

## MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, March 19, 2024

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106

**Present:** **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; **Sybil Sharvelle**, Engineering; **Sharon Anderson**, Health and Human Sciences; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts **Christine Pawliuk**, Libraries; **William Sanford**, Natural Resources; **Michael Antolin**, Natural Sciences; **Zaid Abdo**, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

**Guests:** **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Steve Reising**, Chair Committee on Faculty Governance; **Theo Reese**, ASCSU Director of Academic Affairs

Absent: Melinda Smith, Chair (excused)

Vice Chair Joseph DiVerdi called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

### March 19, 2024 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

#### I. Minutes to be Approved

##### A. Executive Committee Minutes – February 27, 2024

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from February 27<sup>th</sup>.

Hearing none, Executive Committee minutes approved as submitted.

##### B. Faculty Council Minutes – March 5, 2024

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from March 5<sup>th</sup>.

Hearing none, Faculty Council minutes approved as submitted.

#### II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

##### A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on March 26, 2024– Microsoft Teams/Administration 106 – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on April 2, 2024 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

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

Provost Marion Underwood: Would like to start with an update on the search for the next Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs. Expressed gratitude to the search committee, who did a lot of work to recruit a very large pool. We had over 140 applicants, with over 120 of them meeting the minimum qualifications. The search committee did a fantastic job of reviewing the applications and providing a group of semi-finalists.

Provost Underwood: Reflected over the semi-finalists during Spring Break and made the realization that these semi-finalists could not be approved. The group was not strong enough to yield the kind of leader and champion for student success that Colorado State University needs and desires. Expressed concern that many of the finalists did not have experience at large Research 1 universities and those that did have experience had been such long-time administrators that they did not have the academic record to meet the criteria for tenure outlined in CSU's department codes. This university needs and deserves a really strong leader, and a person with a strong academic record and the leadership experience to be an influential and impactful leader to effect change at this large Research 1, land-grant university, to help us make even more progress in undergraduate student success and inclusive excellence.

Provost Underwood: To find this person, we need to modify the position description and the minimum qualifications, as well as modify the title. Realized that we needed to extend the search and try some new strategies to get more excellent candidates. We are going to extend the search, and repost the position, which will happen later this week or early next week. The new strategies will include adding "Dean" to the position title, which was approved by President Amy Parsons. This will be a strong signal to applicants about the importance of undergraduate education, as well as the hope of attracting more senior candidates. Many universities have a Dean of the Graduate School, as well as a Dean of Undergraduate Education. At CSU, we have the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, so that dean is at the table with the other deans as a peer. Currently, the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Affairs does not hold the Dean title, so they are not at the table with the deans as a peer. Think it would be better for CSU to have a Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Affairs, and a type of person that can sit with the deans and influence the deans and faculty to do even more amazing things. The idea of adding the "Dean" title was the inspiration of the search chair, Steve Dandeneau. We will modify the minimum qualifications to specify that we are seeking candidates with tenure and long-time leadership experience at other Research 1 universities. We will add a note that undergraduate student success is President Parsons' top priority, and we will add a link to the Boyer report on the Equity-Excellence Imperative to further underline our strong commitment. We will also need to increase the salary range modestly, in keeping with the "Dean" title.

Provost Underwood: We will notify all the candidates in this pool and invite them to consider this new position with the modified description and minimum qualifications and to reapply if they wish. We will have energetic outreach to have the Board of Governors, peer institutions, and other universities nominate outstanding candidates, and we will again try to attract a diverse pool of candidates. Believe it is great news that our President and the University is willing to invest even more in helping us find a strong leader and to elevate undergraduate student success at CSU by making this a Dean position. Expressed appreciation for the search committee, who

have agreed to continue working on this. We will likely need an interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs because of the timing, but we will get out of the gate fast here and have the position posted for six (6) weeks. The hope is to bring finalists to campus in May. Would love to have someone start in July, but that is probably not realistic. We will see when the person could start, and we will make it work. Believe there is incredible talent at this University and great people that could serve as an interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs very well.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Thanked Provost Underwood. Asked if there were any questions.

