To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, please call, send a memorandum, or E-mail immediately to Rita Knoll, ext 1-5693.

NOTE: Final revisions are noted in the following manner: additions <u>underlined</u>; deletions ~~over scored~~.

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
October 3, 2017– 4:00 p.m. – A201 Clark

CALL TO ORDER

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.   Next Faculty Council Meeting – November 7, 2017 – A201 Clark – 4:00 p.m.

Gallagher announced that the next Faculty Council meeting would be held on November 7, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. in A201 Clark.

2.   Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website –
August 15, 2017; August 22, 2017
(http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

Gallagher announced that the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes are posted on the FC website.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1.   Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – September 5, 2017

By unanimous Faculty Council consent, the minutes of the September 5, 2017 Faculty Council meeting were approved. The minutes will be placed on the Faculty Council website.

Karen Barrett motioned to amend the minutes. Barrett stated her focus was really on resources given to departments rather than the college. The college didn't get the resources, even if there is a particular unit within the college that has that need.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): page 9 faculty not faculty council.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1.   Faculty Council Standing Committee Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance

Steve Reising, Co-Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance moved to elect the following faculty to three-year terms on Faculty Council Standing Committees, effective July 1, 2017.

COMMITTEE ON NON-TENURE FACULTY

		Term Expires
C.W. MILLER	CVMBS	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
MARY VAN BUREN	CLA	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

HONG MIAO	CoB	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

Gallagher asked if there were other additional nominations from the floor. Hearing none, Gallagher closed the nominations.

All faculty members were elected to a three-year term beginning July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2020.

2.   University Committee Elections

Steve Reising, Co-Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, moved that Faculty Council elect the following faculty to the University Committee – Grievance Panel:

BALLOT
University Committee Nominations
GRIEVANCE PANEL
3-year term
October 3, 2017

MICHAEL GROSS	CoB	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

Gallagher asked if there were any additional nominations from the floor. Hearing none, Gallagher closed the nominations.

Gross was elected to a three-year term beginning July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2020 on the Grievance Panel.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. President – Tony Frank

    Frank reported on the following:

    President Frank started by saying he believes that the issue of balancing free speech with an inclusive environment is the biggest challenge we are facing right now. Faculty Council Chair Gallagher has been very active in the free speech discussions. A recent study from the Brookings Institute shows that 30% of college age men believe that violence is an acceptable response to hateful speech. We need to make sure there is s no gap in our commitment to free speech and that we also embrace an inclusive campus. Free speech policies will be addressed at the Board of Governors meeting so that we anticipate challenges that might occur in the weeks and months to come.

    The State legislative front is fairly quiet at the moment. Higher education related legislation is likely to be proposed during the upcoming session and it will be monitored closely. But for the first time, the Colorado Futures Center sees a fairly stable next decade, which would mean modest growth in state revenue and so the on-going defunding of higher education seems to have slowed down.

    On the federal level, Secretary DeVoss rescinded the "Dear Colleague" letter related to title IX but we're not sure what this will mean. "Preponderance of evidence" standard may give way to a "clear and convincing evidence" standard, which wouldn't rise to the standard of "beyond a reasonable doubt" but has yet to be defined. The President's R&D budget hasn't gained much traction. This is good news for federal R&D budgets. The university will be monitoring the DACA issue very closely. Frank met with around 100 of these students who grew up without benefit of citizenship and then were offered the DACA opportunity, but now are seeing this shut off in a disruptive manner as the program terminates on March 1.

    On the University front, Frank is starting his 10th year shortly. Frank felt that 10 years is a good block of time to ask where have we made progress and where not. Enrollment is up, graduation rates are up, diversity up, 1st generation up, gaps around ethnicity have declined, student debt levels have gone up--with default rates among the lowest in the country. High employment, student satisfaction and alumni participation going up while national trends going down.

Philanthropy campaign is going well. Research funding also good. NIH and NSF potential declines could require action. Five or six counties that opted out of extension have opted back in. International enrollment has been high, although there are concerns about the future.

