MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 23, 2024
3:00pm – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106

Present: Melinda Smith, Chair; Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair; Andrew Norton, BOG Representative; 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

Guests: Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Ryan Brooks, Chair Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty; Kristina Quynn, Assistant Dean of the Graduate School & Director, CSU Writes; Audrey Swenson, Assistant Director & Deputy Title IX Officer; Katherine Castaneda, Senior Human Resources Partner & Deputy Title IX Coordinator

Absent: Sue Doe, Immediate Past Chair (excused); Zaid Abdo, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

April 23, 2024 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved
   A. Faculty Council Minutes – April 2, 2024
   B. Executive Committee Minutes – April 9, 2024

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any edits or changes to the minutes from the Faculty Council meeting on April 2nd or the Executive Committee meeting on April 9th.

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 April 30, 2024 – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106 – 3:00 p.m.

Chair Smith: This will be the final Executive Committee meeting of the academic year.

      2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on May 7, 2024 – Location TBD – 4:00 p.m.
Chair Smith: We are finalizing the location, but the final Faculty Council meeting will be hybrid. You are welcome to join us in-person or via Microsoft Teams.

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

Provost Marion Underwood: Would like to provide updates on three (3) academic projects being worked on.

Provost Underwood: Have asked Rick Miranda to lead a planning group for the alignment of the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability (SoGES) and the Climate Initiative. We wanted to look at whether these two (2) groups could work together. Believe that greater alignment between these groups would help make all our efforts in climate and sustainability more coherent within the University, but also more visible to outsiders. CSU has fantastic expertise in this area, but it is sprawling. Think we need structures to make it more visible to outsiders. We are also still reeling from the loss of Diana Wall, but this seems to be a good time to consider what structure might serve us into the future and what kind of director might be appropriate. Asked Miranda to lead a working group of people from the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability and from the Climate Initiative. They have started their work and are conducting surveys. They will be holding open forums for feedback and then they will advise on the best kind of process and timetable for considering aligning these groups and a possible new director. Looking forward to hearing their conclusions, likely at some point in May.

Provost Underwood: Another thing that has been underway for a while is a working group to look at additional academic opportunities or offerings at the CSU Spur campus in Denver. There is a lot of interest in offering additional academic programs at Spur that take advantage of the distinctive assets there. President Amy Parsons is interested in looking at the possibility of a first-year program at Spur, an opportunity for students in Denver to begin a CSU-Fort Collins experience, especially students who may feel they cannot move away yet and might not be ready for the move to Fort Collins. This task force is off to a great start, and they have wonderful ideas. Sybil Sharvelle, from Executive Committee, is part of that group.

Provost Underwood: The third project is that we are starting to consider piloting some modest modifications to the tenure and promotion process. We have shared these possible plans that we would like to try in the coming year at the tenure and promotion forum hosted by Vice Provost Susan James and the Faculty Success team last week. That was mainly a presentation on how the process works now, and shared some of the changes we are contemplating. What we hope to do is to try these changes in parts of the University in the coming year and work with Faculty Council on which ones we want to implement, adjusting from what we learn about the pilots. The reasoning for this is that candidates in different parts of the University experience different processes for promotion and tenure and feel this process should be similar across the University. Certainly, the criteria will differ by units. Feel there are a lot of steps that happen after cases come to the Provost’s Office that are not written down anywhere. Whatever we are doing, Faculty Council should have a chance to weigh in on it and we should be able to create that process together. Would rather have campus promotions committees advising on these cases.
Provost Underwood: Have been working on meeting with all the vice presidents and deans this week, along with Vice President Brendan Hanlon, and communicating which of the budget reduction proposals we have been accepting. Those meetings have gone well and have been productive conversations.

Chair Smith: Thanked Provost Underwood for the report. Have a question related to the CSU Spur first-year program idea. Think this is exciting and it would create a new avenue for students to get into the CSU System. Understanding is that CSU Spur is under the CSU System, so wondering why only CSU-Fort Collins is envisioning a first-year program, when it could also engage with CSU-Pueblo or potentially CSU Global. Curious about this, because it could be beneficial to both campuses potentially.

