

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
Tuesday, April 7, 2015– 4:00 p.m. – A203 Clark Building

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Mary Stromberger, Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Next Faculty Council Meeting – May 5, 2015 – A203 Clark Building – 4 p.m.

Stromberger announced that the next Faculty Council meeting would be held on May 5, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in Room A203 Clark Building.

- B. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – February 24, 2015 - Amended; March 10, 2015 – Amended, and March 24, 2015

Stromberger noted that the February 24, 2015; March 10 and 24, 2015 Executive Committee meeting minutes can be found at the following website.

<http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/files/ecminutes>

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

- A. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – March 3, 2015

By unanimous consent, the March 3, 2015 Faculty Council meeting minutes were approved.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. President – Tony Frank

President Frank reported that the budget cycle is finishing up and the budget report will be given to the Board of Governors soon. Overall the news about the budget is good. ~\$10.8 million will be coming to the university from the state (about double expected from early projections). We will drop the tuition rate increase from ~6% to ~5.5% for residence students. ~40 new tenure track lines are included for next year. Non-Tenure Track Faculty, safety initiatives, and Title 9 initiatives also have some pieces of the budget. Frank noted that much work stills need to be done. Tuition increases impact the middle-income students relatively more than the low or high income students. NTTF and TTF need more investment. This is the 16th budget Frank has been involved in and 7th as President.

Frank commented on the state of shared governance. Frank supports discussion, debate, and exchange of ideas and believes these topics are important to the running of the university. These topics are embedded in how we act and are structured. We cannot expect to agree on everything. Frank considers shared governance part of his core values. Outreach to colleges, open forums, meeting with Faculty Council officers are all things Frank is proud of. Whether all of these

things matters or not is secondary to meeting the expectations of the faculty (a core constituency). The Administration has been trying to do a better job of listening to Faculty concerns. One piece of evidence is conversation with employee groups on a proposed tiered zone parking plan, which has been scrapped due to concerns raised. Next year is the 100th anniversary of shared governance and Frank values that and wants to celebrate it.

Roger Culver (College of Natural Sciences) – stated that the administration should not always get its way. Culver added that he heard that there would be a resolution or statement on shared governance on the agenda, but didn't see it. Maybe Stromberger can comment on that. Frank replied that he does not think that the administration always gets it way. Frank added that Faculty Council has the prerogative to make statements (about shared governance, the stadium or other). Culver agreed that is Faculty Council's responsibility. Frank added that he supports Faculty Council's to debate issues around the administration and respects such outcomes.

Frank's report was received.

2. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported that Joe Parker was hired as the new athletic director. The Administration is still working on the Semester-at-Sea contract and it is getting closer to completion. Miranda noted that the Agriculture Innovation Summit occurred recently. Another issue of note is an increasing interest from CCHE in prior learning assessment credit (e.g., AP, military service) and getting the institutions in the state working together to recognize such credit. More will be coming on this topic.

Miranda detailed the incremental budget (i.e., change from last year) for education (~\$400 million) only. CSU has ~\$940 million total budget. Tuition and state appropriations are the possible increases to the budget. Tuition used to be ~1/3 of the budget; now tuition is about 3/4 of the budget. ~\$10 million additional funding from the state will be coming this year (total ~\$110 million). To put this amount in perspective, the lowest funding level from the state was ~\$85 million and the high was ~\$130 million in past years. ~\$21 million will come from tuition resulting from a rate increase (5.5% for in-state undergraduate students) and increase in student numbers. Budget modeling exercises have a one-year time lag on including changes in student numbers. However, the admissions office suggests we will have an increase in the number of students, which will show up in the budget for the following year.

Jason Ahola (College of Agricultural Sciences) asked what the rationale was for different rate increases for in-state and out-of-state students. Miranda replied that we compete against other in-state options in one market, and against out-of-state options in another market. The dollar amount of the increase, as well as the rate of increase, are both important to consider. Frank added that the University of Colorado had an in-state increase of ~2.9%, but they have a much

different profile in terms of the number of non-residents and how much they increased the rate of tuition increase on those students. CU's in-state rate is about 15% higher than CSU's.

Van Buren (Anthropology) asked what the relative impact of the F&A is on the budget. Miranda answered that F&A is about \$40 million. Half of that (\$20 million) is in this budget.