Areas where we struggle--control of benefits costs; salaries (especially in CLA); and enrollment growth met with increases in NTTF.

Questions:

Mary Meyer (Statistics): Meyer challenges the validity of the Brookings Institution survey. Meyer compared the funding for academic programs to athletic programs and shared her analysis of the funding levels.

Frank: Frank commented on the sources of data analyzed and said that regardless of that technical issue, he would phrase the problem differently--have we prioritized effectively? Are we prioritizing academics properly? Frank argued that academic budgets have grown in excess of enrollment plus inflation and that the amount that would be returned to academics if athletics were eliminated would not substantively change the academic budget situation.

Marie Legare (CVMBS): Legare argued that administrative costs and rise in administrator salaries seem excessive contrasted to working conditions in her college (CVMBS). She argued more funds should be put into aging academic facilities.

Frank: Frank responded that administrative salary expenditures are in line with other institutions and that increases have been related primarily to things like student advisors that are actually academically related. He agreed that work remains to be done of campus facilities.

Mary Meyer (Statistics): Meyer commented that $153M of funding in the education & general fund budget isn't going to the colleges and asked where this money is going?

Frank replied he wasn't able to address that in detail off the cuff and an answer would be provided.

Robert Keller (Economics): Keller questioned the way that athletic scholarship funding is accounted for.

Frank responded that the manner in which CSU accounts for the scholarships is routine and frequently audited.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Pedros-Gascon argued that parking rate increases have been driven up by the need for new parking facilities to support the new stadium.

Frank responded that nothing about the stadium construction was tied to the parking plan, which was already happening and stated that the idea that the stadium has driven the parking plan is incorrect.

Doug Cloud (English): Cloud asked where the revenue from parking on football weekends goes. Does athletics collect the revenue?

Frank: We collect the revenue but he did not know if a portion was returned to Parking Services.

Frank's report was received.

2.   Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Tomorrow at Council of Deans – discussion of several new degree proposals. The process starts with preparation of a preliminary proposal (more addressing the question of Should We Do It), followed by a comprehensive proposal (addressing the can we do it question). Five preliminary ones will be reviewed tomorrow (professional doctorate in systems engineering is one example) and four comprehensive proposals (Ph.D. in Watershed Science is one).

There has been an exciting development over the past year plus, which heated up this summer, and meetings over last month—the possibility of creating a medical school cohort in cooperation with Anschutz. They are interested in having a cohort of medical students from CU-Anschutz up here at CSU. Likely we would offer first- and second- year courses, with clinical rotations in 3rd and 4th year. Likely focused on rural medicine. We already have many cooperative relationships with them and this would enlarge that.

Student Success Initiative 2: Six teams are in the process of sending forward recommendations to increase retention and improve learning. SSI-1 primarily focused on expanding and training our advising corps. SSI-2 focuses more on student learning and the teaching and learning side, in addition to the advising side. So, this involves the faculty more directly, e.g., how to harness the course design to make progress on student success.

DACA students—roughly 189 such students. This is a population of students who are feeling uncertain about the future as their status will change in March unless Congress acts to prevent their DACA status from expiring. They are worried about finishing school, gaining employment, being safe. The sentiment around immigrants in this country is different than it was a year ago. They're worried about deportation. We hope that these things won't happen but students will need to commit to us in December for the spring semester and they are wondering if they should return. Several issues that we're working with them on: thinking about how to help them complete their degrees if they do leave; finding employment (which is a tough one for us if they're forbidden to work); reassuring them that we won't be involved with deportation or detainment though we won't stand in the way of a valid subpoena. One might be inclined to reach out to these students but Miranda cautions faculty on this. The students value their privacy and don't want to be identified; so if you happen to know some with DACA status, it may not be positive to specifically tell them that you know that they are DACA and that you is willing to help and be supportive. It can happen that the student will feel more vulnerable that their DACA status is known; this is private information that the students feel is dangerous to be widely shared.