Provost Underwood: Think we were beginning with CSU-Fort Collins, but if our goal is to help more students in Denver matriculate to the System, we also want to prepare them for the possibilities in Pueblo. Maybe as we think about wrap-around activities, since the group is interested in a cohort model, we would like to also introduce them to possibilities at CSU-Pueblo, and some may be interested in CSU Global as well, if that makes sense for their lives and their work. President Parsons was interested in this as a pipeline to Fort Collins, but think people on the committee, as well as the fellow executive sponsor for the group, James Pritchett, were interested in considering pathways to Pueblo also.

Chair Smith: Another question has to do with the idea of integrating the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability with the Climate Initiative. Expressed hope that during the consideration of this that recognition is given to all the work that was put into the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability by Wall and the consideration of how sustainability is a much larger umbrella in which climate change and other global changes are nested. Just wanted to voice this opinion. Asked if there were additional questions for Provost Underwood.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: In the past, there have been concerns expressed about the amount of money being spent on CSU Spur. Think there is an interest in having a better understanding of how much money we are spending on some vanity projects and how much we are prioritizing the expenses that we have and how much are we envisioning it tilted towards an education kind of service rather than just a public image.

Provost Underwood: Think the hope is that the first-year program could meet our missions of student success and access and provide opportunities for more students to select CSU and to matriculate. The hope is that it would generate revenue along with some other academic programs that could be offered at Spur, taking advantage of that particular location. For example, we already have a masters in social work program that is located at CSU Spur. It is wonderful place in which to learn the discipline of social work, because those students have access to urban Denver, which is a very different program because it is located at CSU Spur. Think the hope is that a first-year program could generate new enrollment, therefore generating revenue, but believe the main reasons that President Parsons is interested in this is because it meets our missions of student success and access.
Pedros-Gascon: The Board of Governors have already shown interest, for down the line, in not paying for CSU Spur and having the costs come to us. Not sure how easy it will be to find the $14 to $18 million that it will cost us and believe that would have a definite impact on our academic mission.

Joseph DiVerdi: Asked if Provost Underwood was familiar with what the staffing plans are for this project. Wondering if people from Fort Collins will be tapped, or whether they will come from the Denver area.

Provost Underwood: Believe the task force is still considering some of those logistics. Think it could be possible that some of the courses are created by Fort Collins faculty but delivered by faculty hired to be in Denver. Or we could just hire faculty that live in Denver to be a part of the program and work down there. Do not think the vision is that faculty living in Fort Collins would be driving back and forth multiple times a week to teach at CSU Spur. Asked if Sybil Sharvelle would like to speak, since she is on that task force.

Sybil Sharvelle: To comment on the CSU Spur piece, think that this was characterized well by Provost Underwood. There are a lot of considerations going on in the committee and they are sensitive to the potential demands on Fort Collins campus faculty. They are considering multiple different options for how this all occurs but are strongly leaning toward having faculty that would deliver courses living in Denver, as well as being open to those faculty who have been active at the CSU Spur campus to be able to have teaching opportunities there as well.

Sharvelle: Want to also echo Chair Smith’s comments with respect to the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability and how that is considered and the integration with the climate group. Think it is has been very core to the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability that this broader umbrella is focused on social, economic, and environmental impacts across many areas, which of course integrates well with climate. Think it is important, however, that we do not lose sight of the vision that Wall and others have had.

Provost Underwood: Thanked Sharvelle. Encouraged members to participate in the survey. If you have not received it, you will soon. There will also be invitations to forums to speak about these things, so please continue to make these points.

Michael Antolin: In Biology, we have been trying to get Life 102 and Life 103 at CSU Spur and are about a year into it. We did hire instructors to teach those courses and they work closely with those of us that teach the same courses on this campus. There were some facilities built at CSU Spur for this contingency. Expressed agreement with Provost Underwood that it is an access issue, in the sense that there could be a population of students in that area who would be interested in taking CSU courses as opposed to community college courses. Expressed support for this idea.

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

C. Old Business
D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – April 5, 12 & 19, 2024

Chair Smith: Reminded members that an additional set of University Curriculum Committee minutes from April 19th were sent via email, as well as the minutes from April 5th and April 12th that can be found in the agenda packet. Asked if Brad Goetz wanted to bring anything to the attention of the Executive Committee.

Brad Goetz: These are a standard set of minutes, and there is nothing of note. Reminded Executive Committee that there are often materials from the University Curriculum Committee that come out after the final Faculty Council meeting that will need to be approved on behalf of Faculty Council. There are usually some time-sensitive items in there.

