

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, December 12, 2017
3:00 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Present: **Tim Gallagher**, Chair; **Sue Doe**, Vice Chair; **Rita Knoll**, Executive Assistant; **Scott Nissen**, Agriculture; **Stephen Hayne**, Business; Engineering; **Carole Makela**, Health and Human Sciences; **Steven Shulman**, Liberal Arts; **Nancy Hunter**, Libraries; **William Sanford**, Natural Resources; **George Barisas**, Natural Sciences; **Anne Avery**, CVMBS; **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President

Absent: **Steven Reising**, Engineering (excused); **Margarita Lenk**, BOG Faculty Representative (excused); **Mary Stromberger**, Immediate Past Chair (excused);

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Tim Gallagher, Chair

February 6, 2018 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – February 6, 2018 –Clark A207–4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – March 6, 2018 – Clark A207 – 4:00 p.m.
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website –

[\(http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/\)](http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. President – Tony Frank
2. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

3. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher
4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes –

F. ACTION ITEMS

- 1.

G. DISCUSSION

- 1.

December 12, 2017 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. November 28, 2017

Executive Committee unanimously approved placing the November 28, 2017 Executive meeting minutes on the Faculty Council website.

B. *Faculty Council Meeting Minutes*

1. December 5, 2017

EC approved unanimously placing the December 5, 2017 Faculty Council Meeting Minutes on the February 6, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: December 19, 2017 - 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration

Gallagher asked EC members if they wanted to meet next week as there were no upcoming action items and due to the approaching Christmas holiday.

Hunter moved (Hayne 2nd) that EC not convene on December 19, 2017.

Hunter's motion was approved.

B. *Action Items*

1. UCC Minutes – December 1, 2017

Makela noted a new undergraduate certificate in Spanish, otherwise routine items.

Hayne moved (Makela 2nd) to place the UCC meeting minutes on the February 6, 2018 FC meeting consent agenda.

Hayne's motion was approved.

2. Proposed revisions to the *General Catalog* – Retroactive Withdrawal - CoSS

Hayne moved (Makela 2nd) to approve placing the proposed revisions to the *General Catalog* – Retroactive Withdrawal on the February 6, 2018 FC meeting agenda.

Hayne's motion was approved.

3. Proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*– Section I.9 – Grades of Incomplete – CoSS

After some discussion amongst EC members, Makela pointed out that a *General Catalog* change is also needed. Discussion of this proposed revision to Section I.9 – Grades of Incomplete will continue at an EC meeting in January 2018.

Gallagher will consult with Karen Barrett, Chair, CoSS.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported the following:

Miranda spoke with Patrick Burns re: including Non-Tenure Track Faculty in the computer refresh subsidy. Deans are asked to assist.

Miranda's report was received.

3. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported the following:

Gallagher talked about the role of Executive Committee in Faculty Council processes. Gallagher gives a presentation

to the Chairs of Standing Committees and explains their role is to give recommendations and Faculty Council will vote them up or down. However, the Committee on Scholastic Standards has autonomous authority and their decisions on student requests for retroactive withdrawals and appeals of academic dismissal are final. Members of EC should ask, “what would FC want?” We are supposed to do this in a way that the only relevant question is: “is the proposed motion ready to sustain debate on the floor of Faculty Council?” It’s not our job to keep things off the agenda of Faculty Council because we don’t like a proposal. We are responsible to the full Faculty Council and don’t want to deprive the collective membership of FC to vote on something.

Barisas: What does it mean-- ready or not ready to sustain debate?

Gallagher provided the following examples: 1) Sometimes there are two points of a motion that are contradictory to each other. EC members can send the motion back to a committee to work on it; 2) A parallel change needs to be done in the *Manual* first before another change can be considered; 3) Something just wasn’t clear in the proposal and EC has to send it back to a committee for clarification. Therefore, in these three cases, the proposal would be considered not yet to be in good form or ready to sustain debate.

Barisas: Since everything we consider comes from our Standing Committees, they are our gatekeeper.

Gallagher has also been communicating with the leadership of CoRSAF, CoFG and CoNTTF. Jenny Morse, Chair, CoNTTF had a meeting with the chairs of CoFG and CoRSAF. Gallagher also attended this meeting and said there was good conversation and it went well.

Gallagher also met with Don Estep, Chair, CoFG, who had an idea and presented it to Morse.

Right now, there is one voting member amongst the NTTF, which is the Chair. The idea was that NTTF who are members of the CoNTTF, if a code change were passed, each of those people would be a voting member of FC if FC voted to approve this idea.