Talking a lot about free speech on campus. First amendment and academic freedom discussions—different buckets of activity and one might be the issue of a controversial speaker. How might the campus react to this. Another situation might be the noose in the residence hall or a swastika drawn somewhere on campus. A third issue is a constellation of issues that Miranda refers to as the climate of the campus—both in a more general way and in more specific ways in terms of acts of micro-aggression. We are taking the incidents seriously that you hear about in rumors and these issues are not always brought out to the whole campus but are sometimes discussed in smaller groups. Central invites us to share concerns but also resist the judgment that if we're not hearing things that issues aren't being addressed.

Questions:

Matt Malcolm (Occupational Therapy): Regarding the medical school—is this more than a rumor, or is there a timeline?

Miranda: Yes. We are going to take the discussion out of 'executive session'. It's not like it has been a huge secret, but now you may see press releases. There are other external partners also interested. The fiscal implications, harnessing resources to fund this, what conversations are needed to be at the state level.

Miranda's report was received.

3.   Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported the following:

Has been meeting with the AP Council regarding the bullying policy. The AP Council will vote on this October 9. The expectation is that it will appear on the November agenda of FC. Gallagher believes that CoRSAF did a great job and the President's Cabinet has approved it, so what we'll be asked to do is put it into the *Manual,* but there will be more discussion of this in November.

Gallagher met with the APC Policy Committee and they were welcoming and had a good discussion with Gallagher. If you want to see what it looks like, go to the website of the Office of Policy and Compliance to read it.

Gallagher is also continuing his quest to attend at least one meeting this semester for all Standing Committees. Since the last Faculty Council meeting, he has visited CUP and UCC.

Gallagher's report was received.

4.   Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported the following:

There was no meeting, so I have no report. A report will be forthcoming in November.

5.   Diana Prieto and Teri Suhr presented a report on the medical plans.

PowerPoint presentation. President Frank asked HR to engage in a conversation with the whole campus on the medical benefits plan. A survey was distributed and Prieto reported the results. This was also shared with Cabinet.

In relation to the survey, 1,894 began the survey but not all completed it. This is 36% of benefits-eligible employees—faculty and administrative professional employees. 53% had dependents. Green plan represents majority participation.

Terri Suhr: Now we'd like to start looking at health care opportunities in 2018. 74% advise a dependent verification audit. 51% identified a plan they would suggest freezing. 63% of those recommending freezing recommend the freezing of the gold plan. In regards to education, the questions query what more could be done to support faculty more fully. 84% promote use of cost estimator tools. 76% promote use of lower cost alternatives. 82% support promotion and

use of price competitive pharmacies. 55% support modifying plans; 65% FITLIFE with $150 incentive. 35% support increasing the $500 deductible. $50 million investment in health plans by employees and the university. 52% support cost-competitive pharmacies, eliminating Walgreen's which is one of the most expensive. 53% support building a small network of providers who will accept a different rate.

Prieto: Premiums. Cabinet has asked HR to effectuate the action items in 2018-19.

Increase to premiums—a really high claims situation has not occurred in the first part of this year so just a 5% increase in premiums has been recommended.

In 2017, there was a change in the cost share with the university taking on more of the burden.

Ram Plan (high deductible) has become very popular in a short amount of time.

Other benefit plans for 2018 - No changes recommended for the dental plan, the vision plan, disability insurance, or life insurance.

2019 look ahead. Deeper dive to look at pharmacy and actuary.

People on plans are often found to be ineligible (i.e. grandchildren added as dependents). Dependent audit won't take place until January. Around end of October, beginning of November, will be enrollment, which will be announced.

Ram Plan and Green Plan are subsidizing the Gold Plan.

Prescription drugs—looking at the Ram Plan, continuing the $500 contribution. Preference for generic drugs but if brand name is needed, that's okay.

$150 FITLIFE incentive will continue.

Question to be considered moving forward: What would it look like to have another network embedded within our network. This is an idea that will be explored.

Cabinet has approved the action items here.

Questions:

Karen Barrett (HDFS): Question about the use of generics.

Steve Reising (CoE): Clarification questions: What are the reasons for dependent ineligibility? Small network idea would involve what?