Bob Keller (Economics) asked what the desired out-of-state enrollment is. Miranda would like to see those numbers be ~30%. However, we have as a goal to continue to be the #1 place for Colorado residents. This implies that CSU will likely continue to grow. Projections suggest we could add ~8,000 students and we would still have a similar campus feel to what we have today. If we increase beyond 8,000 students, some compromises would need to happen (e.g., buildings on green space). Keller asked if the impact on the community is considered. Miranda replied yes, and on and off campus housing has been examined. Frank added that some city planning staff is on CSU planning committees.

Van Buren asked what the projection increase in tenure-track faculty lines would be in the future. Miranda replied that similar ratios of TTF, NTTF, and TAs would be kept.

Mingzhong Wu (Physics) asked if the F&A rate reflects the new rates. Miranda replied no, the new rate will be phased in over the coming years.

Nancy Hunter (Libraries) asked how the libraries, and other non-college support services, will grow. Miranda replied that about 1/3 of next year's budget will be devoted to non-academic areas. The Library is considered part of the direct academic support though; a significant budget increase for journal subscription maintenance is in the budget.

David Gilkey (CVMBS) asked if the number of TAs would increase with the new budget. Miranda replied that the number of TAs has rebounded in recent years.

Miranda then detailed expenses. About 1/2 of the increase in tuition dollars that are due to enrollment growth will go to colleges, 1/6 will go to the Provost's office to support interdisciplinary programs and 1/3 will go to the general fund. Part of the expenses will be devoted to student aid. GTA tuition support has increased. Salary for faculty and staff will increase by 2%. Promotion increases are factored in as well as a 1% increased contribution to the DCP retirement plan. Increased support for health care coverage for graduate students will happen. Other mandatory costs including heating, lighting for new buildings is factored into the budget. Differential tuition for graduate student programs is factored in. After those costs there was ~\$8 million left for discretionary spending, in addition to the enrollment growth dollars. Current planning suggests about 40 new faculty lines (\$6.5 million), academic program support (\$3.2 million), student program support (\$1.4 million), outreach (\$1.4 million), infrastructure and compliance (\$2.8 million). The budget will be finalized shortly.

Ross McConnell (Computer Science) asked for details about how the money is distributed to departments and whether departments decide how to spend it, including distribution of the 2% salary increase. Miranda replied that departments do control their budgets and department chairs decide how to distribute the salary increases.

Miranda's report was received.

3. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger

Stromberger provided an update on the proposed bullying policy. The policy is going under a major revision, such as reporting and references to the Faculty *Manual*.

Stromberger explained that a task force is being formed to investigate the faculty ombudsman position. Dan Bush is the chair of the task force and Stromberger will serve on it.

Stromberger has been meeting with college executive committees and FC reps, along with Frank and Miranda. They have met with all colleges now, except for Warner College of Natural Resources, and will also meet with the Libraries soon.

Stromberger (and others) attended the recent parking open forum. On Monday, Stromberger attended a meeting hosted by Martin Carcasson, Director of the Center for Public Deliberation, along with officers from the Administrative Profession Council, Classified Personnel Council, ASCSU, Amy Parsons, and Cara Neth. Carcasson presented a summary of the survey and forums, and recommendations. Some recommendations were that more study on the tiered model is needed. A map of the parking spot distribution is needed as some respondents may not have realized the distances between parking and campus buildings. Another hybrid model could be considered, in which parking spaces in a distant lot (by tennis courts) could be offered at a lower fee. The sliding scale model should be investigated and employees engaged. A punch card system could also be investigated to make parking easier. More engagement and feedback about extending parking enforcement beyond 4 p.m. was a recommendation. More feedback from students is also needed. An employment assistance fund is also being created. We need to see how this works. Stromberger thinks that Parsons will probably recommend to Frank to hold off on changes, except for a rate increase to cover bond payments, to better investigate these options and recommendations. Basically we need to buy some time. Frank added that the master long-term plan is to push parking to the fringes of campus and have a walking focus in the core. Frank agreed that many questions remain and more discussion is needed.

