the policy being considered is germane to Faculty Council governance procedures, because some of them are not.

Hunt: That has been a new process since taking over the Policy Office. We found that people did not know that a policy was being changed and did not have an opportunity to provide feedback, especially some areas being impacted by the changes in policy. As part of the policy review process, we have two (2) steps. With the drafting committee, there is a stakeholder feedback list, and at one of the initial meetings, that list is gone over to look at every single area to see who might be impacted and make sure they are included in the feedback request. The comment section also allows us to parse through feedback more easily. If there is something that requires review by the Office of General Counsel, we confer with Jannine Mohr and Jason Johnson. We meet with them every six (6) weeks to discuss policy changes that are happening. We have expanded the socialization process in the interest of shared governance.

Norton: Expressed appreciation for work on that. With our process, we probably cannot make blanket changes, it will need to be on a case-by-case basis. Imagine there will need to be discussions about where it belongs and where it does not belong.

Doe: This goes back to the importance of the University Policy Review Committee and their awareness of all the policies that might be commented on. It seems that we need to be conscious of helping those people to understand the importance of their work, because we could potentially miss something that faculty should have a voice in.

Vice Provost James: A question to ask is what does need to be approved by Faculty Council and what does not, and what the Office of General Counsel would say about it. Think we need to have a conversation with the University Policy Review Committee, the Policy Office, and the Office of General Counsel. Think we need that clarity from the Office of General Counsel.

Chair Smith: Asked if Hunt had some links to policies in the Manual.

Hunt: Provided some examples. The employee study privilege information in the Manual is out of date, and a lot of things that are related to Human Resources. Those are the kinds of things that we see either being taken out of the Manual or being replaced by links. There are sections in the Manual that are not reviewed regularly, but with policies, reviews are scheduled.

Vice Provost James: Asked: Does the policy library indicate who owns the policy?

Hunt: Yes. Some of them have joint ownership. Anything that is Faculty Council is owned by the Board of Governors, and that is because you have to take any changes to the Board of Governors. Went through these with the Office of General Counsel recently because we are doing a wide review of all university policies.

Vice Provost James: At least the Office of General Counsel has determined the leadership that owns these policies. Maybe the University Policy Review Committee needs to look at the updated ownership and make sure we are not in disagreement.

Chair Smith: Will reach out to them. Asked Martin if this is something she was interested in being involved in.

Martin: Indicated that Eykholt has a good pulse for when there are things in the policies that impact what the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty is working on. Think it would make sense to take that responsibility from Eykholt and internalize it within our committee.

Chair Smith: Expressed agreement. Thanked Hunt for coming to Executive Committee. Asked if that information on the policies could be shared.

Hunt: Recently had a student look at everything in the Faculty Manual and where it might be duplicated in the policy library, so we have a list. Happy to share with and can take it back to the University Policy Review Committee for discussion.

2. Manual revision process

Chair Smith: Directed members' attention to the Board of Governors submission guidelines document that was updated in December 2023. Want to acknowledge the work that goes into each of these Manual revisions. There are certainly some challenges in the process in the sense of timeliness and getting these revisions into the hands of the Provost and then on to the President, ultimately getting them in front of the Board of Governors. These guidelines also include a timeline for submission.

Chair Smith: One of the things we have discussed is that this could help smooth this process and something that can help us provide us guidance to the standing committees that are considering any of these changes. We were thinking, particularly with ones that could potentially be problematic, is to provide a summary and tentative timeline of how these Manual changes might proceed through the committee to Faculty Council and onward, so we can set the stage and get

everyone on the same page. With these timelines, we want to help with guidance for the standing committees and getting these Manual revisions through in a timely manner.

Martin: Will speak to this specifically with the administrative leave policy. We are aiming to get this to the Board of Governors in the spring. Realistically, in order to get on the May Board of Governors agenda, we would have to have it in front of Executive Committee by the end of February. It sets back the process two months. It is something we can do, but this is something that standing committees need to recognize and be aware of, especially in situations where it can get cumbersome in General Counsel is involved. The window is narrow to get something through the processes we have on campus even before it reaches the Chancellor's office.