Suhr explains the health care deployments where people on health plans are actually ineligible. Sometime people have added grandchildren to their plans and those children are not eligible.

Network within the network. POS plan includes U.S. and overseas and have contracted with providers. We wish for them to create a network within a smaller network that would agree to a lower reimbursement level in return for higher volume.

Michael Pante (Anthropology): Noted no clear relationship between choices and consequences. Felt uneducated while doing the survey. The high deductible plan—what are the long-term consequences? We are now avoiding going to the doctor but might this have negative long-term health implications?

Prieto: Preventive care is covered free of cost on all the plans so please take advantage of this benefit.

Suhr: It's not the cost of any individual visit but the cost over the course of the year. A very individual and personal decision that can be changed each year.

Lisa Langstraat (CLA): How does a 28% increase of health care costs over the last several years compare to other institutions?

Prieto: We compare favorably. We had no increases during the recession for 4 years.

Suhr: We compare every year to keep in place with other institutions.

Prieto and Suhr's report was received.

CONSENT AGENDA

1.   UCC Minutes – August 25, 2017; September 1, 8 and 15, 2017

Carole Makela, Chair, UCC moved that Faculty Council adopt the consent agenda.

The consent agenda was unanimously approved by Faculty Council.

ACTION ITEMS

1.   Proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* - Section E.9 Faculty Productivity - CoRSAF

>Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF moved that Faculty Council approve the proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* - Section E.9 Faculty Productivity
>
>The Committee on Responsibility and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following motion:
>
>MOVED, THAT SECTION E.9 OF THE *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:
>
>Deletions ~~Overscored~~   Additions Underlined

E. 9 Faculty Productivity (last revised February 14, 2014)

Decisions concerning tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases are linked to the faculty member's productivity in the three categories of teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and University and professional service. Merit salary increases may also take into consideration negative behaviors that fall outside of these three categories. However, for tenured faculty, this may occur only if these behaviors resulted in disciplinary action through the process in Section E.15. Each academic unit must establish expected levels of productivity for the unit in each of these areas. Productivity is assessed by relating the effort expended to the outcome, in terms of effectiveness, impact, and documentation of the activity. Effort distribution is the allocation of effort into particular areas of responsibilities. Workload describes the professional responsibilities of the faculty. The responsibilities of faculty members for each of these activities will vary, depending upon the mission and needs of the academic unit and the expertise and interests of the faculty. The University recognizes that a faculty member's activities may change over a career and is committed to the use of differentiated responsibilities for individual faculty. Hence, in the evaluation process, reasonable flexibility should be exercised, balancing, as the case requires, heavier responsibilities in one (1) area against lighter responsibilities in another.

Decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases must be consistent with, and based upon, the effort distribution established for each faculty member. The department code shall define the general expectations of effort distribution regarding teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service responsibilities in terms of the academic mission of the department. Where appropriate and consistent with the academic mission of the department, the department code should define outreach/engagement expectations and how those expectations are addressed in the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service effort distribution. During the probationary period and following tenure in the years leading to full professor, there may be a need for changes in the workload and effort distribution originally established at the time of hiring or at the time of tenure and promotion to associate professor. These changes shall be negotiated between the faculty member and the department head (E.9.1, E.9.2). In this event, since promotion and tenure decisions are linked to the faculty member's productivity in line with effort distribution and workload, the promotion and tenure committee or a subcommittee thereof shall provide input in writing to the department head regarding the extent to which these changes may affect progress toward tenure. Following any negotiated

changes, these changes and the committee's response, shall be clearly articulated in writing by the department head to the faculty member.

Rationale

Annual performance reviews are limited to the evaluation of faculty performance in the three categories of teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service and/or outreach. These reviews may document negative behavior, but the result of the review is based only on performance in the three categories mentioned above. On the other hand, Section E.9 states that merit salary increases are only "linked" to faculty productivity, so negative behavior can be a consideration in merit salary increases. On the other hand, Section E.15 states that tenured faculty can be disciplined only through the process in Section E.15. Thus, negative behavior should not be allowed to affect merit salary increases unless disciplinary action has been found to be appropriate via the process in Section E.15.