Chair Smith: The plan will be to have Executive Committee approve those items via email.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote to place the April 5th, April 12th, and April 19th University Curriculum Committee minutes on the Faculty Council agenda.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for May 7th.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Attended the tenure and promotion open forum last Thursday as a panelist, along with DiVerdi. It was interesting and was useful to have Provost Underwood present some of the forward-looking pieces. There were a lot of people there and good questions asked.

Chair Smith: On Friday, attended a virtual symposium hosted by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (CoIA). That was faculty-centered and am happy to share the agenda for that. There were many interesting parts. They provided context for all the lawsuits that are underway at the NCAA and how we have arrived at the current state, which is high uncertainty about whether the NCAA will continue in its current form. There were discussions about what will happen to the power football programs, name, image, and likeness (NIL), and the transfer portal. The biggest lawsuit still pending is a $1.4 billion lawsuit that could be $4 billion. They think the NCAA will settle, but that could lead to this domino effect. There is high uncertainty with respect to student athletes and the future they are facing. The other pieces of information we learned is about the landscape of looking at students as employees of universities, and there was not much certainty with that. Delaware did it, but the person they had from NCAA sounded skeptical as to whether that would become a nationwide movement. As you can imagine, that could have huge implications on our budgets. They also shared information about name, image, and likeness (NIL), and if one of these lawsuits gets upheld and supported, that could mean at least some student athletes could get reimbursement going back to 2008. That would be money that universities would pay, not NCAA. For those programs who have really big players, it could be difficult. The final issue discussed was around the gambling issue, which apparently is a huge
problem for students. They market specifically toward students in universities and have even opened it up to micro-betting. They discussed how people rack up these huge debts because they are gambling and that there is a movement to try to limit it and the predatory behavior of some of these online gambling companies.

Kristina Quynn: Asked if there were any representatives from student affairs or people who were doing something in that arena.

Chair Smith: Think that is something we should consider talking to our Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics and our faculty representative to the Athletics program, because we will be facing this kind of stuff soon. This meeting was packed full of information that is relevant to what we do as faculty.

Andrew Norton: Discussed this last year but think it would be worth Faculty Council taking up joining this organization.

Chair Smith: Will be proposing this to our Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. Think we need to have either one of those members, or the faculty representative to Athletics, be a member of this group. We need to stay informed.

Jennifer Martin: A few weeks ago, CU hosted a conference, and this was one of the topics they addressed. They had their athletic director, a sports lawyer who is a faculty member, one of their student athletes, as well as the men’s basketball coach, and they had a similar conversation. They discussed the landscape and some of the legal cases that are now out against the NCAA and the sports betting challenge, as well as the collectives at large. Liked the way they approached this topic head-on as a campus and had an open conversation around the challenges they are facing. The reality is that there are no answers yet, and they are waiting on a lot of other dominos to fall from the various court cases. Would propose that we consider having a similar conversation on our campus, because we often talk about athletics in the budget space and the challenges there, but we do not really talk about the landscape of athletics and how it is changing. It is how we move forward with this changing landscape that should be a conversation we have on campus, and that faculty should have a voice within.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin. Expressed agreement.

DiVerdi: Perhaps we could offer to the interim Athletic Director this information and request that we do something similar here, because we want to steer this from our traditional kinds of interactions with Faculty Council.

Norton: President Parsons is the Mountain West Conference representative, and as a lawyer, she is quite aware of the landscape and could lead a values kind of presentation.

Chair Smith: Would be happy to reach out to President Parsons and the interim Athletic Director and share this link. If Executive Committee is in favor, will ask them to provide some clarity around or at least address these issues.
Executive Committee members expressed agreement.

Pedros-Gascon: Believe we agreed to have a meeting with Steve Shulman to discuss the budget priorities. As we are reaching the end of the semester, am presuming this will not be happening. Would like to know if this has been discussed or how a decision was reached to not pursue this situation that was agreed upon.

Chair Smith: Had reached out to Vice President Hanlon, who indicated he was maxed out on the budget forums and the budget redesign process. Vice President Hanlon indicated he would be open to doing something on this in the fall, which is something we should jump on immediately.

Pedros-Gascon: Given that we have been given and received plenty of information from Vice President Hanlon, do not see that having him in a meeting in which additional data is being presented should be considered as an event. It is not like we are inviting Shulman to come to Faculty Council to be in discussion with him, it was a special meeting. Do not agree with the logic of having Vice President Hanlon present and explain the points over again. Feel that we are missing the voice and understanding from one of our own faculty.

