

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 underlined; deletions ~~over scored~~.

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
February 6, 2018 – 4:00 p.m. – A207 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 – March 6, 2018 – A207 Clark – 4:00 p.m.

Gallagher announced that the next Faculty Council meeting would be held on March 6, 2018 at 4:00 p.m. in A207 Clark.

2. Elections for Faculty Council Chair, Vice Chair, and Board of Governors Faculty Representative – March 6, 2018 – Committee on Faculty Governance. ***Nominations close February 20, 2018. Send nominations to Don Estep, Chair, CoFG***

Gallagher announced the upcoming Faculty Council officer elections. To be nominated, faculty must be current or past members of Faculty Council and have to be eligible to serve on Faculty Council. Gallagher had been asked if the three incumbent officers could run again and, yes, we are eligible. If you have any nominations, please contact Don Estep, Chair, CoFG, who oversees the election process.

3. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – November 28, 2017; December 12, 2017; January 16, 2018
(<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 – December 5, 2017

Correction noted: College of Health and Human ~~Services~~ Sciences

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. None.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. President – Tony Frank

No report given as President Frank was ill today. Executive Committee will try to get President Frank rescheduled for another Faculty Council meeting.

2. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

- President Frank asked Miranda to let faculty know that the nominations made by the Governor for Board of Governors were all approved. There are two returning Board of Governors members and one new member. All seems to be going smoothly. Board of Governors Meeting and Retreat starts tomorrow in Pueblo through Friday afternoon.
- DACA students. Government seems to be deadlocked on how to get past the March 5 date. There has been a judge that has put an injunction on this process, but we don't know what an appeal will lead to. Working with the 180+ DACA students here on campus. Being as supportive as legally allowed to be.
- Last Friday speaker from Turning Point USA visited the campus. Protesters and counter-protesters came out. We anticipated this and the event went off very calmly. The speaker did a respectable job. Outside of the student center there was more activity. CSU PD stepped in and prevented what could have escalated between two opposing groups. No injuries reported or arrests made. LSC staff was also at a heightened awareness, which helped as well.
- Miranda is a member of the Board of Semester at Sea, along with Lynn Johnson, representing CSU. Had a Board meeting on the ship in San Diego while docked. A few days later the ship was boarded by 550 undergraduate students, 30 staff and 30 faculty, and then sailed to Hawaii as the first leg of their voyage. Miranda stayed on the ship for the first week. Miranda went to orientations, and visited many classes (there are about 75 classes taught on the voyage). Miranda very pleased with the level of organization, the preparation that went into classes, and he recognized some of the

classes we teach on campus. Our faculty were just stellar. The ship was continuing on to Japan, then Vietnam, etc., going until April. Only other one university has more SAS students than us—University of Colorado.

- Budget. Not a lot of news regarding the budget. Expense budget for financial aid picked up a couple million dollars. More students taking advantage of guaranteed scholarships than originally estimated. The rest will hopefully stay the same.
- Miranda is presenting an open forum on the budget next Monday (February 12) in LSC – Room 308-310 at 1:00 p.m.
- Dependent Eligibility Audit by HR: Miranda hopes that all who need to do this have gotten the follow-up email explaining your options if you don't want to do a digital upload of your documents. We have had about 1/3 of faculty that have executed the audit.

Brad Conner (CNS At-Large): Appreciated the memo. Concerns about short time frame for folks to gather information. Some people are struggling to find the proper documents. March 7 is the deadline?

Miranda: HR will work with folks on the deadline. Your dependents will not be removed from the system automatically despite what some messaging indicates. Also, you can call the HR office if you have any questions.

Marie Legare: How big a problem is this in reality? Does HR consider this a huge problem?

Miranda: Audits have become a standard operating procedure for universities. CU did this about 7 years ago and found 1100 people who were on the books and drawing benefits who were ineligible. Of the first 1/3 who have submitted, about a dozen identified mistakes have been noted. Sometimes these are honest mistakes when people forget to do an update to their data. In an effort to keep costs down, most institutions do this periodically. All new employees are managed with more detail; we do this for all new employees.

Moti Gorin (Philosophy): 2-4% \$500,000 impact. Absolute numbers based on percent. How much would this cost each individual? How much per person is that impact?

Miranda: Our health benefits cost the institutions 10's of millions of dollars every year, so even at 1% is significant. This wasn't some kind of

life or death, have to do it, but the audit was overdue to be done. Communication could have been better. HR is trying to offer faculty some other options.

Tom Chermak (School of Education): Found it easy to do and you can redact any information that you don't want to share.

Michael Pante (Anthropology): Noted status of CSU in terms of rankings. It is difficult for students from other countries to get funding when the rankings fall.

Miranda: We certainly watch this. International ranking organizations are getting more sophisticated and are expanding the number of institutions being ranked. Another effect is that they change their criteria as well.

Michael Pante (Anthropology): Over the course of 5 years, CSU has dropped 200 spots.