Faculty Council unanimously approved the proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* - Section E.9 Faculty Productivity

2. Proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – Section K Resolution of Disputes CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF moved that Faculty Council approve the proposed revisions to the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Section K Resolution of Disputes

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Would it be possible to divide the discussion in sections and do something like five sections at a time? Section K-5, K 6-9, K10-K 11?

Gallagher: Each section would then need to be voted on separately. Asks Richard Eykholt (serving as Parliamentarian).

Eykholt (UGO): Suggests that we move to informal discussion so that we can discuss this in sections.

Moved by Antonio Pedros-Gascon (2nd by Matt Hickey).

Discussion of whether to do this prompted by Gallagher.

Ross McConnell (Natural Sciences): Can I talk about Section 10 when we are discussing Section 11?

Nancy Hunter (Libraries): Do the APs need to see and approve this before we do?

Gallagher: They have already approved this.

Silvia Canetto (Psychology): How will we do this since it's nearly 6:00 p.m.?

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): I can discuss a few of the sections.

Gallagher: Vote on motion to go into informal discussion mode. Unanimously approved by Faculty Council.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Section K 1-5; K.3.3 section b, line 7. Appeal committee. The process involved in choosing the appeal committee seems problematic.

Eykholt (UGO): Only thing debatable is the proposed changed content. What you've referred to is not something being proposed.

Margarita Lenk (BOG rep): In my naïve reading, I thought there was a change. We increased the size of the Grievance panel to make it more equitable.

Eykholt (UGO): The panel is being increased so there are more people to choose from.

Ross McConnell (Computer Science): The assertion that there's nothing being changed is incorrect. K11.

Eykholt (UGO): Look at section K.10.2. The language was transported from another section, so this is not a change in content.

McConnell: Who serves on the Grievance Committee is administration driven. Three hearings last year 15 people available. 9 needed last year for three hearings. AAUP members not invited to the Grievance Committee. No one else from AAUP picked either.

Eykholt (UGO): Ross is confusing several things that I have told him. The Office of General Counsel said an elected person to the Grievance Committee could not be tenure-track. Ross was skipped due to the hearing being in regards to a full professor and it couldn't be heard by Ross, who is Associate Professor. Other situations required specialized knowledge. The finding was for the grievant, so the grievant was not harmed.

Gallagher: Do you want to vote on the substance of the proposal?

Silvia Canetto (Psychology): I motion to adjourn as we have lost so many faculty members.

Gallagher: We have lost our quorum so we must adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned. The proposed revisions to Section K Resolution of Disputes of the *Academic and Administrative Faculty Manual* will be placed as Unfinished Business on the November 7, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

3. Proposed revisions to Section E.12.1 Teaching and Advising of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*

The meeting was adjourned. The proposed revisions to Section E.12.1 Teaching and Advising of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* will be placed as Unfinished Business on the November 7, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Deletions ~~Overscored~~   Additions <u>Underlined</u>

E.12.1 Teaching and Advising *(~~last revised August 2, 2013~~)*

As part of its mission, the University is dedicated to undergraduate, graduate, professional, and continuing education locally, nationally, and internationally. Toward that end teachers engage learners, transfer knowledge, develop skills, create opportunities for learning, advise, and facilitate student<u>s'</u> <u>transfer of knowledge across contexts and their</u> academic and professional development.

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, classroom and/or laboratory instruction; individual tutoring; supervision and instruction of student researchers; clinical teaching; field work supervision and training; preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; service learning; outreach/engagement; and other activities that organize and disseminate knowledge. Faculty members' supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that do not confer any University credit also is considered teaching. Associated teaching activities include class preparation; grading; laboratory or equipment maintenance; preparation and funding of proposals to improve instruction; attendance at workshops on teaching improvement; and planning of curricula and courses of study; <u>and mentoring colleagues in any of these activities</u>. Outreach/engagement activities such as service learning, conducting workshops, seminars, and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes, may be integrated into teaching efforts. These outreach activities include teaching efforts of faculty members with Extension appointments.