Gallagher has had similar conversations with Marie Legare and Richard Eykholt regarding their respective roles on CoRSAF. They stated that they are making progress as well with the CoNTTF proposal. Possible amendment to E2: there would be two different ways to hire NTTF—bring someone in under contract or bring someone in under continuous employment. As part of this, tenure-track faculty would be pre-tenure vs. tenured faculty, especially in order to avoid the use of the term “regular faculty.” Gallagher was pleased to learn that the conversations have been positive in tone and perhaps productive. Gallagher is not projecting that these proposals will prevail but only that “good blood” seems to be developing and conversation is ongoing and will continue over semester break. Early spring semester is objective rather than late spring semester.

If you recall, EC decided not to put a discussion item on the December FC agenda. CoRSAF has told Gallagher that if they continue to make the progress they’re currently making, then they may be ready in early spring to put out a discussion item in early spring. EC will decide whether we think the discussion is desirable. Gallagher reports he has been busy on this and met with Jenny Morse earlier today. He was pleased to be able to speak directly to all parties and get assurances that the message is consistently positive at this point.

Hunter: Don’s suggested idea is that the 10 Non-Tenure Track faculty who are the members on CoNTTF would be voting members on every issue? This would include voting on tenure cases, wouldn’t it? That’s part of the code.

Gallagher: If you’re a voting member of FC, then you vote on everything unless the proposal were to state otherwise. When Don Estep was coming up with this, he had a broader application of this logic. He said there’s no reason why this rule in regard to committees couldn’t be applied to all FC meetings so that all members of CoRSAF would become

voting members of FC. Gallagher found this an interesting idea but would this mean that these committee members would be substitute members vs. existing reps to FC, or would they enlarge the membership as a whole?

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk was not present at today's meeting.

4. Paula Mills, Provost's Council of Engagement – Council's mission and initiatives planned for academic year

Mills called Miranda as she had a family emergency so could not attend today's meeting.

Miranda reported the following on Mills' behalf:

Miranda reported that in the summer of 2016 conversations started with Lou Swanson about engagement. CSU applied for an award for engagement and won that year.

Engagement is significant involvement with stakeholders off campus that reaches two ways and involves co-creation of solutions to problems that exist in communities. This can occur in teaching, research, or service—so this is a way to think about work in any of these areas as opposed to a separate category of work. We decided to develop the Provost's Council for Engagement with a rep from each college. In the spring of 2017, we started writing down ideas for giving some awards, including one for mature engagement activities and another for something who is starting something. There is one group that is trying to tell the story about engagement. Another group is looking at incentives and awards for engagement work: Is there a way to more effectively encourage and reward engagement in the various areas? How to reward service is different than how to reward engagement. So, Paula was going to give a little presentation on the activities and futures of the Council.

Miranda's report was received.

Questions:

Gallagher: Should we invite Mills to give a report to Faculty Council?

Avery: Would the goal be to ask something of faculty?

Miranda: Not a request, but bringing the Faculty Council up to date.

Hayne: Given that there may be a discussion from CoSRAF regarding CoNTTF, Hayne recommended that we table Mills' presentation for now and see what is on the February agenda.

Gallagher will tell her the report will come later.

D. Discussion Items

1. Audio recording requests of Faculty Council meetings (Section C.2.1.10 and Faculty Council Operating Procedures)

Gallagher reported on a request from two Faculty Council members who would like to have full audio recordings at every FC meeting. Gallagher was asked to present this request to Executive Committee.

Augmentation and stifling of discussion could both be the result of audio recordings. Who would have access? Publish in the same location as the minutes? Why stop at audio?

Another point suggests that the meetings are already open. Indeterminate viewing and/or listening audience changes things. What would the cost be?

Would it be searchable? Yes, it can be run through text analytics with voice recognition.

If a compelling case can be made then we would declare this to be ready to sustain debate on the floor of FC.

We can choose to send an informal proposal like this to a committee, or they can lobby a committee themselves. However,

they need to know which way to go and how to create a path. If you wish to pursue this, here's what the process would be.

Gallagher will check with trusted sources to see how a proposal for this idea would be done—committee initiates or comes from EC? He will then contact Canetto and Meyer.

The interested parties might want to see if other universities do a recording of the FC meetings.

Makela points out that any amendment that's proposed must be sent to the Chair prior to the meeting and this was done so this amendment could be projected onto the screen.

Miranda states that the full FC must be involved in this decision about recordings.

Gallagher will have more information for EC at the January 16, 2018 meeting. We need more fact gathering and will decide if this goes onto the agenda of the FC meeting as a discussion item or as something else.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

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