

## MINUTES

Executive Committee

**Tuesday, September 10, 2024**

**3:00pm – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106**

**Present:** **Melinda Smith**, Chair; **Joseph DiVerdi**, Vice Chair; **Jennifer Martin**, BOG Representative; **Sue Doe**, Immediate Past Chair; **Marion Underwood**, Provost/Executive Vice President; **Amy Barkley**, Executive Assistant; **Catie Cramer**, Agricultural Sciences; **Rob Mitchell**, Business; **Peter Jan van Leeuwen**, Engineering; **Svetlana Olbina**, Health and Human Sciences; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts; **Christine Pawliuk**, Libraries; **Randall Boone**, Natural Resources; **Steve Benoit**, Natural Sciences; **Brian Geiss**, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

**Guests:** **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Susan James**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; **Richard Eykholt**, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty; **Karen Estlund**, Dean of Libraries; **Laura DeLancey**, Associate Dean Collections & Discovery; **Justin Dove**, Director of the Student Disability Center; **Joe Tiner**, Assistant Director of Access and Accommodations

Absent: none

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

### **September 10, 2024 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

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

##### **A. Executive Committee Minutes – August 27, 2024**

No changes or edits were suggested. Minutes approved by unanimous consent.

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

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

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on September 17, 2024 – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106 – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on October 1, 2024 – Microsoft Teams/Eddy 212 – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Smith: Reminded members that the first Faculty Council meet and greet is this Thursday, September 12 from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Lory Student Center Room 312. Encouraged members to attend if they are able.

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

Provost Underwood: Those of us in academic leadership have three (3) responsibilities, which are to set the strategy and vision for a unit in collaboration with faculty, staff and students, to offer outstanding undergraduate and graduate programs, professional development, and creating an environment where people can thrive, as well as garnering and stewarding resources and taking good care of the money and space we have. A persistent theme has been that in allocating resources, we need to take great care of the faculty and staff who are here now. Outlined a general plan that is materializing around classroom utilization and position control to help prioritize compensation.

Executive Committee members asked how the position control would work and equity around space usage on campus and what process and incentivization would be used for that. Another member mentioned the costs associated with growth and asked if there were conversations in that area in regard to using our resources well.

Provost Underwood: Confirmed that position control would include the administrative level and all positions being considered for hiring for will be considered. For classroom utilization, details are still being worked on, but this will be done in close collaboration with the Registrar's Office. Additionally, we hope the faculty will think creatively and strategically about new opportunities, but sometimes strategic growth means stopping doing other things too. Will be starting an academic portfolio review with deans this year to look at relevant data around enrollment and discuss goals and where they would like to grow and how to achieve that.

An Executive Committee member asked about the reevaluation of the Institutional Learning Objectives and whether there will be direction from upper administration to have individual units look at efficiencies at the department level and how those interact with revising learning objectives in accordance with those revised at the University level.

Provost Underwood: Indicated that the task force that is working on revising Institutional Learning Objectives is a faculty committee and we want faculty making principled judgements about what our curriculum should be. Heads, chairs, and deans will always need to do the best they can with the resources they have but would like that process to be separate from the faculty discussion of the revision of the Institutional Learning Objectives and the core curriculum.

An Executive Committee member asked about position control related to positions such as the Rambassador and CSU Spur.

Provost Underwood: There will be controls for all positions, and any new positions will need to be carefully justified. Understanding is that the ambassador positions, such as the one currently filled by Terrell Davis, are being paid through donor funds. CSU Spur also came to us with a budget, and we are trying to work within the CSU Spur budget as much as we can. Any new positions there will also receive the same position control.

Executive Committee members suggested that this be explained to Faculty Council since there have been questions about CSU Spur and the Rambassador program and how those are funded.

### *C. Old Business*

*D. Action Items*

1. UCC Minutes – August 23 & 30, 2024

Chair Smith made the motion on behalf of Brad Goetz to place University Curriculum Committee minutes on the Faculty Council agenda. There was no discussion.

Motion passed. Will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for October 1<sup>st</sup>.

2. Proposed Revisions to Section E.6 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Bharad Kannan, Chair

Jennifer Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty moves that the proposed revisions to Section E.6 of the Manual be added to the Faculty Council agenda. This revision clarifies that a tenure-track faculty member who is not renewed for employment cannot apply for tenure.

A minor edit regarding some numbering in the document was suggested by Executive Committee members. Martin stated that this edit would be made, and the document resent.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote.

Motion passed. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for October 1<sup>st</sup>.

3. Proposed Revisions to Section E.2.1.6 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Bharad Kannan, Chair

Martin: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that the proposed revisions to Section E.2.1.6 be placed on the Faculty Council agenda. This revision states that application for emeritus/emerita/emerit status needs to be made at the time of retirement, not at the end of transitional retirement. Stated that this is not a change in current process.