Excellent teachers are characterized by their command of subject matter; logical organization and presentation of course material; <u>ability to help students recognize</u> ~~formation of inter~~relationship<u>s</u> among fields of knowledge; energy and enthusiasm; availability to help students outside of class; encouragement of curiosity, creativity, and critical thought; engagement of students in the learning

process; <u>understanding of how students learn and encouragement of effective learning strategies;</u> use of clear grading criteria; and respectful responses to student questions and ideas.

Departments shall foster a culture that values and recognizes excellent teaching, and encourages reflective self-assessment. To that end, departmental codes ~~should~~ <u>will</u>, within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching should be designed to highlight strengths, identify deficiencies, and improve teaching and learning.

Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching ~~shall~~ <u>must</u> involve <u>substantive review of</u> multiple sources of information such as course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; integration of service learning; ~~appropriate course surveys of teaching and/or~~ <u>summaries of how the instructor used information from student feedback to improve course design or instructional delivery, as well as any evidence of the outcomes of such improvements</u>; letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and evidence of the use of active and/or experiential learning, student learning achievement, professional development related to teaching and learning, and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Anonymous letters or comments shall not be used to evaluate teaching, except with the consent of the instructor or as authorized in a department's code. Evaluation of teaching ~~effectivemenss~~ <u>effectiveness</u> should take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., face-to-face and online settings; lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching assignments~~, in particular~~ <u>in the context of</u> the type and level of courses taught. The ~~Univeristy~~ <u>University</u> provides resources to support the evaluation of ~~teacing~~ <u>teaching</u> effectiveness, such as systems to create and assess teaching portfolios, access to exemplary teaching portfolios, and professional development programs focusing on teaching and learning.

Effective advising of students, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, is a vital part of the teaching/learning process. Advising activities include, but are not limited to, meeting with students to explain graduation requirements; giving academic advice; giving career advice or referring the student to the appropriate person for that advice; and supervision of or assistance with graduate student theses/dissertations/projects. Advising is characterized by being available to students, keeping appointments, providing accurate and appropriate advice, and providing knowledgeable guidance. Evaluation of advising effectiveness can be based upon signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty members, and professional peers. The faculty in each academic unit shall develop specific criteria and standards for evaluation and methods for evaluating teaching <u>and</u> advising effectiveness and shall evaluate advising as part of annual and periodic comprehensive reviews. These criteria, standards, and methods shall be incorporated into departmental codes.

Rationale:

The proposed changes to the language incorporate recommendations from the 2015 TILT/UDTS Task Force Report on Teaching and Learning and are consonant with proposed change to the language in the Faculty Manual in section I.8 that addresses student course evaluations. Providing coherent guidance in both I.8 and E.12.1 of the Faculty Manual on the appropriate use of student course surveys will help to ensure that information gathered through them will not constitute the sole or primary basis for judging teaching effectiveness. Making this change in policy will help lead departments to adopt evaluation strategies that can support fairer and more accurate evaluations than is possible through use of student course survey results alone.

4. Proposed revisions to Section I.8 Student Course Survey of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual –* CoTL

The meeting was adjourned. The proposed revisions to Section I.8 Student Course Survey of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* will be placed as Unfinished Business on the November 7, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

The Committee on Teaching and Learning submits the following motion:

MOVED, THAT SECTION I.8 OF THE *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~   Additions <u>Underlined</u>

I.8 Student Course Survey *~~(last revised June 21, 2011)~~*

The Student Course Survey is designed to provide feedback to course instructors and is to be used for course improvement. In addition, it is designed to provide information for students to make informed choices about courses. <u>If used for teaching mentoring or as part of the evaluation of teaching, the student course surveys must be used ONLY in conjunction with other sources of evidence (see section E.12.1). Thus, these surveys may not be used, in whole or in part, as the primary source of evidence for an instructor's teaching effectiveness and must be treated as one element of limited weight alongside a range of evaluative tools (as mentioned in E.12.1). The use of course feedback as a stand-alone tool is not a credible means of evaluating the quality of teaching.</u>

