

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, October 8, 2024

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106

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

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Susan James**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; **Cassandra Moseley**, Vice President for Research; **Brendan Hanlon**, Vice President for University Operations; **Steve Shulman**, Department of Economics

Absent: Christine Pawliuk, Libraries (excused); Brian Geiss, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences (excused)

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

October 8, 2024 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – September 24, 2024

A minor correction was received from Antonio Pedros-Gascon.

Hearing no further edits or suggestions, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on October 22, 2024 – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106 – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on November 3, 2024 – Microsoft Teams/Eddy 212 – 4:00 p.m.
3. Next Faculty Council Meet & Greet – Thursday, November 7 – Lory Student Center Room 312 – 3:30pm-5:00pm

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

- a. Academic Analytics discussion – Provost Underwood & Vice President for Research Cassandra Moseley

Provost Marion Underwood: CSU purchased Academic Analytics to help the University and faculty get the recognition they deserve. This is a tool that compares academic units to different peer groups to help us decide where we can invest to make our academic and research enterprises even stronger. It is not a tool for faculty evaluation. We use Interfolio for faculty evaluation. Academic Analytics is not suited for evaluation and will not provide the information required for individual evaluations. Noted that Academic Analytics looks at research metrics and computes them for tenure-track faculty, not contract, continuing, and adjunct faculty, so this tool only enhances part of our academic enterprise, which is another reason we would never use it for faculty evaluation. Showed examples of data and information available through Academic Analytics.

Vice President Cassandra Moseley: Expressed agreement that Academic Analytics has tools around prestigious honors and awards and the opportunities we can identify to allow us to make sure faculty get the recognition they deserve. Another dimension of Academic Analytics is that we have tools to assist with supporting faculty and developing proposals for grant funding. This tool is particularly useful for interdisciplinary teams and for large proposals. Explained some of the tools available, which includes identifying external collaborators.

An Executive Committee member expressed concerns that this system is not ethnic or culturally based. The member asked Provost Underwood and Vice President Moseley to elaborate on how this system would not perpetuate an ethno-based system.

Provost Underwood: This is not a system fueled by artificial intelligence. This is a web-scraping tool that scours the internet for information about faculty accomplishments. It is not perfect and relies on the information it can find, so it is not equally accurate for all disciplines. It does compare disciplines to other same disciplines and will not compare across disciplines. Believe this tool promotes equity because decisions will always be made by academic leaders on who to nominate for an award. This tool allows leaders to make decisions based on data.

Vice President Moseley: Academic Analytics has spent a lot of time and energy focusing on bringing into the ecosystem non-English language books and journals so that the research metrics are measuring those publications. They do not need to be in English to end up in these data sets, which is a competitive advantage over many of the other tools available. The data sets also show awards and honors across disciplines including the humanities, social sciences, and the arts. This creates opportunities to take a step back and look at the whole faculty and departments in an equitable way. This is a tool that has been around for a while and does not use artificial intelligence.

Vice Provost Susan James: Had asked a similar question to the people from Academic Analytics. The question was whether the data was based on information available publicly and how it does not perpetuate the bias that is built into the academic system. They did not have a perfect answer, but it was indicated that the focus on scholarly work does not include data on gender or ethnicity, and it looks at people in new and emerging fields. It does cover the interdisciplinary areas where often scholars with minoritized identities are working. While they did not have a perfect answer, it was shown that it does have advantages for diversity, equity and inclusion.

An Executive Committee member expressed concern about the privilege of those nominating others for awards, including those who have received the award themselves. Eventually people and their biases come into the mix.

Provost Underwood: Expressed appreciation for the concern. We are viewing this as a tool for heads, chairs, and deans to be used at the local level. We would like heads and chairs to have this tool to see who within their disciplines are a good fit for awards and do something different to move the needle. We would like to build a culture where people feel comfortable nominating themselves, or if you do not know someone to nominate you, this tool can help the chair or head find a nominator. Believe that when this is used at the disciplinary level, this can get more faculty on a trajectory of awards and build more of a culture for awards.

An Executive Committee member asked if Provost Underwood thought that the challenge in getting awards at CSU was identifying the awards people are eligible for or the time it takes to put together the packet. The member asked whether other institutions using Academic Analytics observed a change in behavior, since the largest commitment is the time it takes to put together the award nomination packet, and whether there is evidence that this will work in that space.

Provost Underwood: This tool is helpful in identifying awards, and there are so many awards and disciplines it is hard to keep up with them all. Expressed hope to see more units have award committees where a group of faculty within the unit share the responsibility of nominating colleagues for awards. Knowing about award possibilities helps units share the work involved in nominating people. The Provost's Office and the Office of the Vice President for Research can help with the bigger ones, but disciplinary expertise is necessary. This tool could be useful for awards committees and can be used in strategic ways.

An Executive Committee member discussed how they handle nominations and awards committees in their department. Members asked about where the budget is involved with this.