Michael Antolin: Expressed appreciation for the vision and the step forward.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Thanked Provost Underwood. Would like to transmit a concern that at the same time we are asking for financial reductions, we are increasing the salary of this incoming individual. Feels this matches the vision that the administration has a different understanding of the impact of policies on them versus others.

Provost Underwood: Commented that these salaries are always a range, and the range is publicly available. Am concerned about the budgetary situation and am not looking to max out the spending on anything. Given the additional title, felt we needed to bump the salary up a little but, but the salary range is broad, and we will do everything we can to make the salary match the person's experience. The range is broad because people come to these roles at different stages in their careers. Hear the concerns.

Andrew Norton: Would like to echo Antolin's comments. Think that this is a great move to have this person sitting with the Council of Deans, especially as we are making more complicated curriculum decisions in the future.

Provost Underwood: Thanked Norton. Stated that she is unavailable for the April Faculty Council meeting. Vice Provost Susan James will present a report for the Provost's Office.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Hearing no further questions or comments, thanked Provost Underwood for the report.

### *C. Old Business*

### *D. Action Items*

#### 1. UCC Minutes – March 1, 2024

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything of note in the University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Brad Goetz: These are an ordinary set.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Requested a vote to place these University Curriculum Committee minutes on the Faculty Council agenda.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

2. New Undergraduate Degree Program: Major in Arts Management – University Curriculum Committee – Brad Goetz, Chair

Goetz: On behalf of the University Curriculum Committee, move that the Faculty Council Executive Committee review this new program for presentation at Faculty Council. This is a degree program that prepares students to enter the arts management arena, rather than an art program that might be painting or sculpture. The only thing that might be different about this is that this is coming out of a Special Academic Unit.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Asked if there were any comments or questions.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Hearing none, requested a vote to place this on the Faculty Council agenda.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

3. Proposed Revisions to Section C.2.3.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Steve Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the proposed revisions to Section C.2.3.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. This is a code change and is a change to the name of the Department of Ethnic Studies to Race, Gender, and Ethnic Studies. The College of Liberal Arts has endorsed this and given a lot of thought to this name change.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Thanked Reising. Asked if there were any questions or comments.

Pedros-Gascon: Spoke in support of this change.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Hearing no further comments, requested a vote to place these proposed revisions on the Faculty Council agenda.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

### ***E. Reports***

1. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: There is not much Board of Governors activity going on right now. There have been efforts to locate copies of old Board of Governors books, which have both incremental budgets as well as the bigger larger picture budget, usually with about a four-year run at a time. We do have most of the last several years of Board books now available on the Board of Governors website. We will be working to put links to Board books, the budgets, and the budget meetings we have been having, as well as literature on the topic on the Faculty Council website.

Norton: Final Board of Governors meeting of term will be on campus the first week of May, on Thursday and Friday. Expressed hope to see members there.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Asked if there were any questions.

Amy Barkley: Indicated that a meeting is being planned to discuss the new Faculty Council website with Rachel Baschnagel. Will loop Norton in to discuss this new budget resources page.

Sharon Anderson: In the Board of Governors meetings, asked if there is any sense of where the budget might go, or if it is not clear.

Norton: Think the clearest answer is what we are hearing from Vice President Brendan Hanlon. Vice President Hanlon has the best sense of what is going on, and is still modeling from the 2%, 4%, and 6% reductions. Have not heard anything concrete at all. Asked if Provost Underwood could speak to this.

Provost Underwood: Think it is a bit of a guessing game at this point but believe Vice President Hanlon is thinking in terms of a 4% plan, so the middle scenario. Do not have more concrete information.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Asked if there were additional questions or comments. Hearing none, thanked Norton.

## 2. Budget Model Update – Rob Mitchell and Jennifer Martin

Jennifer Martin: Not much has changed substantially since the last update during the Faculty Council meeting from Vice Provost Susan James. The Technical Committee and the Steering Committee met the week prior to break, and the Steering Committee will be putting out an update to inform the campus community to where they are at in the process and what the conversations were from the last meeting. The email will come later this week.