Each term, course instructors shall conduct a<u>t</u> <u>least one</u> student survey of all the courses they teach through a system administered by the University utilizing the standardized University-wide instrument. ~~At the end of each term, survey forms shall be digitized and responses shall be tabulated.~~ Summaries of responses for each course surveyed shall be posted at http://coursesurvey.colostate.edu. Access to the summaries shall be granted to anyone with a CSU eID. Access to digital copies of the survey forms shall be granted only to the course

instructor(s), to individuals explicitly granted access by the instructor(s), and to any other persons granted access by the department code. Costs for conducting and providing access to survey results shall be shared by the University and the Associated Students of Colorado State University (ASCSU). ASCSU's financial contribution shall not exceed half of the required financial resources to operate this program.

The Committee on Teaching and Learning is responsible for making recommendations regarding the survey instrument and its use. Changes to the Student Course Survey shall be approved by Faculty Council.

Rationale: The ASCSU Student Course Survey has been used for more than three decades, in various forms, as a source of information in annual evaluations of faculty as well as in tenure and promotion processes. A steady accumulation of research on the use of student course surveys indicates, however, that student responses to such surveys, in isolation, cannot substitute for the judgment of peers and the careful examination of course materials, classroom activities, and student learning outcomes. A recent review article by Stark & Freishtat (2014), for example, concluded that although students can offer valuable information about student experiences in a class, particularly in the areas of "*clarity, pace, legibility, audibility, and their own excitement (or boredom),*" they are poor judges of teaching effectiveness (p. 13). In their review, Stark and Freishtat also reported, *"Controlled, randomized experiments find that SET [student evaluations of teaching] ratings are negatively associated with direct measures of effectiveness. Importantly, SET seem to be influenced by the gender, ethnicity, and attractiveness of the instructor*" (p. 19).

In August 2013, the Faculty Council approved changes to section E.12.1 of the manual that direct departments to ensure that their codes, "within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness." Providing coherent guidance in both I.8 and E.12.1 of the Faculty Manual on the appropriate use of student course surveys will help to ensure that information gathered through them will not constitute the sole or primary basis for judging teaching effectiveness. Making this change in policy will help lead departments to adopt evaluation strategies that can support fairer and more accurate evaluations than is possible through use of student course survey results alone.

DISCUSSION

1.   None

        Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 6:22 p.m.

                                Tim Gallagher, Chair
                                Sue Doe, Vice Chair
                                Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
<u>UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING</u>

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2019
<u>Stephen Coleman</u>	Animal Sciences	2018
Scott Nissen	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management	2018
<u>Adam Heuberger</u>	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2019
<u>Thomas Borch</u>	Soil and Crop Sciences	2020
<u>Jane Choi</u>	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Merlyn Paulson</u>	College-at-Large	2020
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2019
Health and Human Sciences		
Anna Perry (excused)	Design and Merchandising	2019
Brian Tracy	Health and Exercise Science	2018
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2019
Karen Barrett	Human Development and Family Studies	2018
Bolivar Senior	Construction Management	2020
Matt Malcolm	Occupational Therapy	2020
Tom Chermak	School of Education	2018
Eunhee Choi	School of Social Work	2019
Business		
<u>Bill Rankin</u>	Accounting	2019
Stephen Hayne	Computer Information Systems	2018
Hong Miao	Finance and Real Estate	2019
(substituting for Tianyang Wang)		
Troy Mumford (excused)	Management	2018
Tuba Ustuner	Marketing	2018
Lisa Kutcher	College-at-Large	2019
<u>John Hoxmeier</u>	College-at-Large	2019
Engineering		
Russ Schumacher	Atmospheric Science	2018
<u>Travis Bailey</u>	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2019
Rebecca Atadero	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2018
Siddharth Suryanarayanan	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2019
<u>Shantanu Jathar</u>	Mechanical Engineering	2020
J. Rockey Luo	College-at-Large	2019
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Ted Watson</u>	College-at-Large	2018