Chair Smith: Might be misremembering. Understanding was that we wanted to have a forum to discuss budget priorities. We could do this just as faculty, but the thought was that we wanted to engage with the person that is fully embedded in the budget decision-making process.

Pedros-Gascon: Given that we have been given and received plenty of information from Vice President Hanlon, do not see that having him in a meeting in which additional data is being presented should be considered as an event. It is not like we are inviting Shulman to come to Faculty Council to be in discussion with him, it was a special meeting. Do not agree with the logic of having Vice President Hanlon present and explain the points over again. Feel that we are missing the voice and understanding from one of our own faculty.

Chair Smith: Might be misremembering. Understanding was that we wanted to have a forum to discuss budget priorities. We could do this just as faculty, but the thought was that we wanted to engage with the person that is fully embedded in the budget decision-making process.

Pedros-Gascon: The problem is that we are now going to be moving on to a new academic year. The decisions about this academic year have already been decided, and the possibility of having some discussion that might have been pertinent for people to understand this is more limited.

DiVerdi: One of the problems is that we certainly have no impact on the current academic year, and we could not have gotten them sooner.

Pedros-Gascon: The information that was presented by Shulman has only been heard by Executive Committee, and feel a little sad that it is only the people in this room that have heard those kinds of ideas.

Chair Smith: Wondering when the meeting should be that would have the most impact. Sense is that with the budget model and the incremental, many faculty are overwhelmed by this point, and it may have more impact to do that in the fall. It also has the potential for impacting the next year’s decisions.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed agreement to do it in the fall. Suggested having it at the entrance of next semester.

DiVerdi: We want Shulman’s comments to be given some air. There is no interest in burying it.

Chair Smith: This does not preclude Shulman from coming to Faculty Council and presenting to them what was presented to us. Given the landscape of the forums and the availability of one of the key people in the decision-making process, it did not seem to make sense to try to make that
happen at the end of this semester. We would be well-served to do this in early September, because then we can get in on the next round of decisions.

Martin: Given the conversation we just had about all the potential changes in the athletics landscape, one question for whatever this conversation will look like is whether it is in the spirit of transparency around the athletics budget. Think that could come as a request to Vice President Hanlon’s office and asking for more detailed reports from Athletics. It could be that after the first year when there are some new legal implications or changes within NCAA, we would not have a choice but to change athletics funding. Think it is important to note that any conversations we have about our desires for the Athletics budget, if the overarching authority that oversees collegiate athletics makes decisions we have to abide by, those may not come into alignment with each other.

Chair Smith: Thanked everyone for the discussion.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: We worked the spring football game cookie handout, along with other employee council leadership. There will be another faculty appreciation cookie event this Thursday on the Lory Student Center Plaza.

Chair Smith: Encouraged Executive Committee members to stop by. DiVerdi is signed up to manage the booth.

Norton: Submitted report for the Board of Governors. Confirmed that the revisions to Section E.6 are on the consent agenda, as well as the changes in the administrative leave policy. Will be giving them a brief update on the task forces. Will also be highlighting the results from the University Grievance Officer report from February. The Board of Governors need to know that the number of people going to the Ombuds office and the University Grievance Officer are increasing. Will also be highlighting the report on salary equity from the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. Will close out report with the anticipated update of the Faculty Council website and the finance pages. Asked Amy Barkley to confirm when Rachel Baschnagel will be back in town to finish this.

Amy Barkley: Believe she is back this week, so will be reaching out to set up another meeting and hopefully Executive Committee can look at the draft pages next week.

Norton: Encouraged Executive Committee members to come to the Board of Governors meeting, which will be next Thursday and Friday, May 2nd and 3rd.

Norton: President Parsons also had the leadership of the three (3) employee councils, the Administrative Professional Council, Faculty Council, and the Classified Personnel Council to the Magnolia House to discuss the concerns of each of the employee groups.
Antolin: Thanked Norton for the update that the administrative leave revisions will be going forward to the Board of Governors. Asked for clarification around the Section E.6. Asked whether it was that President Parsons signed off on it that it was moving forward.

Norton: Confirmed. The President is the one that brings the agenda to the Board of Governors, so they would not bring anything forward that they would later get rid of.

Antolin: Asked: So this means that the President and the Office of General Counsel has approved this?

Norton: Confirmed.

Antolin: Asked about the Section J revisions.

Norton: Those have gone through the Board of Governors and were approved as submitted. Believe we are up to date on business and everything that has been approved for the Manual since February are on the consent agenda. Requested that Barkley confirm.

Barkley: Confirmed. All the Manual changes that have been approved since February are going forward to the Board of Governors, including the Section F revisions.

Executive Committee expressed appreciation for Chair Smith’s leadership.

Chair Smith: Thanked Executive Committee. Hearing no further questions or discussion, thanked Norton for the report.


Martin: Asked Vice Provost Susan James to speak to this as a member of the Steering Committee. Indicated that a general campus update usually goes out after every steering committee meeting. They met last Thursday, and due to Pam Jackson being on leave, that communication will be going out to campus next week.

Vice Provost Susan James: The Steering Committee went through a lot of discussion around additional metrics to be used in the formula-driven part of the new budget model. There are no decisions made yet. The people on the steering committee filled out a survey about various metrics, including the tradeoffs, positives, and negatives, and compile that idea. The idea is to get the Technical Committee something that they could start running some models for us. They have not done that work yet and are waiting on us. The Technical Committee shared the work they have done with cost analysis and modeling. We had a great presentation from a member of the Technical Committee, which made us feel better about the data that they are working with. It led to a discussion about the quality of data available and things like costs of various programs. An example of one of the metrics we are discussing was looking at enrollment and student credit hours. We did talk about tradeoffs. For instance, we asked whether enrollment as a metric captures student credit hours, for both majors and minors, or whether we need to take into account second majors and advising.
Ryan Brooks: The goal of the conversation with the Technical Committee was to discuss these possible metrics and have them start giving us possible data back so we can see some scenarios. Angela Nielsen and her group are working on those possible metrics. Again, nothing has been decided, but we are trying to allow the Technical Committee to give us some of those reports back to see what we have data on and what this could look like in different models. One of the metrics that came up was post-graduation placement of students. That might be a nice metric, but we need to know how to use it.

Sharon Anderson: Asked: Do these metrics have to do with future financing or funding?

Martin: The way traditional hybrid RCM works is that there is some allocation metrics, so formulaic allocation, and so a metric or series of metrics may be reflecting student success and then a handful of other metrics that this committee has not decided on determines how resources revenue flows to the college. In this particular case, if you remember from a few meetings ago, the guidance that the Steering Committee has thus far received from the Executive Sponsor Committee is that revenue allocation should focus right now only on tuition revenue and not other sources of revenue. This would reflect how perhaps all or some of those tuition dollars would flow to academic units. In the case of CSU, the academic unit that this Steering Committee is focusing on are the colleges, and they have not yet focused at all on the administrative unit allocations.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin. Hearing no further discussion, requested to move on to next report from Brooks.

4. NTTF Faculty Success: Onboarding and Mentorship Report – Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty – Ryan Brooks, Chair

Chair Smith: We will be receiving this report with the intent of placing this on the agenda for the Faculty Council meeting on May 7th.

Brooks: This is the result of a combination of conversations that have occurred over the past year that the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty have been a part of in terms of common pinch points that come up and how we improve efforts, especially with non-tenure track faculty. We have talked about onboarding for some time and these efforts are inconsistent across the University. Mentoring come sup in other conversations and the question has been asked about whether we have guidelines or standards for mentoring practices.

Brooks: We felt it would be good to take a deeper dive into this and how we could improve on what is done across the University. We sat down with Provost Underwood at the beginning of this semester and discussed amongst the other standing committees on the issues we are working on and that we wanted to look more into onboarding and mentorship in terms of faculty success for continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty. Improving promotion could be another piece of this and trying to do a better job of making people aware of the promotion processes. Inherently, onboarding and mentorship are closely integrated.
Brooks: We charged two (2) subcommittees, one on onboarding and one on mentorship, to look into this a bit more. We had conversations with Vice Provost James and Sue Doe, because TILT does some onboarding as well across the University and they have ideas about what has worked across the University and what we need to improve. There are some University-level items, but then there are obviously differences at the college levels. In some places, there is not much that exists. Based on conversations we have had in the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, and to try to see what is done currently across the University, we surveyed all departments at CSU. We had eighteen (18) responses out of sixty (60). We were trying to figure out what we are currently doing. In the appendix of the report, there are a handful of questions that were posed to various department chairs. We wanted the subcommittees to come up with recommendations or guidance for best practices that should be employed in terms of onboarding and mentorship in various academic units. This is just a start. The hope is that it creates more conversation. Non-tenure track faculty are at the front of this, as it comes from the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, but feel it is relevant to all faculty.