Stromberger explained that the Executive Committee has been discussing a statement of shared governance. The discussions have been difficult, and Stromberger has been moving cautiously. These discussions have helped identify strengths and weaknesses. Some strengths include many of our standing committees (e.g., Committee on Faculty Governance, UCC, Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty, and Committee on Teaching and Learning). Some weaknesses include

situations that have led some faculty to feel left out of decisions. This happens when certain types of decisions are made, and Faculty Council needs to work on identifying ways to engage faculty in these types of decisions. One type of decision where faculty can be excluded is decisions that need to be made quickly. How do we bring in faculty quickly and then communicate results back out? Confidentiality agreements/decisions are another class of decisions that can be difficult. How do we bring in faculty, but yet maintain the confidentiality? Another class of decision is in terms of getting faculty involved in long-term budget planning. We do have a committee on strategic and financial planning, but we may need to change that committee or add another committee to add this responsibility. Another class of decision is in terms of long-term vision for the university. How does faculty have a voice in such conversations? How does input from departments, etc, influence such decisions? Stromberger is committed to improving faculty input but needs help.

Stromberger's report was received.

4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Alexandra Bernasek

Bernasek noted that the next BOG meeting is in May. Rather than give a report on BOG activities, Bernasek read the following report:

Report of the Faculty Representative to the BOG from CSU to Faculty Council

Respectfully submitted by Alexandra Bernasek

Statement to Faculty Council – April 7, 2015

I do not have my usual report today. The BOG has not met since February. The next BOG meeting is at CSU on May 7-8, 2015. I do have something to report in my capacity as faculty representative to the BOG, however.

Over the last year a number of faculty members have approached Executive Committee members with concerns about administrative decisions being made without substantive faculty involvement. Their perception was that the administration has repeatedly not fulfilled its stated commitment to shared governance by not ensuring faculty involvement at the earliest stages in decision making processes, overturning faculty recommendations, and ignoring procedures set out in the *Faculty Manual*. Examples that were brought up include the contract with INTO, the decision to build an on-campus stadium, and the decisions to establish a teaching facility at Todos Santos and to join Unizin. They also include areas where the faculty has an especially important role to play in making recommendations to the administration: promotion and tenure decisions and grievances.

Over the last seven weeks the members of Executive Committee have attempted to write a statement expressing faculty concerns with the current state of shared governance at CSU to provide a basis for

discussion in Faculty Council. Due in large measure to structural problems with the way in which the Executive Committee is constituted, especially the inclusion of the Provost as a member, we have not been able craft a statement to bring to Faculty Council. Although we have come very close to agreement at various times we were not able to bring a statement forward to include on the agenda of today's Faculty Council meeting.

Last week Iuliana Oprea, the representative from the College of Natural Sciences, resigned from Executive Committee because she did not believe she could continue as an effective representative of faculty in her college. Today, four others of us do the same. I, Steve Reising, Mary Van Buren and Tim Gallagher all offer our resignations from Executive Committee today. We do not believe we can be effective representatives of the faculty, given the current organization of that Committee.

We believe that it is legitimate to discuss concerns that decision-making by the administration shows little evidence of respect for shared governance. We further believe that the process for dealing with that in Executive Committee is problematic. We would like to make it clear that this is not a personal criticism of Faculty Council leadership.

It is clear that our views on important issues are not in accord with those of some of our colleagues on Executive Committee. We hope that by stepping down from Executive Committee the impasse on that Committee can be broken. We also hope that Faculty Council continues to do the important work of representing the faculty and continues to push for an active faculty role on campus.

Doug Brobst (member of the Fort Collins community) asked if he would have time to ask questions. Time is available at the end of the meeting.

Ross McConnell (Computer Science) asked what would happen now, given the resignations. Bernasek replied that replacements would need to be found. McConnell asked what the administration's response is. Frank said he needed to have some time to digest what he just heard.

Mark Zabel (CVMBS) asked if Executive Committee still has a quorum? Stromberger replied yes. Stromberger thanked Bernasek and others for their service and engagement. Bob Keller added that this represents a major loss of talent.

A member of Faculty Council asked if there was conversation in Executive Committee about this. Stromberger replied that this was the first she had heard about the resignations of Bernasek, Gallagher, Reising, and Van Buren.

Reising added that he would still serve on standing committees.

Bernasek's report was received.