Martin: Something to note that will be in the email is that the Steering Committee will be hosting an open forum for the budget model revision process to solicit feedback from campus and provide an update. That forum will be held in Lory Student Center Rooms 304-306 on April 3<sup>rd</sup> from 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. There will also be a hybrid option.

Rob Mitchell: It would be great for everyone to work with the representatives from the different colleges and inform them about this forum and let their departments know about it. We are hoping for broad participation.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Asked if there were any questions. Reminded members that there will be another Faculty Council meet and greet this Thursday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Lory Student Center Room 322.

Vice Chair DiVerdi: Hearing no other questions or comments, thanked Martin and Mitchell.

## *F. Discussion Items*

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

Theo Reese: Have previously presented this item to Executive Committee and the Faculty Council. To refresh everyone's memory, the purpose of the syllabus bank is to have a large, searchable repository of past syllabi for all classes and all professors that students can access in order to foster student success and increase preparedness for upcoming semesters. The feedback received was largely positive, with a couple issues that we took into consideration while doing research and drafting the official proposal.

Reese: Some of the previous issues were that professors had different syllabi even though they teach the same class, and they have a different way of teaching or different materials. Certain departments at CSU already have a syllabus bank. There was strong concern that there should be a caveat at the beginning of the syllabus bank before students can access it, that would essentially state that these are not what the courses will be in the future but can show what past courses were like and be a guideline. There is nothing set in stone and professors are not bound to what they did in the past. We also assessed intellectual property because we want everyone's intellectual property protected.

Reese: We looked into syllabus banks that have already been implemented through CSU departments. Many were difficult to find, and even when they were found, many syllabi were out of date. Most were from 2020 and 2021, which makes sense, since COVID then occurred and turned everything upside down. Reached out to Dr. Deborah Garrity, the head of the Biology department, and their syllabus bank was the most up to date that we were able to find. The main concern Garrity emphasized was that professors did not want to go through the hassle of sending their syllabi to someone else and have them upload it to the bank, as well as double-checking and tracking down all the professors.

Reese: We reached out to other universities, such as the University of Arkansas, the University of Florida, and Stanford. We had deeper conversations with Stanford, because they were able to have a syllabus bank implemented through their Canvas system. We emailed them for months and discussed all the backend IT information. Happy to share that information if people are interested. The syllabus bank for Stanford is simple. Professors upload the syllabus as normal, and it immediately goes into the syllabus bank, so there is no extra step for professors and no extra learning for students, since they learn Canvas during their first semester. We also discussed with Stanford whether there have been complaints about discontinuity between courses because of the uploaded syllabi, and they indicated that they did not.

Reese: We submitted an official campus project request on the Friday before Spring Break. Happy to send the document to everyone if that would be helpful. We have also presented this to interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs Tom Siller, who seemed very supportive. We provided a one-page write-up to present to the Provost and received support there as well. Asked if there were any questions or concerns.

Norton: Asked if most professors are using the Canvas syllabus tool, as well as uploading a separate document with more information.

Reese: Would say that it is split, about 80-20. Most professors have utilized the syllabus tab in Canvas, but there are many others that will publish a class schedule that is different. That would be more of the technical part of the syllabus that students would not be able to hold professors or anyone else accountable to, because that changes from year-to-year. It would really just be the main course content that would be covered within that given year, more of a general layout of what the class will look like.

Antolin: Thanked Reese for all the work on this. Happy to hear about the Canvas delivery to have this done more automatically and provide a firewall, which means intellectual property will have a level of protection. Think that should be featured, because there would likely be more support for this when it is indicated that it is not only easier for instructors to implement, but that it is also not just being thrown out onto the internet.

Reese: That was another benefit of having this on Canvas, because you need some sort of CSU credential to access the syllabus. This was a huge benefit that we say with Stanford as well.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed appreciation for this option too. Am a lot more comfortable knowing it would be in Canvas, because as Antolin indicated, the idea of having a firewall will ease the discussion. As long as the students understand that this does not commit professors to anything. Just because the class looked one way last semester, does not mean the class will be taught the same way in another semester.