Chair Smith: Another sticking point is around the format in which we give these to the Provost's Office and whether we put the onus on them to put it in the appropriate format for the Board of Governors or whether we help with that ahead of time to smooth the movement of these items through the Provost's Office.

Martin: Thinking about what happened with Section E.6, which was the change in contract language for our contract, continuing and adjunct faculty. This section did go through the process, and it stopped at the President's and Provost's offices. Even if we get it through the campus piece, it can still get hung up after it leaves Faculty Council before it gets to the Chancellor's Office. It is almost as if we need those processes to happen parallel to each other while we are working on something that will eventually go to the Office of General Counsel or to the Board of Governors so that the President and Provost are informed of the conversation, so it is not brand-new information to them because these windows are so small. Where we see major problems is not only the formatting but if the President has not seen these changes before and if the communication between the Provost and the President does not happen.

Chair Smith: We had the opportunity to meet with the President and Provost today. Part of the agenda was updates on Manual changes because that is something we need to keep messaging. The hope is that if there are issues in the future, they can be identified with that level of conversation.

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty is unique because we meet weekly, so if something does come back to us, we can be mobilized. We have seen some large changes to the Manual recently, but having the President and the Provost see a draft of what we are working with can allow them to identify any problems. Not sure of the appropriateness of sharing a draft with the Provost or President but know that Vice Provost James has been helpful as a liaison.

Chair Smith: It seems like getting those items to the Provost would make sense, because the Provost has meetings with the President where those conversations can occur.

Provost Underwood: Confirmed.

Chair Smith: Have put upcoming changes in report, but another way to do this is to keep communicating what we are doing.

Doe: Have heard from deans that they were unaware of the changes made. Not sure if it is the Provost's Office that needs to help communicate these changes but heard many times as chair that the deans felt blindsided by things. There was some pushback where they felt they needed to have the opportunity to speak to some of the motion, and it brings up the question about how far back we have to go to have these changes go through all these parties.

Vice Provost James: Have said this before, but getting the Faculty Council representatives to talk to the deans on a regular basis is important and that communication is not necessarily happening as well as it should. The whole point of a representative to Faculty Council is to have them go back to their college and department and let them know what Faculty Council is doing.

Martin: Recently with Section J, we heard feedback from research associate deans that it had been shared by the faculty with the deans but not with them. Finding ways to institutionalize what we are doing relative to Manual changes is important. There are not only some language changes, but other important changes that deans and other directors and leaders need to be aware of. Their representatives are the people who should be responsible for doing that, but many do not know who their representative is. Think there is a lot of education to be had relative to the roles of Faculty Council representatives within their colleges, and there are some deans that do not seem to recognize which committees do what and who to speak to about any questions they have.

Provost Underwood: Expressed agreement with everything being said. Indicated that the Provost's Leadership Council would be an easy place to provide these updates. Can assist communicating these with the President.

DiVerdi: A question that comes to mind is their role in approving these changes. We have a process of approvals, and it is possible for people not directly in the approval line to sidetrack something positive, so we have to manage that part too.

Norton: Believe there is information on the Faculty Council website of the work each committee is going. Suggested sending an email to each Dean with the agenda for the next Faculty Council meeting, indicating what we are working on.

Vice Provost James: They do get the agenda.

Chair Smith: Have been told before that they are not receiving that email.

Mitchell: Think that there is a conflation of shared governance and shared decision making in our culture and people believe at some point in the process that they should have a say in something that is outside our governance structure. The point is that if you want to be involved in decision-making, you need to be involved in shared governance. Having a process where everyone is voting on everything in the university does not work. We need to be able to trust that other people have a role and doing their job in that role and ensuring various conversations are happening and that people are socialized to think about shared governance and not shared decision-making, because there is a real conflation between the two. It does not help us from an efficiency standpoint, a collaboration standpoint, or even a trust standpoint.

Chair Smith: This has been a great discussion. Thanked Provost Underwood for willingness and commitment to communicate to the President and opportunity to bring up these items at the Provost's Leadership Council. Expressed appreciation for the idea of sending something out to the deans and their communication teams. With the orientation we do each year for the new Faculty Council members, we need to emphasize the role of communicating back.

G. Executive Session

Executive Session deferred to February 20th.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

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