ALLISON LEVEL
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Libraries 2018

Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

KYLE SAUNDERS
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Liberal Arts 2018

CRAIG WEBB
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) CVMBS 2018

Committee on Libraries

LAURENCE JOHNSON
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Business 2018

MARTY GELFAND
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Natural Sciences 2018

NOREEN REIST
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) CVMBS 2018

Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Ag Sciences 2018

TIM AMIDON
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Liberal Arts 2018

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Natural Resources 2018

LINDA MEYER
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Libraries 2018

Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education

DONALD SAMELSON Business 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

RUSS ANTHONY CVMBS 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

Committee on Scholastic Standards

_____ Ag Sciences 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

_____ Business 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

_____ Engineering 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

SUE DOE Liberal Arts –Regular Faculty 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

SUELLEN MELZER-DRINNEN Ag Sciences 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

NATALIE BARNES CLA 2018

_____ Natural Resources 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Business 2018

GEORGE BARISAS Natural Sciences 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

Committee on Teaching and Learning

MATT HICKEY HHS 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

APARNA GOLLAP Liberal Arts 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

Committee on University Programs

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Ag Sciences 2018

THORSTEN RUDROFF HHS 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Business 2018

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance) Engineering 2018

RICHARD BESSON CVMBS 2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

Stromberger noted that there was no faculty on the ballot for Discipline Panel. Stromberger asked if there were any nominations from the floor.

Reising nominated (Hunter 2nd) Iuliana Oprea for the University Discipline Panel.

Oprea was unanimously elected.

5. Proposed revisions to the *Manual*, Section E.2.1.4, Special Appointments – CoNTTF

Jen Aberle, Chair of CoNTTF, moved that Faculty Council approve proposed revisions to the *Manual*, Section E.2.1.4, Special Appointments and explained the motion.

Proposed revision to Section E.2.1.4 Special Appointments of the *Manual* The Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty MOVES, THAT Section E.2.1.4 Special Appointments OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE REVISED AS FOLLOWS:

Please note the language: additions underlined, deletions ~~overseored~~.

E.2.1.4 Special Appointments (~~last revised August 2, 2013~~)

Special appointments may be either full-time or part-time. Part-time is defined as any fraction less than one hundred (100) percent of full-time. The distinguishing features of this type of appointment are:

a. Special appointments are "at will" and are subject to termination by either party at any time unless the faculty member has a multi-year contract for research or teaching, in which case the terms of the contract shall stipulate its ending date. Upon the expiration date of the contract, the multi-year contract may be renewed by written agreement of both parties. If it is not renewed, one of the following outcomes occurs: 1) For special appointment faculty who were originally at-will and entered into a multi-year contract, employment as a special appointment faculty member reverts to at-will. 2) For special appointment faculty who were originally hired with a multi-year contract, the appointment may be converted to an at-will appointment upon agreement of both parties. Otherwise, employment is terminated upon expiration date of the contract.

b. ~~Unless the faculty member has a multi-year contract,~~ A special appointment multi-year contract carries an ending date as specified in the contract. ~~Otherwise,~~ special appointments need not carry specified ending dates, but an ending date indicating the point in the future when the funding and/or appointment is expected to terminate should be included when known. In that situation, the inclusion of a specified ending date on an appointment form or other such

documentation ~~is for administrative convenience only and~~ does not create a minimum or fixed duration of appointment.

c. Faculty members on special appointment are not eligible for tenure (see Section E.10.4).

d. Faculty members on special appointments shall receive a salary and shall participate in annual reviews and the annual salary exercise in the same manner as faculty with senior teaching, regular full-time, and regular part-time appointments.

~~e.~~ The effort distributions of faculty members on special appointments shall be specified in the appointment letter. While the effort distribution in the case of special appointments may include all three (3) areas of teaching, research, and service, often it is focused in one (1) or two (2) areas, such as teaching, research, service, or extension.

f. Offer letters for special appointment faculty should be written following the format and content provided on the Provost's website.

eg. Multi-year contracts for research may be offered only for research performed for the University. The unit or department must document that the multi-year contract or extension is necessary for the hiring or retaining of the faculty member.

~~fh.~~ If a tenured faculty member changes positions to a special appointment involving a multi-year contract, he or she must relinquish tenure and retire from the University. A tenured faculty member who wishes to gain emeritus/emerita status, must apply prior to the time he or she relinquishes tenure and retires.

gi. Special appointment faculty are required to enroll in the retirement program and are eligible to participate in other benefits offered by the University as described in the *Administrative Professional Benefits and Privileges Handbook* and in Section F and G of the *Manual*. They are not eligible for sabbatical leave.