Reese: This was something we included on the form we submitted, to have some blurb or caveat that indicate that this is not a word-for-word depiction of what classes will be in the future and that they are just a general outline for students to see and follow.

DiVerdi: Asked if Executive Committee members would agree to have this on the Faculty Council agenda for April 2<sup>nd</sup> as a discussion item.

Executive Committee members expressed agreement.

Pedros-Gascon: Suggested that in preparation for this presentation, that a couple slides be provided for a visual so people can have a better understanding of how this will look.

Reese: Not sure if slides can be created with a mock-up of how this will look in Canvas in such a short time but can show what Stanford looks like.

DiVerdi: Asked if there were any other questions or comments. Hearing none, thanked Reese.

2. Discussion on proposed revisions to Section F.3.7 and Sections F.3.14 through F.3.17 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: Want to start by acknowledging the work of Richard Eykholt in helping navigate this process, not only as the University Grievance Officer but also the connection with the Office of General Counsel, working together to reach a revision that is amenable to faculty. Expressed thanks as well to Antolin and Anderson, and the task force, that put a lot of effort into thinking intentionally around what revisions should look like for our campus and gave the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty something tangible to work with.

Martin: The revisions we are proposed are around administrative leave. In some cases, the policies are completely new and did not previously exist. The revisions offer timelines for administrative leave and a review process for faculty members who might be placed on administrative leave. This does not currently exist in the Manual and is not available to our campus colleagues.

Martin: The hope with this discussion today is to identify any potential changes that might be needed or suggested to these revisions so that the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty can revise, review, and potentially adapt those changes coming from Executive Committee. Recognize that we have a short runway to get these revisions on the Board of Governors agenda. Expressed hope that we can see this on the April Faculty Council agenda, by voting on this at Executive Committee next week.

DiVerdi: Asked if there were any questions.

Antolin: There are four (4) additional things to add as part of these revisions. One of the changes is that it distinguishes between the process of administrative leave with pay and without pay. Another is that in our review of state statutes and administrative leave policies from other places is this idea that this is a rare instance of where there is a potential for harm either to the University or to individuals at the University, in which case it is an extraordinary move that requires fast action. The other part is the creation of procedures for timeline of review and how the administrative leave is communicated to the person being put on administrative leave. This includes both faculty and administrative professionals. The process is going to be overlooked by a committee that is high level and includes the head of Human Resources, the Chair of Faculty Council, and the University Grievance Officer. There is potential then for not only hearings for the individual but includes representation for that individual for the specific case, that may include legal representation.

Antolin: This is an important change. It creates a timeline for the individual placed on administrative leave to appeal the process, and the appeal can include both the extent to which the person is excluded from the University or University resources, as well as whether the leave continues or not. One of the things that never existed before in University policy was who could initiate administrative leave, and there was no review stipulated. This lays out clearly what people can expect and the responsibilities from both sides. Indicated this had been reviewed by the Office of General Counsel, and believe they would accept it if Faculty Council approves it.

Norton: Asked if President Parsons has seen these revisions.



Martin: No, the President has not seen it. Another hope of having this on the agenda today is that Provost Underwood would have a chance to review this as well. Vice Provost James has also seen this.

Martin: If there is anything glaring in these revisions, the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty meet again next Monday to address any updates. If there is nothing, we ask that this be added as an action item for a vote at next week's Executive Committee meeting. We are also working on a document that outlines the overarching changes so that we can share that with colleges in front of the April Faculty Council meeting. There may be some questions, and the hope is that providing information prior to that meeting will help address concerns or alleviate some of the questions that may derail a vote.

DiVerdi: Thanked Martin. Asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, we will add this to the Executive Committee agenda for next week.

DiVerdi: Asked if there was any other business.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if there was any follow-up to the idea of a special Faculty Council meeting or something similar to discuss budget priorities.

DiVerdi: At this point, we do not have anything formal on the table, but will bring this back. Thanked Pedros-Gascon for the reminder.

Executive Committee adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

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