Executive Committee members discussed the process of applying for emeritus/emerita/emerit status. It was noted that the rationale in the document was not complete. Martin stated that this would be corrected, and the document resent.

Hearing no further discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote.

Motion passed. Will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for October 1<sup>st</sup>.

4. Proposed Revisions to Section E.11 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Bharad Kannan, Chair

Martin: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that the proposed revisions to Section E.11 be placed on the Faculty Council agenda. This revision addresses appeal of early termination of contract faculty. The revisions make it clear that an advisor may be present during the appeal interview, which is standard practice, but not explicitly stated in current Manual language. It also makes it clear that the report from the Appeal Committee will be sent to the Appellant, the Recommender, and the Provost.

Hearing no discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote.

Motion passed. Will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for October 1<sup>st</sup>.

5. Proposed Revisions to Section E.16 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Bharad Kannan, Chair

Martin: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that the proposed revisions to Section E.16 be placed on the Faculty Council agenda. This section deals with termination of tenure-track faculty. These changes make it clear that the report from the Appeal Committee is sent to the Appellant, the Recommender, and the Provost.

Hearing no discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote.

Motion passed. Will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for October 1<sup>st</sup>.

6. Proposed Revisions to Section E.17 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Bharad Kannan, Chair

Martin: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that the proposed revisions to Section E.17 be placed on the Faculty Council agenda. This section deals with renewal of tenure-track faculty. The revisions clarify standard practice, which allows an advisor to be present during the interview and the report provided by the Appeal Committee is sent to the Appellant, the department head, and the Provost.

Hearing no discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote.

Motion passed. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for October 1<sup>st</sup>.

Executive Committee discussed the timing of the action items to be seen by the Board of Governors in December. It was suggested that the October Faculty Council agenda be potentially sent two (2) weeks in advance or to send the proposed Manual revisions ahead of the official agenda to allow members time to review.

Chair Smith: Provost Underwood and Tammy Prusha requested a summary of Manual changes that occurred last year and may occur this year to present to the Provost Leadership Council. Expressed hope to do this once a semester or something similar.

### *E. Reports*

#### 1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Shared draft of the charges for the potential Task Force on Department Code Review. The rationale behind this task force is that department codes are sent to the Provost's Office for approval of any changes or revisions and there is not a level of consistency. The other motivation is whether codes align with what is in the Manual. This task force would work with the Provost's Office collaboratively in the review and approval process, as well as help develop a template that could be used by departments to simplify their codes and streamline the process. A key outcome from this task force is whether a standing committee makes sense. Faculty Council can receive that report from the task force, and next steps can be taken.

Executive Committee members asked whether codes that have all the key elements in the Manual would be required to re-write their code to match the proposed template. Chair Smith added this to the task force charge for consideration.

Chair Smith: Asked for any members interested in participating on this task force to reach out or ask their colleagues for interest. Will be sending out a call for volunteers.

Chair Smith: The other potential task force is one on faculty student mentoring. Explained the rationale and that this comes from the ASC/Advisor and Faculty Student Success Framework. The goal of this task force would be to determine whether and how such a framework would be implemented. Asked for feedback and suggestions for potential members.

#### 2. Board of Governors Report – Jennifer Martin

Martin: The Board of Governors is completing the October agenda. We have a standing request for the Executive Committee to have some level of interaction with the Board. Nothing is confirmed yet, but a request has been made.

### *F. Discussion Items*

1. Licensing of films discussion – Karen Estlund, Dean of Libraries & Laura DeLancey, Associate Dean, Collections & Discovery

Dean Karen Estlund: Provided context for discussion. In 2020, the Faculty Council Committee on Libraries formed a task force to look at copyright of video streaming and what we were doing for courses specifically. The Committee on Libraries came up with guidelines in collaboration with General Counsel, focusing on making the process easier and those making the copyright decisions were at a level that made sense. Following Associate Dean Laura DeLancey joining the Libraries in 2020, we discovered that the guidelines were not being followed. Noted that the communication regarding this came out late, and in most cases, we were able to work with faculty to find everything they needed. We are not following the guidelines exactly, but we held firm that we will not digitize anything that is already available streaming. We are following the guidelines while being as flexible as possible for fall and working on solutions going forward.

Executive Committee members discussed the communication mentioned. It was noted that this communication was sent only to department chairs and heads, and not necessarily to faculty. Executive Committee members asked for clarification on this service being provided.