Vice Provost James: One of the things that comes up a lot, even in the Principles of Community task force, is that we ask department chairs whether they have mentoring programs, and many do not. There is a bit of a disconnect. Wondering if there has been any discussion about accountability and leadership for trying to do some of this.

Brooks: It was brought up that there are the two (2) approaches, the top-down and the bottom-up. As a future goal, what we have alluded to, is that what is missing from this is the faculty expertise, experience, and perspective. It is not just asking the top-down what is being done. Think what needs to continue to happen from this is that people go back to their department heads and ask what can be done to improve this. Hopefully there is some momentum there. Do not think anyone is trying to be deceptive in terms of what we are doing, but sometimes, even at the higher level, it may look like we are doing more than we actually are.

Vice Provost James: Expressed agreement. Think something Faculty Council should think about in the future is where mentoring is a performance management for faculty as well as administrators. Know that Dean Colleen Webb has brought this up around graduate student mentoring. It is not only leadership, but more senior faculty or later career faculty that tend to be involved in the mentoring of early career faculty. They are busy people, so we need to figure out how to reward them for that and talk about where it counts, such as part of your service appointment.

DiVerdi: Asked whether all the colleges were represented in the responses.

Brooks: Explained where the responses came from. It was a low response rate, which was tough. Discussed this with Vice Provost James and Doe, because we want to figure out what is done.

DiVerdi: The Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty went through a review of department codes for non-tenure track faculty service.

Brooks: We did not send that report to Faculty Council, but we did review all the code to pull out the service. Do not know how much the codes speak to onboarding and mentorship.
Chair Smith: Wondering with the code templates being available, if there is a place where the mentorship piece can live.

Vice Provost James: All we have right now is a checklist of what is in the Manual. Expressed hope that we can get Faculty Council to consider a standing committee on code templates. Think it needs more shared governance attention from both the Provost’s Office as well as Faculty Council. There is a lot of progress, so this is a great lead-in to that. The other thing is that the effect on culture and departments to get people really helping people is huge.

DiVerdi: When we talk about retention, this could really contribute to that.

Anderson: Regarding mentoring, was involved in a project around ten (10) years ago that talked with different departments on campus, and one of them was around mentoring. Think this was for a research project. Spoke with some people at the College of Biomedical Sciences and Veterinary Medicine and was impressed with the mentoring program they had set up. Not sure if it is still in place, but it was very impressive. If they are still doing that, or there is some data around how they were mentoring their junior faculty, it was impressive what they were doing.

Vice Provost James: Asked if it was the Microbiology, Immunology, and Pathology department.

Anderson: Not sure.

Vice Provost James: They have a good metric program. There are a lot of examples from them with workload calculators that Faculty Success has borrowed. The advocates and allies group is putting together a mentoring toolkit for departments partially informed by that model.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further discussion, requested a show of hands to place this report on the Faculty Council agenda.

Request was approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for May 7th as a report item.

F. Discussion Items

1. CSU Writes – Kristina Quynn, Assistant Dean of the Graduate School & Director, CSU Writes

Quynn: CSU Writes is often confused with the Writing Center, but we are different programs. Was thinking about how to range this conversation for Faculty Council. Would like to speak to faculty and the value of faculty on how they are the heart of this program. Will give some background on that. Would also like to talk about the nature of running a supplementary program on campus that does essential work. When we talk about writing offices, we are thinking of essential writing work that is done in the curricular fashion, and this is for professional development and development across the career. Would also like to talk about how CSU Writes works uniquely with writers. Directed members’ attention to a report that was included in the agenda packet when we looked at operating programs for graduates, postdoctoral students, and
Quynn: We have Graduate Writes, Faculty Writes, and then we also do team writes for collaborative writing work. We expected to work with about thirty (30) to fifty (50) writers in the first year, but it has continued to grow. We have anywhere between 2400 to 3500 attendances per year. It’s through different events and different types of support. The reasoning for this is that if we are looking at people where they are in their career stream, they are not in the same place at the same time and need different types of support. It’s an opt in program and is not required. It is rooted in principles of writing, containment and writing productivity, as well as writing and social spaces. Those all work well together to be able to support people who are writing to build out proposals, manuscripts for submission. We want to also think about how to build community within your programs, and it is something we do not often think about with writing because it is a place that is so essential that it is invisible. It can become a place where people, if they do not feel supported, can feel very isolated. CSU Writes has put within a systematic and programmatic way a program that can help writers where they are. We are still small. We work with about 10% of CSU faculty and about 10-15%, depending on the year, of graduate students. It is across all disciplines, all colleges. We have a lot of campus partners that we work with to do special programming.