Rationale: Special appointment faculty members demonstrate the same commitment and enjoy the same benefits and privileges as regular appointment faculty members. Their inclusion in annual evaluations and the salary exercise is inconsistent based on department. Likewise, in spite of efforts on the part of central administration to provide guidance to department heads and deans regarding offer letters, there is widespread inconsistency across campus. Inclusion of this added content to the Manual ensures fair treatment regardless of department specific practices.

There was no discussion.

Aberle's motion was approved.

6. Proposed revisions to the *Manual*, Section E.6, General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty – CoNTTF

Jen Aberle moved that Faculty Council approve proposed revisions to the *Manual*, Section E.6, General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty Manual and explained the motion was about multi-year contracts.

Proposed revision to Section E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty of the *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*
The Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty MOVES, THAT Section E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE REVISED AS FOLLOWS:

Please note the language: additions underlined, deletions ~~overscored~~.

E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty (~~last revised May 9, 2014~~)

a. The conditions and expectations of every appointment shall be confirmed in writing. Any subsequent modifications of the appointment shall also be confirmed in writing after the faculty member and the administrator have mutually determined the new conditions. The faculty member shall receive a copy of these documents.

b. All faculty members who are on regular full-time or regular part-time appointments and who have not acquired tenure, shall be appointed for a period not exceeding one (1) year. All faculty members on special or temporary appointments shall be appointed "at will."

c. Faculty members on multi-year contracts shall be appointed for periods of one (1) to five (5) years for research and one (1) to three (3) years for teaching..

1. A multi-year contract does not carry any guarantee ~~or implication~~ that the contract will be renewed, even though the duties of the employee may have been discharged satisfactorily.

2. Renewal of a multi-year contract does not entitle the individual to further renewals, a tenure-track appointment, or to a decision concerning tenure.

3. Renewal or extension of multi-year contracts may be made at any time during or after the onset of the contract and shall meet the same conditions required for the initial contract as specified in Sections E.2.1.3 and E.2.1.4.

4. If the contract is not renewed and the individual was originally 'at-will' and entered into a multi-year contract, employment as a senior teaching or special appointment faculty reverts to 'at-will' as specified in Sections E.2.1.3 and E.2.1.4.

d. If the department head does not propose to reappoint a non-tenured faculty member holding a regular full-time or regular part-time appointment, the faculty member shall be informed in writing that the appointment will not be renewed. This must be done by March 1 during the first year of employment, by December 15 during the second year, and at least twelve (12) months before the expiration of the appointment in succeeding years.

e. A non-tenured faculty member holding a regular full-time, regular part-time, or multi-year contract may be disciplined or terminated for cause without following the procedures of Section E.15 for tenured faculty. Such actions may be grieved as described in Section K.

f. If a decision made at a higher administrative level will have the effect of altering or reversing a decision made at a departmental level regarding conditions of employment, including reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary, then, before this change can take effect, the department head must be notified in writing of both the proposed change and the reasons for this change, and he or she must be given the opportunity to submit a written reply.

Rationale:

Necessary amendment to the MANUAL in order to maintain consistency in policy and practice of use regarding multi-year contracts for non-tenure-track faculty. This section operationalizes the use of contracts as specified in Sections E.2.1.3 and E.2.1.4.

There was no discussion.

Aberle's motion was unanimously approved.

7. Proposed revisions to the *Manual*, Section E.2.1.5, Temporary Appointments – CoNTTF

Jen Aberle moved that Faculty Council approve the proposed revisions to the *Manual*, Section E.2.1.5, Temporary Appointments and explained the motion concerned retirement contributions from NTTF and further distinguished between temporary and special appointments.

Proposed revision to Section E.2.1.5 Temporary Appointments of the *Manual*

The Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty MOVES, THAT Section E.2.1.5 Temporary Appointments OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE REVISED AS FOLLOWS:

Please note the language: additions underlined, deletions ~~overseored~~.

