

## MINUTES

Executive Committee

**Tuesday, March 26, 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; **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; **Susan James**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Absent: none

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

### **March 26, 2024 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

#### **I. Minutes to be Approved**

##### **A. Executive Committee Minutes – March 19, 2024**

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

Mike Antolin: Indicated a minor change to be made to a statement made later in the meeting. Currently it states “chance” and think it should be “change.”

Chair Smith: Thanked Antolin. We will make this correction. Hearing no further corrections, the Executive Committee minutes from March 19<sup>th</sup> are approved as submitted with this minor edit.

#### **II. Items Pending/Discussion Items**

##### **A. *Announcements***

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on April 9, 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 use report today to speak about an excellent faculty member who recently passed away. For those that had not heard, Dr. Diana Wall passed away yesterday. Wall was a University Distinguished Professor and director of the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability.

Provost Underwood: Wall was a brilliant mind and a thoughtful, measured colleague who cared deeply about the success of her students and peers. As we know more from her family and with their approval, we will share details about a memorial service. There will also be a SOURCE article about Wall's career and contributions.

Provost Underwood: It was clear how proud Wall was of the leadership of the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability, as well as the faculty and students, and the impact of the school in addressing global challenges and building a more sustainable world. Wall will be deeply missed on many levels. Sent a message to the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability for distribution to their faculty and board. Read some of the responses that were sent back. They are moving and should inspire us to understand the impact of the role of a faculty member. It is a tremendous loss for our community and share these comments as a reminder of the importance of the role of faculty and what a faculty leader can mean to a university community. We should be grateful for every day. Wall was involved with her work up until the end of her life and took great joy and pride in her students, faculty, and staff.

Chair Smith: This is a huge loss. Thanked Provost Underwood for sharing all the kind comments. Asked if there were any questions or comments for Provost Underwood.

Andrew Norton: There was a report on NPR that the Joint Budget Committee has made some recommendations as to budget. Sent an article to Executive Committee that has some detail. Asked if Provost Underwood could speak to this.

Provost Underwood: Sense from talking to the finance experts here is that there is a bit of good news, that CSU will get \$1 million more. It is not much but it is better than where we were yesterday. It is maybe not everything we hoped but it does help a little bit.

Norton: Asked if there was any update on the Veterinary Teaching Hospital construction request.

Provost Underwood: Have not heard any change on that. Think the plan for that funding is still alive and well.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions or comments, thanked Provost Underwood.

### *C. Old Business*

### *D. Action Items*

1. UCC Minutes – March 8, 2024

Chair Smith: Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything of note in this set of University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Brad Goetz: These are ordinary, so there is nothing to pull from these minutes.

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

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

2. Election – Faculty Representatives to Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Smith: The next action item is a ballot for faculty representatives to Faculty Council standing committees from the Committee on Faculty Governance. Requested a vote to place this ballot 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 F.3.7 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Jennifer Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty propose an amendment to Section F.3.7 as seen in the agenda to be placed on the Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Smith: Reminded members that this was discussed last week. Asked if there was any further discussion or questions about this before we move to a vote.

Zaid Abdo: Have some minor edits that can be sent to Martin. Have a major edit for the section about unpaid administrative leave, Section F.3.7.2. The starting point is similar to what is described in Section F.3.7.1. Feel this could be clearer by directing people to the procedure described above.

Martin: Asked if the intent with these changes is to consolidate sections. If we look at the section on unpaid administrative leave, there is a sentence there that is an important qualifier about the transition from paid administrative leave to unpaid administrative leave. Think there is a solid reason for keeping them separate because of the ways in which a person in this process could move from one type of leave to the other. We could wordsmith this to be clearer, but conversations in the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, as well as following suggestions from Antolin's task force and legal counsel, the preference is to have two (2) clearly articulated sections, even though there are similarities between the two. The sections describe in detail the process for administrative leave that is paid versus administrative leave that is unpaid.

Abdo: Not arguing for complete consolidation. The issue is the flow in the reference of what comes next, so arguing for clarity.

Antolin: Believe there is confusion about a reference to a section. The section Abdo is referring to has a sentence that directs people to the same section, so it probably should be directed people to Section F.3.7.1, not F.3.7.2.

Antolin: These sections have slightly different timelines, and that was something that we discussed with the Office of General Counsel about trying to make the same. There is a feeling that paid leave has more urgency because of the financial implications for the person being placed on leave, and so there is a faster timeline for paid leave than for unpaid leave.

Abdo: Expressed agreement, but reiterated reasoning for suggested change.

Martin: Asked if the suggested change is to state, “the process described below.”

Abdo: Feel that would be a simpler approach.

Martin: Think a friendly amendment to that effect would be fine.

Abdo: Another thing to consider is that sending things by mail might not be efficient.

Martin: We had an extended discussion about this. The standard procedure in the Manual is to do this by mail.

Abdo: Thanked Martin. That is fine. Reiterated major areas that need clarification. Think these edits would simplify things. Happy to share suggested edits.

Norton: Wondered if these suggested changes would be accepted by the Office of General Counsel. Would not like to have Martin go through all that again.

Martin: Would think so. Expressed hesitation to make any changes because of what we have seen from the Office of General Counsel.

Joseph DiVerdi: Indicated that there was a sentence where it appeared that the word “leave” was left out.

Chair Smith: Would recommend that we not change this, because there might be a reason that this was worded the way it was. Have a feeling it was not left out by mistake.

Martin: In our experience with Section J, things we see as miniscule changes may be justification for this to not be approved through the Office of General Counsel. Would say that if there are grammatical changes, that might be fine, but these are things we could address with quick revisions in the fall, if they are not substantiative in nature.

Norton: Would propose, with the consent of Executive Committee, that this be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for next week, and have Martin contact Jannine Mohr about these changes. If Mohr agrees to them, then they can be made from the floor of the Faculty Council. Would not want to delay, because otherwise this will not be seen until next year.

Martin: Will contact Mohr today.

Abdo: Clarified that the grammatical changes will be done at Faculty Council and not today.

Martin: Correct. The Office of General Counsel has been fine with grammatical changes. Requested Abdo send the changes to get them included in the document to send for the Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further discussion, requested a vote to place this item on the Faculty Council agenda, with the caveat that these grammatical changes will be made.

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

4. Proposed Revisions to 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: This is another change relative to administrative leave. The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty propose amendments to Sections F.3.14 through F.3.17 in the Manual. These are the same revisions that Executive Committee discussed last week and reflect changes that were just discussed in Section F.3.7 to appropriately change the use of administrative leave or the improper use of administrative leave.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any comments or questions about these revisions. Hearing none, requested a vote to place these 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. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: The first meeting of the Principles of Community task force will occur this week. They will be given their charge and then they will get started.

Chair Smith: Every April, we have an Employee Appreciation week. This year, it will be the week of April 20<sup>th</sup>. Employees can get their free cup of coffee from Human Bean, and each employee council is putting forward \$1,500 to assist with this effort. There will also be a 35% discount at the bookstore that will be sent out. This is for both in-person and online bookstore purchases. There will also be Eileen's cookies available. You can get these cookies on April 20<sup>th</sup>,

which is the spring football game, with a kickoff at 1:00 p.m. There will be a table for Faculty Council at the New Belgium porch in the stadium. Will plan to be there, and encouraged others interested to reach out to spend some time at the table. There will also be another opportunity to represent Faculty Council on the Plaza on April 25<sup>th</sup>, and we will have a table for that as well. An email will be sent by this, but wanted to get this on people's minds as we go into April.

Chair Smith: The meet and greet for April has been rescheduled to April 18<sup>th</sup>. Have sent an invitation to Vice President Brendan Hanlon to attend this meet and greet. It might not be possible, so am open to other suggestions for people to invite. This meet and greet will not in the Lory Student Center, and we are looking into another venue. Will keep everyone updated on that.