Provost Underwood: Perception is that leaders always make decisions about how to allocate resources. This tool allows you to base those decisions on data. Provided some examples of identifying potential support for departments.

An Executive Committee member expressed that it would be good for departments to have guidance and structure. The member also stated that it would be good to hold chairs and heads accountable for not acting on the data and would hope this would be a part of their evaluations.

Provost Underwood: We want to have a user agreement with guidelines for how the data will and will not be used. We will also help university leadership engage with this tool. Heads and chairs will get training from Academic Analytics on how to use the tool and we will want deans to also sit down with chairs to look at it.

An Executive Committee member asked how faculty and a group of researchers could request assistance identifying funding through Academic Analytics, given that it is only being used at the chair, head, and dean levels.

Vice President Moseley: If the head is willing to help, that is great, but the Research Acceleration Office is being trained specifically on this part of the tool. Would recommend reaching out to them.

An Executive Committee member suggested communicating this information directly to faculty rather than relying on communication through the chairs.

Hearing no further questions or comments, concluded report.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – September 20, 2024

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hands for those in the room and through the chat for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed. Will be placed on Faculty Council agenda for November 5th.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Met with Shane Kanatous, chair of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. We discussed the conversation with Executive Committee. Kanatous reported that there is engagement with Director of Athletics John Weber. Have requested to set up a meeting with Director of Athletics Weber to discuss the committee and clarify the charge. Kanatous has additionally agreed to edit the annual report and provide more information as requested.

Executive Committee members discussed issues around athletics, as well as discussions regarding budget and athletics. Members emphasized that there is support for student athletes and the discussions around the athletics budget are separate from that support. It was suggested that Executive Committee contact the Student Athletes Advisory Committee for a discussion.

2. Board of Governors Report – Jennifer Martin

Martin: The Board of Governors met at the ARDEC facility last week for the October meeting. We received the Ag and Experiment Station report, as well as reports around the mental health initiative. All the campus reports were shared. Similar to the last Executive Committee meeting, mentioned culture and how, especially when there are compensation challenges, that culture becomes more important. Acknowledged the Board and their appreciation about culture being important and not only culture among faculty, but the recognition that administrative professional staff and classified personnel staff are vital parts of our campus community, and we cannot operate without them. We recognize the role these other employee groups play in shared governance, but also in our larger teams.

Martin: Reports from the finance committee and on the budget were received as well. We received an update on some audits as well as the campus budget reports. Explained the budget presentation was similar to what was seen at Faculty Council.

Martin: The leadership of Faculty Council, the Administrative Professional Council, and the Classified Personnel Council was able to have dinner and attend a volleyball game with the Board of Governors on Thursday, October 3rd. Indicated that due to traffic and time, there was little opportunity for interaction with the Board of Governors. Expressed hope to have more facilitated interaction when they come back to campus in May. Have invited a Board of Governors member to attend either the November or December Faculty Council meeting.

Martin: Something that happened last year was a change in the way state funds are allocated to CSU. In the past, those funds went to the campuses, and we sent money back to the System, which was out of compliance with state legislation. Now the System receives the money and allocates the money to the campuses. Asked whether a line-by-line budget expenses and changes over time for the System would be provided similar to the campus budget reports. Was told to look at previous years. We are going to be in a climate on campus where we need to be diligent about how we are expanding resources and being transparent. That transparency should not stop at the campus level and should exist at the System level.

Executive Committee members discussed the budget situation related to past administrations, the new buildings, and optimism around the transparency happening with regard to the budget.

F. Discussion Items

1. Incremental budget discussion – Vice President for University Operations Brendan Hanlon

Chair Smith invited Steve Shulman to speak to concerns expressed in an email to Executive Committee members. Shulman emphasized the work of the academic side of the University as opposed to Athletics and elaborated on email discussion.

An Executive Committee member noted that something that has significantly changed in the past ten (10) years is state appropriations, as well as the national context of higher education funding.

Vice President Brendan Hanlon: Discussed the incremental budget. Explained the process using enrollment and how the budget reallocations work to bring everything into alignment. Acknowledged Shulman's point that while there has been revenue growth and financial capacity, cuts have been moderated to calibrate expenditures over time.

Executive Committee members discussed the new construction projects with Vice President Hanlon, who explained how those various projects are being funded. An Executive Committee member asked Vice President Hanlon to clarify how much the current administration costs compared to the most recent administration, for both the President and the Provost offices. It was stated that this question had been asked of previous administrations.

An Executive Committee member moved to continue this discussion at a future Executive Committee meeting in Executive Session. The motion was seconded and approved by members.

Executive Committee members discussed funding and support for higher education, and the future for both.

2. Faculty Council Procedures Handbook Updates

Discussion item deferred to October 22nd Executive Committee meeting.

3. Executive Committee minutes & AI notetaking

Discussion item deferred to October 22nd Executive Committee meeting.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

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