Liberal Arts

Michael Pante	Anthropology	2020
<u>Marius Lehene</u>	Art (will serve term thru Fall '19)	2019
Julia Khrebtan-Horhager	Communication Studies	2019
Robert Keller	Economics	2020
Doug Cloud	English	2020
Albert Bimper	Ethnic Studies	2019
Peter Erickson	Languages, Literatures and Cultures	2018
(substituting for Jonathan Carylyon – Fall Sabbatical)		
Robert Gudmestad	History	2020
<u>Gayathri (Gaya) Sivakumar</u>	Journalism and Technical Communication	2020
<u>Wesley Ferreira</u>	Music, Theater, and Dance	2019
Moti Gorin (excused)	Philosophy	2019
<u>Kyle Saunders</u>	Political Science	2018
Tara Opsai	Sociology	2019
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2019
Steve Shulman	College-at-Large	2020
David Riep	College-at-Large	2018
Allison Prasch	College-at-Large	2020
Lisa Langstraat	College-at-Large	2020

Natural Resources

Mike Falkowski	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2020
(substituting for Monique Rocca)		
Julie Savidge (Fall 2016 and 2017;	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2018
Barry Noon (Spring 2017 and 2018)		
Wade Tinkham	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2020
(substituting for Chad Hoffman)		
<u>William Sanford</u>	Geosciences	2020
Tara Teel	HDNR in Warner College	2020

Natural Sciences

Jennifer Nyborg	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	2019
<u>Melinda Smith</u>	Biology	2018
George Barisas	Chemistry	2020
Ross McConnell	Computer Science	2019
Yongcheng Zhou	Mathematics	2020
TBD	Physics	2017
Silvia Canetto	Psychology	2019
Mary Meyer	Statistics	2019
Chuck Anderson	College-at-Large	2020
<u>Anton Betten</u>	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Janice Moore</u>	College-at-Large	2018
Brad Conner	College-at-Large	2018
Alan Van Orden	College-at-Large	2020

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

C.W. Miller	Biomedical Sciences	2019
Dean Hendrickson	Clinical Sciences	2019
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2020
Bradlee Borlee	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2018
(substituting for Alan Schenkel)		
Noreen Reist	College-at-Large	2020
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2020
William Black	College-at-Large	2020
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2019
Anne Avery	College-at-Large	2019
Tod Clapp	College-at-Large	2019
Dawn Duval	College-at-Large	2019
Patrick McCue	College-at-Large	2018
Stuart Tobet	College-at-Large	2018
DN Rao Veeramachaneni	College-at-Large	2018

University Libraries

Nancy Hunter	Libraries	2019
Michelle Wilde	At-Large	2019

Ex Officio **Voting Members**

Timothy Gallagher	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2018
Sue Doe	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2018
Margarita Lenk	BOG Faculty Representative	2018
Don Estep, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2019
Todd Donavan, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2017
Nancy Hunter, Chair	Committee on Libraries	2019
Jenny Morse, Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Marie Legare, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty	2018
Donald Samelson, Chair	Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education	2019
Karen Barrett, Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2019
Katharine Leigh, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2019
Matt Hickey, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2019
Mo Salman, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2018
Carole Makela, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2018

***Ex-Officio* Non-Voting Members**

Anthony Frank	President
Rick Miranda	Provost/Executive Vice President
Brett Anderson	Special Advisor to the President
Kim Tobin	Vice President for Advancement
Mary Ontiveros	Vice President for Diversity
Louis Swanson	Vice Provost for Engagement/Director of Extension
Robin Brown	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
Dan Bush	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Patrick Burns	Vice President for Information Technology/Dean Libraries
Jim Cooney	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Tom Milligan	Vice President for Public Affairs
Alan Rudolph	Vice President for Research
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Kelly Long	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
Lynn Johnson	Vice President for University Operations
Ajay Menon	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Jeff McCubbin	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
David McLean	Dean, College of Engineering
Jodie Hanzlik	Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Jan Nerger	Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Mark Stetter	Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
John Hayes	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Shannon Wagner	Chair, Administrative Professional Council