Miranda: What's your perception? Do you perceive the quality of the university has fallen?

Michael Pante (Anthropology): I'm not saying we are doing anything wrong. Our metrics are pretty stable.

Miranda: What I am told is that the international market for prospective students is sensitive to rankings. They cannot easily perceive who we are and what we are all about.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): I sent the following questions to the Provost regarding follow-up on parking monies to athletics:

1. How much money gets collected annually (i.e. last three years) from parking fees for the days that we have any paid game or similar sports activity on campus (be it football, basketball, etc.)? (including old stadium)
2. Do any of the fees collected go back into the upkeep of the parking facilities?
3. How much does it cost to staff the lots on these days?
4. Who covers that staffing expense (University, Athletics, or Parking Services)?

Miranda: The revenues to the athletic department amounted to \$377K, mostly from football games, but also men's and women's basketball and volleyball. They typically do not share those with parking and transportation services. The time on the asphalt (impacts) are not significant. If there's a tournament, the athletic department pays a little. They do pay for the staffing that's required for having traffic control and money collection. It's a revenue generator for athletics. In addition to paying the staffing costs for the parking, they also contribute to the transit on football game days. In general, parking is not giving up revenue; parking is free on weekends anyway. Still charge for garages, which is the exception. On those 6 days of football games, monies are sent to the City of Fort Collins for MAX and funding the internal bus line (Around the Horn) during the game days too. The lots in the south campus, at the veterinary school, are also used. People can hop on the buses to come to the main campus.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): The data you summarized means that in total, and following the figures that you presented, Athletics has received as a net revenue from parking fees \$314,689 in 2017; \$272,569 in 2016; and 237,195 in 2015 (for Football, Men's Basketball, Women's Basketball and Volleyball games). In total, after paying staffing expenses (\$62,555 per year), Athletics has cashed out a net revenue of \$824,453 dollars over the last three years alone. In your email explanation, you indicated that, for those years, Athletics may have helped raise up to \$1500 that went to parking revenue (half of a maximum of \$3000 collected in other athletics activities, which though staffed by Parking Services, had to be shared with Athletics). As you know, Parking is a service that Colorado mandates to be self-supporting as a revenue unit. Can you explain why CSU is taking out revenue that belongs in a unit (due to the nature of the services that they have to provide), and instead of reinvesting it in funding that unit, the revenue is used to subsidize another completely different unit (Athletics)? On days like game day, it is one of the few occasion in which Parking Services has the capacity of produce revenue or be for profit.

These administrative decisions redirect the equivalent of a %4.06 of the annual budget of Parking (for fiscal year 2017 it was \$7,746,942) to Athletics, a unit who had an annual operating budget of \$34,559,680 for year 2016-2017. To Athletics, not receiving the parking revenue of those days would be the equivalent of %0.90 reallocation or reduction of their budget.

This situation means that Athletics has received for parking services 98.81% of the cash collected on games days, and Parking a total of 0.18%. Athletics does not contribute to maintain and improve parking. It is understandable that parking does not charge fees on some activities like

graduations, etc., since the nature of those activities is not for profit. That is not the situation here: Athletics is cashing out both by selling tickets for games (these activities are not pro bono, but for profit), as well as for parking; yet they do not contribute to upkeep the lots and parking they make use of.

Money collected on parking services should be directed to maintain and lower the expenses of parking, since it is a self-supporting unit, not to subsidize athletics. It is us (faculty, admins, students...), its year-long customers, who end up paying extra for having access to a service that the state mandates to be self-supporting. Yearlong customers are having to pay a surcharge to have access to parking, since money is being funneled out of the self-funded revenue stream.

Miranda: Athletics does use the parking assets we have but there are many, many other entities that use our parking assets. We don't charge for any parking on weekends for conferences and other activities in evenings and on weekends. This is not a decision that was made recently during Tony's administration. The ceding to Athletics of parking revenues has been part of the athletics budget for decades.

Dawn Duval (CVMBS At-Large): Points out that Tony indicated that the restriction of cars from the campus may have been a bit of an over-reaction and wonders if that might change. Students, in particular, are inconvenienced by not having cars to do errands and such over the period of restriction.

Miranda: We installed the re-park program for students and did a quota for others who might need to be on campus, giving a pass to those who really need to be on campus (i.e. housing and dining). Miranda was given the authority to give 500 additional passes to Academic Affairs, which were distributed through the Dean's offices. Did not use them all. They will be looking at the numbers next season, although probably won't be able to cancel the re-park program for students. Did we choose the right lots and get the timing right? We will be looking at all of that, but this year we were shooting in the dark. When the Mountain West scheduled evening games, it was a surprise, so things like this we will try to take into account in the future.

Dawn Duval (CVMBS At-Large): So from that perspective, what I find a little intriguing is why was the choice to put the students on the periphery, and transfer on foot to dormitories, rather than asking the football participants to park on the periphery and use a bus to come in for a 6-hour period of time.