E.2.1.5 Temporary Faculty Appointments (last revised ~~May 2, 2007~~)

Temporary faculty appointments may be either full-time or part-time and are distinguished from other types of appointments by the expectation that the appointment is for a specified period of time, at the end of which, it is anticipated that employment at the University ~~will~~ may not be renewed or that the member will transition to a different appointment type (see d. below) in the foreseeable future. Part-time is defined as any fraction less than one hundred (100) percent of full-time. ~~Further features of this type of appointment~~ Conditions applicable to temporary appointments are:

a. Temporary appointments are "at will" and are subject to termination by either party at any time. The process set forth in Section D.5.6 regarding the termination of "at will" appointments applies to temporary faculty appointments. Temporary appointments need not carry specified ending dates, but an ending date indicating the point in the future when the funding and/or appointment is expected to terminate should be included when known. The inclusion of a specified ending date on an appointment form or other such documentation ~~is for administrative convenience only and~~ does not create a minimum or fixed duration of appointment.

b. Temporary appointees are not eligible for tenure.

c. ~~Individuals receiving a temporary appointment for one (1) semester or less ordinarily are not enrolled in a retirement program (see~~ Temporary appointees are required to enroll in the retirement program and if half-time or greater are eligible to participate in other benefits offered by the University as described in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Benefits and Privileges Handbook* published annually by Human Resources and in Sections F and G of the *Manual*. Eligibility for sick leave is defined in Section F.3.2. Temporary appointees are eligible for faculty privileges ~~(see described in Sections G.1 – G.3).~~ Temporary appointees are not eligible for sabbatical leave (see Section F.3.4.1).

d. The University recognizes that the nature of a temporary appointment is incompatible with recurring consecutive appointments over a long period of time. Therefore, after the second consecutive semester for a 9-month assignment (excluding summer session) or after the first year for a 12-month assignment, the faculty member's appointment shall be required to convert to a special appointment and cannot be renewed as a temporary appointment.

Rationale:

E.2.1.5.c requires changes to correctly describe benefits eligibility as of Jan. 1, 2014 (following elimination of the 1-year waiting period) and to correct an error regarding retirement eligibility for temporary appointments. Temporary appointees have always been required to contribute to a retirement plan in lieu of Social Security.

E.2.1.5.d is being proposed to prevent the practice of using recurring temporary appointments when another appointment type should be used. Recurring temporary appointments create uncertainty and can be detrimental to members and departments. The fringe rate for a temporary appointment faculty member increases automatically to equal that of special and senior teaching appointment faculty after one year of employment.

There was no discussion.

Aberle's motion was unanimously approved.

DISCUSSION

1. Course Surveys
-Stephanie Clemons (Chair) and Dan Turk, Committee on Teaching and Learning

Clemons introduced other members on the Committee on Teaching and Learning and presented a slide presentation on potential changes to the course survey. The PowerPoint presentation will be posted on the Faculty Council web site.

The course survey should not be used as the only source of teaching effectiveness in evaluation. Turk detailed that some of the uses of the survey are not proper. The survey is expensive and has other issues (bias, reliability, validity, response rate). There are gender biases (women are often ranked lower than men) and student evaluation of the course is often correlated with the quality of the room. Many other issues exist. Many of the issues remain after the last revisions. Turk explained the agenda for the next year. Turk suggests that we use experts to redesign the survey, rather than CoTL and Faculty Council word-smith the current survey. We could continue to use the survey, revise the survey, or develop a new survey. We could contract a private company to revise the survey, or we could rely upon the expertise on campus. Turk suggested we involve the large group of stakeholders, experts on campus, much discussion, over the next year and

maybe roll out a new version of the course survey in Fall 2016. We might move to make the survey electronic. We would have to find funding for the developments.

Clemons asked for input on how to make the process open, transparent, and inclusive. Bernasek thought finding a way to engage the faculty outside of Faculty Council is needed. Gilkey thought the process is off track because the tool only measures a reaction. Turk explained that the survey would not be used to measure teaching effectiveness, but would provide feedback to improve teaching.

McConnell quoted from the *Manual* about the many criteria included in the evaluation of teaching. A single metric is not to be used. McConnell said he finds the student comments most useful and that the survey should not be used as only an assessment tool. Clemons said a task force is developing guidelines so that what is in the *Manual* is followed. Clemons thought these changes could influence departmental policies.