Chair Smith: Would like to get Executive Committee feedback on the standalone certificate task force. As a reminder, Faculty Council approved the definition change to what a certificate is at the last Faculty Council meeting. There was some debate, including interest and concerns raised, particularly around the process that will be put in place to help make these undergraduate certificates.

Chair Smith: Have been sent a draft of the task force charge by Andrea Duffy. Have agreed with Duffy that the work of this task force will require people beyond faculty and Faculty Council purview and will require other stakeholders to be involved. We certainly want to have representation and input on such a task force. The charge of this task force would be shepherding this implementation of these standalone certificates for non-degree-seeking students. This task force would work with leadership stakeholders to articulate a process for this to occur and to determine what it would be that would make an undergraduate certificate proposal supportable. There were many concerns raised about what criteria would be in place and how enrollment would play out. This task force will also determine the costs of implementation of these kinds of certificates, as well as work with campus leadership and stakeholders to develop a vision for these kinds of certificates. This is a big task, and this task force might also identify other concerns that might come to bear for how we implement these kinds of certificates.

Chair Smith: Provided Executive Committee members with proposed membership list for the task force.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions or concerns.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Have a question specifically about procedures of the group. There is only one faculty representative, and many people from administration. Faculty is outnumbered in this situation and that is not ideal. There are even some offices represented by two (2) people.

Chair Smith: That is a good point, and why discussion was requested. Think representation from the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning, as well as the Committee on Teaching and Learning. The destination of this work is Faculty Council. We need more faculty representation not only for representation, but the fact that certificates are so different in different disciplines, and we need more disciplinary expertise there.

Pedros-Gascon: Yes, Faculty Council is eventually the ones voting, but we are voting on things that have been approved without a lot of faculty participation. This is a huge concern. If faculty are not in the weeds when the decisions around real impact is being discussed, we are only approving what has been decided with very little input.

Chair Smith: When first sent this proposal, first thought was whether it made more sense to have the Committee on Teaching and Learning take this one first and then engage with other stakeholders. We need to be involved. All these other pieces do need to come into play but wondered if we wanted to take the first crack at this as faculty and then move on to engage other stakeholders.

Martin: Expressed agreement with the need for increased faculty representation. To clarify the process, this would serve as a task force that would then make recommendations that would potentially go to other standing committees, who do have diverse representation across the faculty. Recognized that the role of the task force is not necessarily to propose changes, but to propose changes to Faculty Council standing committees. Asked if this was the intention with this task force as well.

Chair Smith: Yes. The issue is that there are some pieces of this, like enrollment, that faculty will not be experts on. We need engagement with the stakeholders that deal with things like enrollment and know those limitations, so it may be that we want to separate out pieces of this. Some issues could be taken up by the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, while others could be taken up by the Committee on Teaching and Learning.

Joseph DiVerdi: Expressed agreement that more faculty representation is key to the academic enterprise. Indicated that there are two (2) areas where representation is doubled up. Recommended having only one (1) individual from those offices and adding faculty instead. This would keep the size of the task force manageable and will shift distribution a bit.

Martin: Duffy and her team are putting together a credentialing vision retreat to help articulate what the vision for micro-credentials and certificates might be for CSU. Believe half of that group of 25 or 26 members is made up of faculty. That group does not meet until the end of May but wonder if that group might inform a task force. Wondering if there is some redundancy in the work of that group and the work of a task force.

Chair Smith: Not sure if Duffy sees these as redundant. This would be a good question to ask.

Vice Provost Susan James: Think the representation might be a little wacky because the charge has some logistics and nuts and bolts type of issues in there, and then there is the much more important issue of quality and approval. Believe Faculty Council is more concerned with the latter. The charge is a combination of things. They are both important things, but maybe they do not all need to be different.

Chair Smith: Expressed agreement. Think this should be split up into two (2) or three (3) different groups and do it parallel, because it is a big task.