Anne Avery (CVMBS At-Large): What if time could be adjusted to allow for faculty parking to continue for up to 2-3 hours before the football games start? Perhaps administration can change the rules?

Miranda: Homeland Security and others are involved with needing to clear things out early so it's not really possible to wait until the last few hours. We have to address public safety recommendations and add barricades to organize traffic flow. You would be surprised how much lead-time is required to stage an event for 30-40,000 people. Our ability to allow the campus to be free and open a couple hours before is probably not realistic.

Miranda's report was received.

3. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Gallagher is continuing the process of visiting all the Standing Committees and attending at least one meeting. The last meeting attended was with the Committee on Scholastic Standards. I would like to extend a thank you to CoSS as they do an outstanding job.

Gallagher also participates regularly on Committee on Inclusion and Diversity; Conflict of Interest Committee; Housing Task Force; Conflict Resolution Committee; Provost's Advisory Committee on Student Success. Plans to attend Committee of Libraries meeting and Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics meeting in March.

Gallagher has personally received many queries regarding the audit process, so Executive Committee met with Diana Prieto and Lynn Johnson regarding the Dependent Eligibility Audit. Executive Committee did a good job and shared all faculty concerns to Prieto and Johnson.

Gallagher had a phone meeting with President Frank yesterday regarding the Preface change that was unanimously approved at the May 2016 FC meeting. If there is any sort of motion on the floor of Faculty Council that affects Administrative Professionals (APs), the APs have to approve changes first before Faculty Council can approve.

Gallagher wanted to give a heads up that faculty will hear more about the Preface in the next few weeks.

When there are amendments (and amendments are proposed on FC), if you change one word on a motion that affects APs, we can pass the amendment but can't vote on the proposal until reviewed and voted on by

the Administrative Professional Council. This situation can stretch things out for months. President Frank has concerns about the unintended consequences and delays that might occur, so he is in conversation with the Administrative Professional Council. We are all rolling up our sleeves to figure out how to be inclusive of those in the APC but not bog down everything. There's also a veto potential here. Parliamentary procedure allows you to suspend the rules and put something on the agenda that's not there. If approved by a 2/3 vote, then it moves forward. In the event that this occurred, given the AP approval requirement, then on the FC floor a new motion would have to be ruled out of order under the current Manual Preface language. Gallagher wants everyone to be aware that the issues are considerable, we will hear more in the weeks to come, and that the good will Gallagher sees will take us to an amicable resolution.

Robert Keller (Economics): What if an amendment doesn't affect APs?

Gallagher: You could propose the amendment then.

Gallagher's report was received.

4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

BOG likes to hear stories on faculty, so please email Lenk and share your stories. The Board meets tomorrow (February 7-9, 2018) in Pueblo.

Lenk's report was received.

5. UGO Annual Report – Richard Eykholt

Annual Report of the University Grievance Officer for 2017

One duty of the UGO is to oversee the disciplinary process for tenured faculty, as described in Section E.15 of the Manual. During calendar year 2107, this process was initiated once in an attempt to terminate a tenured faculty member. The faculty member has agreed to resign and is currently working out the details with the Office of General Counsel.

Another duty of the UGO is to manage the grievance process, as described in Section K of the Manual. During calendar year 2017, the UGO dealt with 16 cases from 16 faculty members and 8 cases from 7 administrative professionals. The distribution of the 16 faculty members by college is as follows:

Agricultural Sciences	1
Business	4

Engineering	1
Health & Human Sci.	2
Liberal Arts	5
Natural Sciences	3

The distribution of the 7 administrative professionals is as follows:

Business	1
Engineering	1
International Programs	1
Natural Resources	1
Natural Sciences	1
TILT	1
Vice Pres. for Research	1

Before summarizing these cases, it is important to note that, if a case is ruled not to be grievable, then it cannot be pursued through the grievance process. However, the UGO can choose to hold off on making this determination in order to have discussions with the persons involved and even to allow the case to proceed to formal mediation. On the other hand, a case cannot proceed to a formal hearing unless it is ruled to be grievable.

For the 8 cases involving administrative professionals, two cases involved termination, one case involved a fear of termination, and one case involved a letter of expectations. Since administrative professionals are at-will employees, the first two cases were not grievable. For the third case, the employee decided not to pursue a grievance. The fourth case was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

Two of these cases involved claims of a hostile work environment. In each of these two cases, an OEO complaint was filed, and the Section K process is on hold until the OEO investigation is completed.

One of these cases involved the denial of a raise that was recommended by the supervisor. For this case, the conflict was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

For the remaining case, the employee contacted the UGO via email, but then decided that it was best not to pursue the issue through Section K, and the issue was never discussed with the UGO.

None of these 8 cases led to formal mediation or a formal hearing, although this may yet happen for the two cases that are still being investigated by OEO.