Margarita Lenk (Accounting) suggested that Faculty Council members need to discuss with their constituencies because the survey affects all students. Stu Cottrell (Human Dimensions of Natural Resources) detailed how some surveys like “rate your professor” are used in his department and that department heads have a lot of power in how surveys are used. Clemons suggested that changes can also occur through faculty voting on department codes.

Tim Gallagher (Past Chair) detailed that in his college (Business) faculty are required to submit responses from a single question from the current survey.

Carole Makela (UCC) said the issues are much bigger than the survey and that assessment of other aspects (e.g., portfolios) is needed to take away the sole reliance on the survey. Makela said what the survey is not to be used for needs to be communicated and made clear. Clemons agreed.

Van Buren asked if the survey should be non-quantitative – especially if comments are most useful. Clemons said the committee has not thought in that level of detail and that feedback is desired.

Bennet noted that one stakeholder group (students) desires a quantitative ranking to help them decide which course/section they want to take.

Troy Mumford (Management) suggested that fewer questions would be better, and that comments should occur before the ranking questions.

Cottrell thought that having students take many surveys all in the same week, at the end of the semester, is problematic, in that students won't want to spend a lot of time on a survey if they have other surveys to complete the same week.

Scott Ricketts (undergraduate student representative on CoTL) said that he takes the surveys seriously and they inform his decisions on which classes he takes. He thought that some of the questions are redundant or may be irrelevant. He thought a comment section is important. He raised a concern about the need to sign the survey for surveys to be taken seriously; some students fear retaliation for negative comments and that might hamper useful feedback. Student involvement is important.

Culver echoed that feedback through comments is essential. Culver does not support the survey being used as an evaluation tool. The survey is about the professor-student relationship. Stromberger added that faculty needs to be recognized for how they respond to and improve their courses based on student comments. Turk replied that the task force is thinking about a reflection piece to annual evaluations where such faculty responses could come out.

Barb Hooper (Occupational Therapy) thought that course surveys as a teaching tool should be examined as well since it helps students understand their role in learning.

Clemons requested feedback in the next couple weeks and expects to work over the summer; she would especially like to hear from experts that might be able to help. Contact Clemons or others on the committee and/or task force.

Stromberger adjourned the meeting at 6:12 p.m.

Doug Brobst, a member of the Fort Collins Community and a self-described outspoken opponent of the stadium, does not think the stadium is a done deal. He appealed for action by Faculty Council to register faculty displeasure with the stadium decision.

Mary Stromberger, Chair
Paul Doherty, Vice Chair
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

Agricultural Sciences

<u>Norman Dalsted</u>	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2016
Jack Whittier	Animal Sciences	2015
(Stephen Coleman substituting Jack Whittier)		
Deb Young	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management	2015
Bradley Goetz	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2016
Francesca Cotrufo	Soil and Crop Sciences	2017
(Allan Andales substituting Spring 2015)		
<u>Milt Thomas</u>	College-at-Large	2016
Kelly Curl	College-at-Large	2015
Jason Ahola	College-at-Large	2017

Health and Human Sciences

Stephanie Clemons	Design and Merchandising	2016
Tracy Nelson	Health and Exercise Science	2016
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2016
Lisa Daunhauer	Human Development and Family Studies	2015
Scott Glick	Construction Management	2014
Barb Hooper	Occupational Therapy	2017
<u>Bill Timpson</u>	School of Education	2015
Jennifer Portz	School of Social Work	2014

Business

Suzanne Lowensohn (Fall 2014);		
Margarita Lenk (Spring 2015-16)	Accounting	2016
<u>Stephen Hayne</u>	Computer Information Systems	2015
Patricia Ryan	Finance and Real Estate	2016
Troy Mumford	Management	2015
Kelly Martin (Spring);	Marketing	2015
Chris Blocker (Oct); Kathleen Kelly (Nov/Dec) (Fall)		

Engineering

<u>Russ Schumacher</u> (Excused)	Atmospheric Science	2015
Travis Bailey	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2016
Suren Chen	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2015
Steve Reising	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2016
<u>Azer Yalin</u>	Mechanical Engineering	2014
J. Rocky Luo	College-at-Large	2016
Jose Chavez	College-at-Large	2016