Rob Mitchell: As has been previously acknowledged, we are late to this game and are not pioneering anything that is new. Wonder if we have looked at what other places have done in terms of structure. It seems that we could make this very structured and put obstacles in place that undermine the opportunities and benefits that we could get from this. The other thing to remember is that the market will determine whether there is value in some of these.

Chair Smith: Noted that Duffy had done some exploration of the local environment and what has been done. That is something that would certainly be relevant to the task force.

Pedros-Gascon: Understand the idea about market, but come from the College of Liberal Arts, and have some concerns about content and the more philosophical approaches. Expressed concern about the market designing our academics. The membership of this group is also heavy on the administration and light on faculty. Reiterated that this is concerning.

Martin: It seems there is consensus that we need more faculty representation. Do not think this would be something Duffy would have an issue with. Wondering if it would be a fair request to go back and ask for more faculty and reduce some of the roles elsewhere, such as combining admissions and registrar.

Chair Smith: This is just a proposal put forward by Duffy so we could discuss. Expressed agreement with the sentiment around more faculty representation. This is a lot for this task force to be doing, and there is expertise in other standing committees that could be dealing with pieces of this.

DiVerdi: The other possibility, besides changing the distribution, is suggesting two parallel task forces. There could be one that handles the operational logistics, and the other handles the academic side.

Chair Smith: Will be meeting with Duffy this coming Friday and we will discuss this. Wanted feedback from Executive Committee ahead of that meeting. Will take these comments to Duffy.

Norton: Asked what the responses were to the inclement weather policy.

Chair Smith: Tammy Hunt indicated that they received over 350 responses, which is the most they have ever received using this method of collecting information. The next steps will be taking those comments to the University Policy Review Committee to provide feedback on whether they want to alter the draft of the policy and how they want to respond to the feedback and input. When we talk to the Policy Office, the process still feels opaque. There is a clear need for improved communication. We do have two (2) faculty representatives on the University Policy Review Committee, but we did not hear from them. We learned that the University Policy Review Committee does not actually see the policy until after they receive feedback, which is not supposed to happen, when you look at the charge of this committee. We are going to get a meeting with Hunt to further discuss this process. Think this policy in particular showed how the communication breakdown can occur. Think Hunt is open to working with Faculty Council and have shared governance as a piece of the policy review process.



Chair Smith: Something else that was discussed in the meeting of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty this week was around changes that might occur in policy that may conflict with what is in the Manual. One thought that will be discussed further is having the chair of the Faculty Council as the gatekeeper, and if there are any policy revisions being considered, that they be notified, and this information could be sent to the appropriate standing committee. This way, we can be involved earlier in the process and can be considering Manual changes in tandem with policy changes and not after the fact.

Martin: Found the history helpful to understand why we have two separate spaces where policies live. Know Richard Eykholt had worked closely with the Policy Office while serving as chair of the Faculty Council, and they removed policies to review more frequently, so any changes to federal law or similar could be reflected. Think the foresight needs to be around what process needs to be in place where we do not get out of alignment. Establishing a process that is not person-specific is critical in this space.

Sue Doe: Had conversations with Hunt and the Policy Office the entire time while serving as chair. Vice President Hanlon had been asked to create a Policy Committee on Policies, because Faculty Council was seen as a rogue entity and was engaging in the creation and construction of too many policies that have sweeping implications. The whole point of the University Policy Review Committee was to provide all employees, not just faculty, a voice in the development and discussion of policies. Think there is basic confusion about who sets policy and which policies. Have yet to see the University Policy Review Committee be used the way it should be.

Chair Smith: We also asked Hunt about how frequently this committee is meeting, and they are meeting monthly. Would like to propose to Hunt that we have one of the representatives come speak to Executive Committee once a month to provide updates.

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any further discussion.

Vice Provost James: There had been discussion about talking about the faculty annual review process at the Faculty Council meeting next week. Think we should do this in April or May, because we are discussing changing the form that we use for faculty annual review.

Chair Smith: Indicated that there is room on the agenda for Faculty Council. We will get this discussion item added. Asked if Vice Provost James could explain this.