Quynn: We did a survey of over one hundred (100) other institutions to see how they are supporting their researchers and writers. We found that there is a clear distinction between the division that they make developmentally between graduate students and faculty. Faculty writing support is often similar to what we have with TILT toward faculty development programs and graduate student supports. We found out a lot during that survey. What we are doing here at CSU is unusual, but in a good way. Think we are ahead of the curve.

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

DiVerdi: Asked if there was a cost to faculty or graduate students to participate in this program.

Quynn: Right now, there is no cost to students. We have discussed charging a nominal fee to reserve a space. For graduate students, it all comes through operating funds. Am currently housed within the Graduate School.

Quynn: Would hope that CSU would look into how we can build community here through things like mentoring circles. CSU Writes is also a place where these conversations can and should be happening.

Chair Smith: Thanked Quynn. Asked if there were any other questions. This is an important program and am supportive. Suggested that when this comes to Faculty Council, would recommend showing slides to help synthesize the presentation.

Quynn: Directed members’ attention to the slides in the agenda packet. Will be bringing these to Faculty Council as well.
Smith: Thanked Quynn. Requested a vote to place this on the Faculty Council agenda as a discussion item.

Executive Committee gave approval. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for May 7th as a discussion item.

2. Office of Equal Opportunity Update – Audrey Swenson, Assistant Director & Deputy Title IX Officer & Katherine Castaneda, Senior Human Resources Business Partner & Deputy Title IX Coordinator

Audrey Swenson: There has been tremendous growth in the area of civil rights compliance at CSU over the last couple years. Whether it is reporting discrimination to helping students navigate issues related to sexual harassment to those experiencing sexual harassment in their work environments, we find that this is an area where the more support that can be provided to faculty, the better. These can be difficult situations to navigate, both emotionally but also as a system.

Swenson: A couple significant changes we have at recently at CSU are that we designated an Executive Director for Civil Rights Compliance and created a joint division, which essentially merges the Office of Equal Opportunity and the Office of Title IX Programs under the President’s Office. That position is currently filled by Araina Muniz. We will formally move under the President’s Office beginning on July 1st. What this means is that there will be centralized reporting platforms for people that are interested in reporting any form of discrimination, including workplace, hostile environment, sexual harassment. Ideally, this will be an easier system for people to navigate.

Swenson: Last Friday, the federal government issued new federal regulations around Title IX and how that is implemented at universities. It is very long, so we are still in the process of working through it, but the implementation for that guidance is August 1st. Want to be mindful that with the conversation with Faculty Council, some of the information in that process may shift on August 1st pending on adjustments and guidance from the federal government.

Swenson: Our office will oversee anything related to reports of discrimination under Title VII, coordination of ADA accommodations for employees or investigations. We also oversee situations where individuals feel they are being discriminated against because of their disability, as well as compliance under Title IX, which applies to both employees and students. Hostile environments, sexual harassment, or any type of sexual assault relating to dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking that occurs on University property are areas that we work with.

Chair Smith: Thanked Swenson. Asked if there were any questions.

Vice Provost James: There is some confusion about which services are focused on students only, and which are focused on both students and employees. Asked if that could be clarified.

Swenson: Those resources were historically divided. The Office of Equal Opportunity would receive any reports related to a staff member, faculty member, or employee that was impacted or
engaging in problematic behavior. Because these two (2) offices are being merged and joined, people can come centrally now to the Office of Title IX Programs and receive that support regardless of what their role is at the University.

Martin: Expressed appreciation for the efficiency of combining the offices, but wondering if there are any concerns about capacity, knowing that the Office of Equal Opportunity is a high-demand office with lots of broad scope and needs. Title IX is also significantly important, especially to impacted parties. Wondering if there are concerns about capacity once the merge of the offices happens.

Swenson: Mentioned that some of the Office of Equal Opportunity’s responsibilities were segmented out with the initiation of the merger of the offices. Asked Katherine Castaneda to expand on this.