Liberal Arts

Mary Van Buren	Anthropology	2017
Eleanor Moseman	Art	2017
Elizabeth Williams	Communication Studies	2016
Robert Keller	Economics	2016
Sue Doe	English	2015
Ernesto Sagas	Ethnic Studies	2017
(Maricela DeMirjyn substituting for Ernesto Sagas)		
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	Foreign Languages and Literatures	2015
(Maite Correa substituting for Antonio Pedros-Gascon)		
Adrian Howkins	History	2017
Jangyul Kim	Journalism and Technical Communication	2017
Gary Moody	Music, Theater, and Dance	2016
Michael McCulloch	Philosophy	2015
Kyle Saunders	Political Science	2015
Ken Berry	Sociology	2016
Mohammed Hirchi	College-at-Large	2017
TBD	College-at-Large	2016
Eric Aoki	College-at-Large	2016

Natural Resources

Monique Rocca	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2017
Will Clements (replace Paul Doherty (through Spring 2015))	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2016
Yu Wei	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2015
Sven Egenhoff (Fall)	Geosciences	2015
William Sanford (Spring)		
Stuart Cottrell	HDNR in Warner College	2017

Natural Sciences

Tom Santangelo	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	2016
<u>David Steingraeber</u>	Biology	2015
<u>George Barisas</u>	Chemistry	2017
Ross McConnell	Computer Science	2016
Iuliana Oprea	Mathematics	2017
Mingzhong Wu	Physics	2015
Zinta Byrne	Psychology	2016
<u>Geof Givens</u>	Statistics	2016
<u>Ed DeLosh</u>	College-at-Large	2017
Christos Papadopoulos	College-at-Large	2016
Roger Culver	College-at-Large	2015
<u>Carl Patton</u>	College-at-Large	2015

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Elaine Carnevale	Biomedical Sciences	2016
<u>Howard Seim</u>	Clinical Sciences	2016
Lucas Argueso	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2017

<u>Alan Schenkel</u>	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2018
<u>Ryan Ferris</u>	College-at-Large	2017
<u>Gerald Callahan</u>	College-at-Large	2016
<u>Pete Hellyer</u>	College-at-Large	2016
David Gilkey	College-at-Large	2016
<u>E.J. Ehrhart</u>	College-at-Large	2016
DN Rao Veeramachaneni	College-at-Large	2016
<u>C. W. Miller</u> (Excused)	College-at-Large	2015
<u>Ronald B. Tjalkens</u>	College-at-Large	2015
University Libraries		
Nancy Hunter	Libraries	2017
Rachel Erb	At-Large	2016
Ex Officio Voting Members (*Indicates Elected Member of Faculty Council)		
Mary Stromberger	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	
Paul Doherty	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	
Alexandra Bernasek	BOG Representative	
Don Estep, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2016
Susan LaRue, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2016
Jerry Magloughlin, Chair	Committee on Libraries	2016
Jennifer Aberle , Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2016
Bill Hanneman, Chair*	Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty	2016
Mark Zabel, Chair	Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education	2016
Melinda Frye, Chair*	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2016
Jeff Willusz, Chair*	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2016
Stephanie Clemons , Chair*	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2016
Eric Prince, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2016
Carole Makela , Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2016

Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members

Anthony Frank

Rick Miranda

Brett Anderson

Mary Ontiveros

Lou Swanson

Robin Brown

Dan Bush

Patrick Burns

Jim Cooney

Tom Milligan

Alan Rudolph

Blanche M. Hughes

Kathleen Pickering

Amy Parsons

Craig Beyrouty

Jeff McCubbin

Ajay Menon

David McLean

Jodie Hanzlik

Ann Gill

Jan Nerger

Mark Stetter

John Hayes

Timothy Gallagher

Toni-Lee Viney

President

Provost/Executive Vice President

Vice President for Advancement

Vice President for Diversity

Vice Provost for Engagement/Director of Extension

Vice President for Enrollment and Access

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Vice President for Information Technology/Dean Libraries

Vice Provost for International Affairs

Vice President for Public Affairs

Vice President for Research

Vice President for Student Affairs

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs

Vice President for University Operations

Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences

Dean, College of Applied Human Sciences

Dean, College of Business

Dean, College of Engineering

Dean, Graduate School

Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Dean, College of Natural Sciences

Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources

Immediate Past Chair, Faculty Council

Chair, Administrative Professional Council