For the 16 faculty members, 11 were tenured faculty, 1 was a tenure-track faculty member, and 4 were special faculty.

For the 4 special faculty, one case involved the termination of a teaching contract, one case involved an annual evaluation, one case involved a letter of expectations, and one case involved allegations that the person's teaching was being micromanaged by the department chair. In the first case, an OEO complaint was filed claiming discrimination, and the Section K process is on hold until the OEO investigation is completed. In the second case, the conflict was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved. In each of the last two cases, the issue was ruled not to be grievable.

For the tenure-track faculty member, the case involved the denial of tenure. In this case, the faculty member accepted a faculty position at another institution and decided not to pursue a grievance.

For the 11 tenured faculty, four cases involved annual reviews, and one case involved a Phase I (five-year) review. For the first four cases, one was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved, one was ruled not to be grievable, and, in the other two cases, the faculty member decided not to pursue a grievance. The fifth case was ruled not to be grievable.

One of the cases involved a claim of retaliation by the supervisor, two of the cases involved claims of unfair treatment by the supervisor, and one of the cases involved a claim that a conflict between the faculty member and a staff member was not being dealt with by the supervisor. In each of these four cases, the faculty member decided not to pursue a grievance.

One of the cases involved the denial of travel funds, and one of the cases involved anonymous complaints against the faculty member. In the first case, the conflict was resolved, and the faculty member received the travel funds. In the other case, no action was taken against the faculty member, and the identity of the person making the complaints is not known by anyone, so there was nothing to grieve.

None of these 16 cases led to formal mediation or a formal hearing, but this may yet happen for the one case that is still being investigated by OEO.

Submitted by: Richard Eykholt,
University Grievance Officer

Gallagher: Richard Eykholt's report is published. Any questions for Richard?

Ross McConnell (Computer Science): In the faculty *Manual* it says the deliberations of the Grievance Committee are supposed to remain confidential. What is the role of legal counsel at grievance meetings?

Eykholt clarified the role of legal counsel.

Eykholt's report was received.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – December 1 and 8, 2017; January 19, 2018
2. Approval of Degree Candidates – Spring and Summer Semesters

SUBJECT: Approval of Spring and Summer Degree Candidates – May 2018 Commencement

Rick Miranda, Provost and Executive Vice President, MOVES THAT FACULTY COUNCIL APPROVE THE CANDIDATES WHO MEET THE DEGREE REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION AT THE CLOSE OF THE 2018 SPRING AND SUMMER SEMESTERS.

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

The consent agenda was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

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

Karen Barrett, Chair, CoSS, moved that Faculty Council approve the proposed revisions to the *General Catalog*– Retroactive Withdrawal.

Karen Barrett spoke to the proposed revisions. This is really trying to make something clearer that was not clear in the *General Catalog* before. Currently we do retroactive withdrawals, but there has been lack of respect with CSU Online through their audit procedure and they weren't sending them to us. We have had a meeting with them and now they understand the process. This will make it clearer in the *General Catalog* language.

Subject: General Catalog Section on Retroactive Withdrawal

The Committee on Scholastic Standards submits the following motion:

MOVED, THAT THE SECTION OF THE *GENERAL CATALOG REGARDING RETROACTIVE WITHDRAWAL*, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions Overscored Additions Underlined

Retroactive Withdrawal

A student seeking a degree at CSU, whether the degree requirements are fulfilled primarily online, primarily though resident instruction, or through any combination of online and resident instruction,

may request that all grades in an academic period (one or more semesters of continuous enrollment) be retroactively removed and be replaced by entries of "W" on his or her transcript. A retroactive withdrawal may be granted only when a student could neither function normally during the academic period nor be reasonably expected to complete a University Withdrawal due to extenuating circumstances such as an incident leading to major physical or mental trauma.

Failure to academically perform due to factors such as the following would not generally be sufficient to qualify a student for retroactive withdrawal:

Bad habits or poor judgment

Time management issues

Failed relationships/roommate problems

Failure to use University resources

Ignorance of University policies

A retroactive withdrawal is not allowed if a student has earned a degree from CSU and the semester in question was used to meet University, college, or departmental requirements for the degree. Generally, requests are not allowed after four years have elapsed since the end of the last semester covered by the request.

Students are allowed two requests for the same period, the second request requiring additional supportive documentation. If granted, assessment of tuition and fees remains unchanged. The student's academic record will remain unchanged if a request is denied.

An undergraduate or graduate student applying for a retroactive withdrawal must submit an online request with supportive, professional documentation from a credible source. The request will be forwarded to the Faculty Council Committee on Scholastic Standards. In order to start the process, students must meet with their department academic support coordinator or advisor or an advisor from the Collaborative for Student Achievement. To make an appointment at the Collaborative for Student Achievement, phone (970) 491-7095 or walk-in to their offices on the main floor of the stadium on campus.