Vice Provost James: Working with the chairs and heads, as well as administrators, Human Resources, and the Office of General Counsel, we have drafted a somewhat revised approach to faculty annual review. We are trying to make the form work closely to what is in the Manual, under sections about research, scholarship, and creative activity. There is another change in going from five (5) ratings to four (4) ratings, which is best practices these days. This discussion has been going on for years, as changing this leads to code changes. We are going to start training on this after the current faculty annual review cycle ends, but we wanted to come talk about this at Faculty Council to get input to inform the training.

Vice Provost James: Part of the reason this has not been changed in thirty (30) years is because there are things in codes. There are some department codes that are 75 pages long and have just been tacked on over the years. It is the job of the Office of the Provost to keep up with code review. We have discussed making a code template for departments. There are codes, for instance, that tie department heads' hands in terms of how they rate people at annual performance time, but the Manual states that it is the department chair that does annual performance ratings. It will not happen this year, but feel it is worth discussion to get us to a point where we feel codes are in compliance with the Manual and that people also understand their department codes. One of the things we have also discussed is the idea of a Faculty Council standing committee that is about codes, so that there is faculty input on code review. The final approval would be in the Office of the Provost, but it would be based on recommendations from this committee.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if there had been any follow-up on a potential meeting of the Faculty Council on budget priorities.

Chair Smith: Have reached out to Vice President Hanlon but have not heard back.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked when we will be meeting to discuss the Presidential evaluation.

Amy Barkley: We are meeting with the Institute of Research in the Social Sciences on April 22<sup>nd</sup> and should have the documents after that. Will share with Executive Committee for the Executive Session where this is discussed.

Pedros-Gascon: Something that has been asked about is whether there is a possibility of Faculty Council members participating in the process of evaluating Faculty Council leadership and expanding input. Think more voices than this group would be more representative. Suggested that this be discussed as a possibility for next year.

Chair Smith: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Have had the same thought.

Barkley: As part of that discussion, the cost of the analysis should be considered. We use the Institute of Research in the Social Sciences and Institutional Research for the other surveys, and we would maybe need to request funding from the Provost's Office. It might be worth getting a quote from them about what a survey of Faculty Council might cost and approaching the Office of the Provost early on in the discussions to see if there would be support for this.

Pedros-Gascon: Think if the questions are more quantitative rather than qualitative, wondering what the cost difference would be.

Barkley: Believe it would be the qualitative review that would be more expensive, since it takes longer, and they do all the narratives for us. The other thing that could work is that if the questions are purely quantitative, that is something the Executive Assistant could potentially take on, since it is just pulling numbers and putting them into a format for dissemination. Think the cost would depend on what questions are asked.

Pedros-Gascon: Think this would be positive and allow more faculty to be engaged.

Chair Smith: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Like the idea of discussion about codes and evaluations. Think if there will be a conversation about evaluations, that will be a larger discussion. Suggested doing this in two (2) parts. Proposed this be a discussion at the April Faculty Council meeting and start there and bring the discussion back in May as well.

## 2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: There were articles that were sent to this group. They do not have details in it, but they do say that we are anticipating receiving one million dollars more than the governor's request. Think these articles are worth a read. They discuss a little bit of the process the Joint Budget Committee went through.

Norton: There is a meeting of the National Faculty Conference on Intercollegiate Athletics. Chair Smith is planning on attending this, but it can be attended remotely. If anyone has an interest in learning about the transfer portal, name, image, and likeness (NIL), as well as athletes as employees, you can learn about all this from some of the top people in the field.

Chair Smith: Will be attending this conference remotely with the chair of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. Will ask the chair to potentially provide a report, because we will likely learn a lot of interesting things.

Norton: This was mentioned last year, but we can become a member of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics by a vote of the Faculty Council. This is a faculty organization.

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

Mitchell: There is an open budget forum next week on April 3<sup>rd</sup>. We are inviting people to attend. The Steering Committee is meeting this Thursday, and the Technical Committee continues to meet. Encouraged members to attend the open forum. The Steering Committee will be there to discuss things and answer questions.