Katherine Castaneda: Prior to the most recent changes, the Office of Equal Opportunity has been responsible for complaints of discrimination and sexual harassment in the workplace, as well as workplace accommodations for employees specifically, as well as serving as that kind of appeal are for students if they were unsatisfied with the accommodations that were established through the Student Disability Center. Other responsibilities that this office had was managing the search process, and that team has moved to the Human Resources division. This left two (2) positions within the Office of Equal Opportunity focusing on compliance and workplace accommodations.

Castaneda: Highlighted that both the Office of Equal Opportunity and Title IX were already departments within the same division under the same leader. There was a lot of collaboration occurring already. One of the great results of this consolidation is that there are certainly claims of sexual harassment that an institute of higher education would need to go through Title IX legislation and there is currently language in the process around where the Title IX coordinator needs to officially pass it to Office of Equal Opportunity review. This helps streamline the review process for all complaints. In terms of bandwidth, know that there are plans to backfull the positions that have been vacated in the Office of Equal Opportunity. One would focus on complaints, and the other would primarily focus on workplace accommodations.

Norton: Asked: With this centralized reporting location, does that mean that the bias report system will be phased out, or will it still be separate?

Swenson: Bias reporting is actually a separate platform facilitated by a separate office. Our Executive Director sits on the Bias Reporting Assessment Team, in case there are components related to sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, and interpersonal violence.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern over the merger of these offices. In the past, there has been a concern about the independence of this office from the President. Wondering if the office is more responsible to the federal mandate or to the President.

Swenson: The direct reporting line from a Title IX coordinator to the president of the university is considered best practice. The reason for this is because the Title IX office, in accordance with federal law, wants to ensure that we are taking necessary action and that there are not layers of
people interfering or preventing our ability to take appropriate and necessary action. That direct reporting line to the president ensures that universities are taking all matters related to Title IX with the gravitas they deserve, and that prompt action can be taken if needed.

Pedros-Gascon: The concern is the fact that you are becoming vice presidents, rather than a more identifiable unit.

Swenson: Clarified that Muniz reports to the Chief of Staff in the President’s Office.

Chair Smith: Muniz does not serve on the Cabinet, either. There is some separation but understand Pedros-Gascon’s concerns. They do not serve the same way that vice presidents do, in the sense that all vice presidents serve on the Cabinet of the President. Asked if there were other questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Given the recent history of what has happened with Title IX and the situation in Athletics, wondering what the office has learned from that situation and what can be done to not end up in the same situation. Provided an example of a previous situation.

Swenson: Expressed appreciation for the question. We are unfortunately not able to speak to cases that have been handled in the past or are being handled currently by our office.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed disappointment that we cannot talk about it because it has already happened. This transmits a lack of accountability on the part of our administration.

Norton: Understanding is that the victim is always empowered to tell their story should they feel it is in their best interest to do so. Interpretation in this case is that the victim is electing not to have their story told. Can respect that.

Pedros-Gascon: The question about what we have learned from the situation could still be addressed. We acknowledge that it happened, but we do not ask what we have learned from that situation and what we will do differently. Think this allows for confidentiality but to acknowledge that something happened and how we are engaging with it moving forward.

Swenson: Am a big proponent of transparency around our process. We want people to understand how our processes work, where they have agency in our processes, and this is something we will be sharing with Faculty Council. Due to time constraints, we did not go through the slides today, but there is a slide included in the materials in the agenda packet that goes over how information is processed when it comes in. Would be happy to go more into depth with that because it could go a long way in terms of building trust in the process and to understand what happens when information comes into our office, how it is handled, and how it is shared or not shared.

Martin: Expressed understanding for Pedros-Gascon’s desire for more information, but also respect that there is a delicate balance of requesting information for the good of the institution, while also maintaining a level of privacy and support for those impacted.
Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions or comments, expressed appreciation for Swenson and Castaneda attending today. It would be great, given the Title IX changes coming, to have this group come back in the fall to provide an update. Feel it will be important for laying some groundwork and updating faculty about the changes that have occurred.

G. Executive Session – Presidential Survey Results [see documents emailed separately]

Chair Smith: Requested a motion to move into Executive Session to discuss the Presidential evaluation survey results.

DiVerdi: Moved.

Pedros-Gascon: Seconded.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Executive Session concluded at 5:43 p.m.
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