Rationale

Policies need to be updated now that there are both undergraduate and graduate online degree and degree completion programs, and CSU Online is a larger player in the campus community. We want to ensure that there is consistency across online and RI programs.

In addition, more and more RI classes are having online options, raising the question of what to do if students are in a CSU degree (RI) program and are taking one or more courses through CSU Online. (Retros are for the entire semester, not just certain courses - CoSS has been reviewing these requests.) A similar issue arises if students are in a CSU Online degree program and taking one or more RI course.

Additionally, language has been changed to make it clearer that although the conditions listed are not sufficient to qualify the student for a retroactive withdrawal, they may contribute to conditions that are sufficient.

No discussion. Unanimously approved.

2. Biennial Reviews for Discontinuance and Continuance of Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (CIOSUs) - CUP

Mo Salman, Chair, CUP, moved that Faculty Council approve the Biennial Reviews for Discontinuance and Continuance of Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (CIOSUs).

Re: Biennial Reviews for Discontinuance and Continuance of Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (CIOSUs) for 2017 - Committee on University Programs Report

The Committee on University Programs is responsible for reviewing approximately 50 percent of all registered Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (CIOSUs) on a biennial basis. Each Administrative Director of each CIOSU selected for biennial review submits a brief biennial report of its activities and accomplishments. Copies of all the biennial reports are deposited in the Office of the Vice President for Research who is responsible for maintaining the updated list of all CIOSUs.

The Committee on University Programs reviewed 53 CIOSUs as part of the biennial oversight process for the academic year 2017.

The CUP recommendations to Faculty Council are to approve as follows:

Discontinued CIOSUs

The following 7 CIOSUs are reported discontinued and were removed from CIOSU listings:

CVMBS_APHI	Animal Population and Health Institute
COE_GEO	Graduate Geoenvironmental Room/Geotechnical Lab
CAS_RMCCB	Rocky Mountain Center for Crop Biosecurity

Provost_CASA	Center for Advising and Student Achievement Note: Name Changed to Collaborative for Student Achievement
CHHS_SPI	Scenario Planning Institute
CVMBS_CEM	Center for Environmental Medicine Note: Center suspended from list: Last report received 2012.
CVMBS_CSUEI	CSU Equine Institute Note: Center suspended from list: Directors do not wish to report.

The following 6 CIOUSs deferred reports to 2018 to accommodate reorganization/staffing plans:

CHHS_Aging	Center on Aging
CHHS_HABIC	Human Animal Bond in Colorado
CLA_CDRA	Center for Disaster Risk Analysis
COB_BBI	Beverage Business Institute
COB_CASE	Center for Advancement of Sustainable Enterprise
COB_CPDBR	Center for Professional Development and Business Research

Continuing CIOUSs

The following 40 CIOUSs have been reviewed through the biennial review process and are being recommended for continuance by the Committee on University Programs:

COISU	College of Agricultural Sciences
CAS_CMSQ	The Center for Meat Safety and Quality
CAS_IPM	Center for Sustainable Integrated Pest Management in Colorado
CAS_WCIRM	Western Center for Integrated Resource Management
	College of Business
COB_EREK	Everitt Real Estate Center

	College of Engineering
COE_CCC	Colorado Climate Center
COE_CMMS	Composite Materials, Manufacture & Structures
COE_CIRA	Cooperative institute for Research in the Atmosphere
COE_CHILL	CSU CHILL National Weather Radar Facility
COE_EUV	Center for Extreme Ultraviolet (EUV) Science and Technology
COE_HRL	Hydraulics Research Lab
COE_ISWR	International School of Water Resources
COE_UWC	Urban Water Center
	College of Health and Human Sciences
CHHS_AMOM	Avenir Museum of Design and Merchandising
CHHS_C-ALT	Center for the Analytics of Learning and Teaching
CHHS_CEP	Center for Educator Preparation
CHHS_CFCT	Center for Family and Couple Therapy
CHHS_CFSPFD	Center for Food Safety and the Prevention of Foodborne Disease
CHHS_HPCRL	Human Performance Clinical Research Lab
CHHS_HSAP	Human Service Assessment Project
CHHS_IBE	Institute for the Built Environment
	College of Liberal Arts
CLA_PLHC	Public Lands History Center
	College of Natural Sciences
CNS_CMP	Center for Meaning and Purpose
CNS_CMB	Cell and Molecular Biology Graduate Program
CNS_MSN	Materials Chemistry Program of Study

	College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
CVMBBS_Argus	Argus Institute
CVMBBS_CCAS	Center for Companion and Animal Studies
CVMBBS_CSUCCVR	Colorado State University Center for Cardiovascular Research
CVMBBS_ETRC	Equine Teaching and Research Center
CVMBBS_FACC	Flint Animal Cancer Center
CVMBBS_HICAHS	High Plains Intermountain Center for Agricultural Health and Safety
CVMBBS_MRL	Mycobacterium Research Laboratories
	Warner College of Natural Resources
WCNR_CCC	Center for Collaborative Conservation
WCNR_Westfire	Western Forest Fire Research Center
	Office of Engagement - Extension
VPE_REC	Rural Energy Center
	(Note: Moved from COE to oversight of Office of Engagement)
	Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President
Provost_CSAL	Center for the Study of Academic Labor
Provost_CNEE	Center for New Energy Economy
Provost_STEM	CSU STEM Center
Provost_SSS	Society of Senior Scholars
	Office of the VP for Research
OVPR_EECL	Engines and Energy Conversion Laboratory
	(Note: Moved from COE to oversight of OVPR)
	TILT
TILT_CM	CSU Center for Mindfulness

New CIOUSUs

The Committee on University Programs approved applications from the following CIOUSUs:

	College of Engineering
COE_CWC	Colorado Water Center at CSU
COE_OWSI	One Water Solutions Institute

No discussion. Unanimously approved.

DISCUSSION

1. Policies related to Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Gallagher provided a narrative of the history of the proposed policy changes relating to Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF). Jenny Morse, Chair, CoNTTF has been working on this for several years; CoRSAF needed to look at Section E and Don Estep is in charge of looking at Section C of the *Manual*, which requires a 2/3 vote to be approved. There are two draft proposals in today's agenda--one from CoRSAF and one from CoFG. They want to know what you like and what your concerns are. What tends to happen when there's something large and complex such as this topic is that it's hard to understand the nuances, compromises, etc., without discussion. So we are hoping that those who like what they see in the agenda packet will express their support and that those who have concerns will have the chance to express their concerns here today so that CoNTTF, CoRSAF, and CoFG can take back what they hear from you today. This process we hope will be a good one. Gallagher turned the discussion over to Marie Legare (CoRSAF), Don Estep (CoFG), and Jenny Morse (CoNTTF).

Legare thanked her committee and named the members. Explains that CoRSAF invited CoNTTF to join the meetings and they sent various people. Started with the facts and figures showing the scope of the issue. NTTF issue is huge. From 2007-2016, there has been a 12% increase of TTF and a 40% increase of NTTF. 44% of undergrad credit hours are taught by NTTF. Most of these faculty do not have a contract.

Legare: We wanted to accord NTTF with safeguards with consistent policies in regard to selection, evaluation, and promotion. Some things are already in the *Manual*. Legare explains appointment types proposed. Professor of Practice was deemed a problem due to the way the term is used differently in different units

The issue is really one of ranks not appointment types so the next step will be in regard to rank.

Appointment types proposed: tenured, tenure track, contract, adjunct, transitional. We believe it achieves modernization of tenure track. Senior Teaching Appointment (STA) is more of a rank, not an appointment. So, this would transition to Senior Instructor.

Estep: Since my wife just got STA, where does this fall into this?

Legare: Feels it's more of a rank. We felt that instructor was more inclusive. Instructor, senior instructor, master instructor.

David Greene (Occupational Therapy): Concerned about what happens if STA becomes senior instructor. Aren't contracts decided at the departmental level? So if central administration doesn't fund and the department can't fund, then does the person revert to being an adjunct and have a four-semester limit?

Legare: People should generally have the stability of a contract. The feeling of the committee is that if you don't have a contract, then you shouldn't be in that situation forever. The next conversation will be at the administrative level. If NTTF need to be stabilized then central admin needs to pony up the money?

David Greene (Occupational Therapy): But will they do that?

Richard Eykholt (UGO): When CoNTTF has gone to Central Admin, what CoNTTF is being told is that the obstacle is Faculty Council. So now the burden is back on them if we move ahead with this.

David Greene (Occupational Therapy): I am not blaming the administration, but we have a very big problem with senior teaching appointments.

Legare: We could put continuous back in.

Ruth Hufbauer (Agricultural Sciences At-Large): We can predict very reliably what we're going to be teaching.

Legare: Some department chairs say you can't predict but others say you can.

Antonio Pedros Gascon (CLA At-Large): I like the proposal. Master Instructor needs to be defined. Special Assistant Professors are not named here. What happens with them? Page 57. Also, if due to financial constraints people go from full or half appointment to less than that, they should not lose rank. That should be explained. Food for thought: who pays for the changes? Beautiful to talk to about professional development. Will the Provost provide the funding for this? Will the university provide the funding for raises and development? How will this work if units are asked to share the cost in a context where there have been few if any departmental budget raises in recent years?

Brad Conner (CNS At-Large): Why are there six different ranks available for instructor? Instructor, senior instructor, master instructor, etc. Why not call them assistant, associate, or full?

Legare: One of the reasons is that a senior teaching appointment is prestigious and we want to keep it that way. Can be hired as an instructor, say post doc, but appointed as an instructor first. There is also an additional rank from the College of Business.

Margarita Lenk (BOG Faculty Representative): Is another rank needed in the College of Business?

Steve Hayne (CoB): Clinical professor is needed.

Estep: My wife is both an assistant professor and an STA. Sees this as an honor, not a rank. What happens to her honorary STA? Regardless of ranks, there needs to be very clear criteria for how someone advances because it's not at this time.

Legare: Ranks are not currently defined in the *Manual*.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): Promotion criteria are laid out in department codes for TTF and often require international research reputation. Some kind of ladder needs to be made available for those to whom this would not apply.

Morse: We are trying to create a career path that opens up to all NTTF.

Brad Conner (CNS At-Large): My concern is that this further complicates rather than simplifying the issue. More ranks may provide more loopholes and complications that may be problematic.

Karen Barrett (HDFS/CHSS): We do promote people who are NTTF line. Responsibilities change from year to year or semester to semester and are not all teaching, service, and depends on grant activities and needs. But, a contract might specify work that they might not be doing in the next iteration. Contracts may box people in.

Legare: Depends on how the contract is written. If there are changes to be made, they can be negotiated with the department head.

Pete Taylor (Chair, Sociology): Have a lot of support for this initiative. I feel one category of appointment that has not been talked about that we would like you to talk about is the advanced Ph.D. Graduate student who is teaching. Stand-alone teaching is a crucial form of support to the graduate student and an opportunity for learning. It's important to finish the degree in a timely manner. The relationship to the department is different.

Legare: I have heard about the Graduate students. So, really, you have student appointments, but I suppose you could use the same terminology. We are defining faculty appointments.

Pete Taylor (Chair, Sociology): They are stand-alone teaching. Sounds like adjuncts for four semesters.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): If they are not more than half-time, then they could be adjuncts for as long as you like.

Joe Cannon (CoB At-Large): One system doesn't describe the variety of situations. The language imposes constraints that don't work for every location. Labeling is the issue.

Legare: Some places offer up to 16 different ranks, which seems excessive.

Matt Malcolm (Occupational Therapy): I appreciate all of your work. Do you have an idea, goal, or hope of when this will be ready for a vote?

Legare: We meet again this week and next and my hope is fine tuning and working simultaneously on ranks and submit them both soon. Maybe next month (March).

George Barisas (CNS): I don't have any answer to this, but I do see long- or short-term that we have three separate issues here: 1) Rank (reflects your stature, independence and quality); 2) the nature of your responsibilities (research, clinical, academic); and, 3) the money related areas (how are you paid, for how long?) It would be nice to have rank that is possible from one kind of responsibility to another but aim for transparency. Rank clarified from appointment type.

Gallagher has talked to people on these committees for a long time and has been a part of these conversations for a long time. Some things work differently in different colleges or departments. People can choose what is appropriate for their areas. May not be the same set of words for everyone.

Alex Bernasek (CLA): I would like to say this is a very big issue. I appreciate the progress you have made and feel this proposal is in a much better place. Please keep moving forward with this. Echoed concern regarding central admin funding. We have a lot of diversity in our college, but also maintain flexibility. I would just like to say we are very supportive of this and looking forward to you talking to us about these issues.

Dan Bush (Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs): Appointment types is the place to focus on pathways with a lot of titles available. If we have a whole lot of titles, then time in rank, promotion criteria, will still be possible. Focus on appointment types.

Legare: We are not trying to usurp department codes. Must include: instructors, clinical faculty, research faculty—not just teaching. Have outlined in their code structure.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Prefers this version. Urges consideration of the representation issues.

Brad Conner (CNS At-Large): Seems like there's a big shift that the contract must be at least two years. Why not one year? How will that work in department codes?

Legare: One of the reasons is we would like to have faculty given more notice before a contract expires. If two years, then at least some notification if the NTTF member will not be renewed. Will ask colleges to come back with ranks that work for them. I need that information.

Morse: Ranks is different from titles.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): I want to clarify something, this proposal hasn't removed any existing ranks. It doesn't take away any internal terminologies that college codes have. Would prefer to not have all the internal terms in the *Manual*. If the colleges and departments have figured out how to use these terms, then let them use them.

Gallagher invited Don Estep, Chair, CoFG to come forward with the CoFG proposal.

Estep: The CoFG is responsible for the Code and has two purposes--Rules for governing and rules to negotiate shared governance with administration. The committee has long been talking about these issues. Here are the two things we have struggled with and what we have done and then the draft motion. The two responsibilities: 1) the preservation of tenure; 2) Representation and participation. We ensure through Section C that people are governed and have input into the process. With that being said, here are some things we have done for some time. Estep takes faculty through the history, using an overhead document. Explains that the current language in Section C holds that Standing Committee Chairs have a right to vote on FC. Additionally, the Chair of CoNTTF has been made a voting member of several major committees such as the CoTL and CoSFP. Reminds that all motions relate back to the protection of tenure. The new proposal reflects CoNTTF's suggestion that all members of that committee become voting members of the Faculty Council in order to represent the diverse needs of the various colleges. The CoFG is supportive of this opportunity.

Nancy Hunter (Libraries): Representing Libraries for Faculty Council, it is difficult to chair her committee given that it also means that she must serve on FC. Is this too much to ask of the same group?

Estep: I only come if I have to speak to the motion usually. Realistically, they won't attend unless there is a motion presented. I am very sensitive to this. Jenny could appoint someone else to stand in and could make that language for any committee. Spreading the workload is important.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): It helps to have figures. How many new reps to FC are we talking about?

Estep: Eight more. Estep would ask every committee if they would want this.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Eight would make the total body 90-some?

Estep: Yes.

Legare: Stated that NTTF are deserving and this is overdue.

Margarita Lenk (BOG Faculty Representative): Thank you to the committees for your work as this is much clearer. Wondering about unintended consequences. Some departments are worried about declining enrollments, so perhaps Lynn Johnson's office could offer a projection of the effect of declining enrollment on this proposal.

Legare: Will be some stipulation as far as "if funding is not available". There would be language in the contract about this.

Margarita Lenk (BOG Faculty Representative): Loophole in contract; or first 5 years to have a promise from upper administration.

Estep: As a new department chair, says he can say that we don't go down a lot inside of a semester. He is personally concerned about the language of financial exigency. There should be a system so that there's a process and not a way to sidestep correct ways of not renewing someone.

Anne Avery (CVMBS At-Large): I was specifically asked about the language in the contract that currently indicates that dependent on funding, then how would this be changed in the new contractual language? Need to take into consideration.

Legare: All I can say, more information is to come. Redraft contracts--what would they say? I cannot predict that. Usually the end date is whenever the money ends.

Joseph DiVerdi (CNS): The proposals are not for purposes of turning every NTTF onto a contract tomorrow. The idea is that some will, and that we will attempt to get as many on contract as possible. To allow for flexibility while striving for some degree of stability. We can do some degree of prediction for instance that the physical chemistry lab will continue.

Morse: Around 40% of NTTF have been here longer than 5 years +. The contract then becomes important because NTTF are at-will employees and they have access to academic freedom. Flexibility is something we have accounted for.

Mary Van Buren (CLA): I have learned that one of the big problems is the lack of consistency--means that anybody can do anything. While there's a need for departmental flexibility, that need must be balanced against the need for some degree of consistency.

Legare: My college has these problems, but I always have an annual evaluation; 40% of faculty don't even get an annual evaluation.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): They have not been entitled to a fair and balanced system. No real security has been provided and we need to balance the situation. This must be acknowledged.

Gallagher thanked faculty for the thoughtful discussion.

Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

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

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2019
Stephen Coleman	Animal Sciences	2018
<u>Scott Nissen</u>	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management	2018
<u>Adam Heuberger</u>	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2019
Thomas Borch	Soil and Crop Sciences	2020
<u>Jane Choi</u>	College-at-Large	2019
Ruth Hufbauer	College-at-Large	2020
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2019
Health and Human Sciences		
Anna Perry	Design and Merchandising	2019
Brian Tracy	Health and Exercise Science	2018
<u>David Sampson</u> (excused)	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
Tianyang Wang	Finance and Real Estate	2019
Troy Mumford	Management	2018
<u>Tuba Ustuner</u>	Marketing	2018
Joe Cannon	College-at-Large	2019
John Hoxmeier	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
Shantanu Jathar	Mechanical Engineering	2020
J. Rockey Luo	College-at-Large	2019
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Ted Watson</u>	College-at-Large	2018

February 6, 2018

Liberal Arts

Michael Pante	Anthropology	2020
Nick Marx (substituting for Marius Lehene)	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 (substituting for Jonathan Carylyon – Fall Sabbatical)	Languages, Literatures and Cultures	2018
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	Philosophy	2019
Kyle Saunders	Political Science	2018
<u>Tara Opsai</u>	Sociology	2019
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2019
Stephen Mumme (substituting for Steve Shuman – Spring '18 sabbatical)	College-at-Large	2020
David Riep	College-at-Large	2018
<u>Allison Prasch</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2020
Lisa Langstraat	College-at-Large	2020

Natural Resources

Monique Rocca	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2020
Julie Savidge (Fall 2016 and 2017; <u>Barry Noon</u> (Spring 2017 and 2018)	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2018
Chad Hoffman	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2020
Mike Ronayne (substituting for Bill Sanford – Spring '18 sabbatical)	Geosciences	2020
Alan Bright (substituting for Tara Teel)	HDNR in Warner College	2020

Natural Sciences

<u>Jennifer Nyborg</u>	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
Alan Schenkel	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2018
<u>Noreen Reist</u>	College-at-Large	2020
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2020
<u>William Black</u>	College-at-Large	2020
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2019
Anne Avery	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Tod Clapp</u>	College-at-Large	2019
Dawn Duval	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Patrick McCue</u>	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
<i>Ex Officio Voting Members</i>		
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 Donovan, 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
Leslie Taylor	Interim 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