Chair Smith: Asked if the open forum will be recorded.

Mitchell: Yes, this one will be recorded. There is also a virtual option for people to join.

## *F. Discussion Items*

Chair Smith: Would like to discuss what occurred at the last Faculty Council meeting. President Amy Parsons had come by the conference room where Faculty Council leadership was, and requested to join, and was turned away. We discussed that there was a perception out there from the November Faculty Council meeting, based on feedback received from not only membership of Executive Committee, but faculty more broadly. Expressed personal feeling that it was a shame that this interaction occurred with the President. It speaks to the perception by some faculty as the role that Faculty Council plays is one of antagonism towards administration. When

we embark on shared governance, that does not mean it is not one-sided from either the faculty perspective or the administrative perspective, but we come to meet in the middle and work together. When we have a President that wants to engage in shared governance, feel it is short-sighted to say no to that, even if it is the small gesture of sitting in the same room together.

Chair Smith: Would like to see Faculty Council move back to a more hybrid approach to meetings, similar to what we are doing with Executive Committee. Think it facilitates connection and discussion.

Chair Smith: Proposed that for future meetings, both for Faculty Council and Executive Committee, that people on the agenda for action items, reports or discussion items, be welcomed into the hybrid space and are allowed to attend in-person if they wish. Recognize that there are differing opinions on this, but as chair of Faculty Council, would live to move forward with this model of inviting people on the agenda to be present in-person if they choose. Invited any feedback from Executive Committee members about this.

Pedros-Gascon: As the individual who originally proposed not having leadership with Faculty Council leadership during meetings, am fine with this proposal. Encouraged leadership to be addressed by their titles during the meetings for formality. Feels that Faculty Council needs to be taken more seriously. Am not accusing our leadership, but the situation at the November Faculty Council meeting escalated due to a lack of action on the administration side. It seems that there is now a deeper understanding of the serious context of Faculty Council and am fine with bringing administration back. Reiterated need for use of formal titles rather than first names.

Chair Smith: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Understand this, but sometimes administration does request that they be addressed by their first name. Think we have been clear about those formalities in Faculty Council meetings.

Antolin: Spoke in favor of what is being proposed here that anyone on the agenda to address Faculty Council should be able to appear in person if they wish. Expressed appreciation for observation that Faculty Council is not in opposition to the administration.

Martin: Would like to speak in support of this. One of the points to recognize relative to Pedros-Gascon's comment is the behavior of faculty in that last Faculty Council meeting that was disrespectful. Think there is an expectation as Executive Committee to help empower our peers to be respectful of leaders, as well as those not in leadership roles, but are bringing things forward to Faculty Council. Thanked Chair Smith for her work in setting ground rules for engagement and setting the tone. Think there is still work to be done. Thanked Provost Marion Underwood and President Parsons for the transparency in their offices and embracing the opportunity to build a transparent relationship with administration that we may not have had in the past.

Chair Smith: Discussed the issues working in a hybrid format.

Mitchell: Echoed support for this idea to start rethinking how we engage with one another. There are many threats to what we do, even the entire model of how universities work and the way they

are budgeted. This is the time, more than any other time, that we need to be working with administration and administration working with us. Think anything we can do to ensure that our efforts are focused on how we can create value for a broad set of stakeholders outside the university as opposed to interactions inside the university that do not help us will be helpful in the long term.

Chair Smith: Will look into options and examples of a hybrid approach that might work for us.

Provost Underwood: Expressed appreciation for the opportunity to have regular interactions with Executive Committee and Faculty Council. Mean no disrespect in using first names and take none when using first name instead of title of Provost. We are working hard together to solve intellectual problems and respect decision about using titles during meetings.

Chair Smith: Expressed appreciation for willingness to discuss this issue and for support. Feel this is important. We need to continue to think about how we can make these meetings effective, as well as respectful, engaging, and inclusive. Any thoughts and ideas on this are welcome because we can only improve.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further business, called the meeting adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

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