Dean Estlund: Our course reserves service in the Libraries tries to provide online access for any materials used in courses up to a point. Most of the work is around PDFs. With videos, we can provide links to our subscription services that we have. The problem is that the cost for video streaming has become astronomical and most, if not all, libraries have cut back on those subscriptions. The other thing that happens is that titles switch out in those subscriptions. The other part of this service is physical property, in a DVD or VHS format. In the guidelines from 2020, if something was not in public domain and was available for a reasonable price, such as a rental for \$5, it would not be something we would digitize. That is not what was happening. DVD and VHS requests were going through the Division of IT, being digitized, and being added to the course reserves.

Executive Committee members expressed concern on the impact that these decisions have on accessibility and serving students, as well as the financial impact on students.

Dean Estlund: Expressed agreement that the communication process over the summer was not good and apologized. Feel comfortable with how the guidelines were developed with the Committee on Libraries and General Counsel. As for access, want to make it clear that we are not saying there is content you cannot use for a class. We are saying that if it is readily available for free, we will not be digitizing it. Associate Dean DeLancey has been working with faculty directly to find alternatives to make sure content is available. We are not choosing what can and cannot be in a class.

Associate Dean Laura DeLancey: When receiving lists from faculty, have looked to see where items are freely available. Provided some options, such as free trials for students on Amazon Prime. We are enforcing this policy but there is some flexibility. We are also trying to negotiate our contract with at least one of our vendors where prices have doubled.

Dean Estlund: Next steps will likely be a conversation with the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts to figure some of this out. Noted that universities such as Duke, Stanford, and Harvard have discontinued streaming services because of the cost. This is not a lack of CSU funding issue, it's a national issue around how these are priced. Something else we are doing is reviewing our

digitization service. It costs anywhere from \$200 to \$600 per title, and they are not accessible, since they are not captioned. We try as much as possible to get videos from streaming services to meet the legal requirements for accessibility. These topics will be discussed with the Committee on Libraries. The legal issues with accessibility and copyright do have an impact. We want to work with faculty and the Committee on Libraries to figure out what we need to do to serve these courses.

Chair Smith: Suggested a potential task force.

Dean Estlund: The Committee on Libraries will meet next week and will discuss the issues. We will likely coordinate with the Committee on Information Technology since this is a shared service.

2. Flexibility in attendance accommodation discussion – Justin Dove, Director of the Student Disability Center & Joe Tiner, Assistant Director for Access and Accommodations

Joe Tiner: Stated that the feedback from Executive Committee was received and they are working on written responses to share with the group by the end of the week.

An Executive Committee member asked about the 20% attendance accommodation and how the Student Disability Center arrived at that number.

Tiner: When looking at laws such as the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, the law says we have to provide accommodations but does not outline specifically what is or is not an accommodation. Those are done through an interactive process, where we meet with the student to determine accommodations. Ideally, we would meet with every student and faculty member to determine reasonable accommodations for each semester, but that is not realistic. What we try to do instead is figure out what accommodations would meet the needs of students in most cases. We can always tailor them to be more specific on a case-by-case basis. The 20% number was determined by the person previously in this role in collaboration with faculty across campus. We recognize that in situations such as labs and practicals, this may not be appropriate, in which case we can engage in a fundamental alteration process to determine what is reasonable for accommodations for the course based on the essential fundamental objectives for the course.

Executive Committee members asked questions around whether there is research available for how students do following college that have had the accommodations, as well as communications around accommodations.

Tiner: Not sure of research that exists around that, but accommodations still exist outside of education. Noted that the Student Disability Center team is consistent, and a student could get the same accommodation from one staff member to another.

An Executive Committee member stated that instructors are doing work to remove barriers in the classroom and adopting inclusive pedagogy. With something like attendance accommodations,

wondering how instructors can work to build those same principles of removing barriers while recognizing that in-person attendance is an important component of the learning experiences as well as having deadlines to ensure students do not fall behind, particularly with things like scaffolded assignments.

Tiner: When we print accommodations, it does not take universal design into account. If an instructor comes forward and states that they have a universal design, we can engage in a process to determine whether an accommodation is reasonable given the structure of the course. When providing students with accommodations, there is communication about using deadline extensions only when necessary and that it is easy to fall behind.

Executive Committee members discussed fundamental alterations and communication with the Student Disability Center, and whether there is an appeal process for decisions where an alteration is denied.

Justin Dove: Encouraged faculty to engage with the Student Disability Center. We can discuss denials of fundamental alterations.

### 3. UGO Survey & Presidential Survey discussion

Executive Committee members discussed the University Grievance Officer survey and whether it should alternate between a purely quantitative survey and the full survey in a specified timeline. Members discussed the purpose of the survey. It was noted that the Presidential survey will proceed as normal.

A motion was made to do a quantitative version of the UGO survey, with the full qualitative version occurring every three (3) years. The motion was seconded and approved by members.

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

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

Melinda Smith, Chair  
Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair  
Jennifer Martin, BOG Representative  
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant