

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday April 24, 2018
3:00 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Present: **Tim Gallagher**, Chair; **Rita Knoll**, Executive Assistant; **Mary Stromberger**, Immediate Past Chair; **Stephan Kroll**, Agricultural Sciences; **Stephen Hayne**, Business; **Steven Reising**, Engineering; **Carole Makela**, Health and Human Sciences; **Stephen Mumme**, Liberal Arts; **Nancy Hunter**, Libraries; **Anne Avery**, CVMBS; **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: **Matt Hickey**, Chair, CoTL

Absent: **Sue Doe**, Vice Chair (excused); **Monique Rocca**, Natural Resources (excused); **George Barisas**, Natural Sciences (excused); **Margarita Lenk**, BOG Faculty Representative (excused)

Tim Gallagher, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

MAY 1, 2018 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – May 1, 2018 – BSB- Room 131
4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – September 4, 2018 –
New location: **Plant Sciences building** – Room C101 –
4:00 p.m.
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC
website: March 20 and 27, 2018; April 10, 2018
(<http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/>)
3. Presentation of Graduate Student Council Faculty Mentor
Awards
-Lindsay Lammers, Graduate Student Council President
4. Presentation of Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg
Distinguished Service Award

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes -

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Elections – University Benefits Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance

D. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda
2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher
3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – March 30, 2018; April 6, 2018

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – Scholastic Standards – CoSRGE
2. Proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – Section I.7 Student Appeals of Grading Decisions – CoRSAF
3. Proposed revisions to Section D.7.1 Maximum Employment of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* - CoRSAF

G. DISCUSSION

1. None.

APRIL 24, 2018 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Faculty Council Meeting Minutes*

1. April 3, 2018

Gallagher: Any changes or corrections?

Makela noted corrections on pages 5, 12, 31 and 40.

Hayne moved (Reising 2nd) to place the amended April 3, 2018 Faculty Council meeting minutes on the May 1, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Hayne's motion was approved.

B. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. April 17, 2018

Gallagher: Any changes or corrections?

Makela noted one correction on page 51.

Hunter moved (Reising 2nd) to place the amended April 17, 2018 Executive Committee meeting minutes on the Faculty Council website.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: May 8, 2018 - 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration

Gallagher announced that the last Executive Committee meeting of the semester would be held on May 8, 2018.

CoTL will not be asking Executive Committee to add the LENS proposal to the May FC meeting agenda, but Matt Hickey will join our meeting today to explain where the proposal stands.

B. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – April 13, 2018
- April 20, 2018

Makela moved (Hayne 2nd) to place the April 13 and 20, 2018 UCC meeting minutes on the May 1, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Makela's motion was approved.

2. Proposed revisions to the *2018-19 General Catalog*, sections on English Composition Requirement and Mathematics Requirement: Removing policy to assign "F" grades if requirement is not completed within 60-credits - UCC

Makela moved (Hayne 2nd) to place the proposed revisions to the *2018-19 General Catalog*, sections on English Composition Requirement and Mathematics Requirement: Removing policy to assign "F" grades if requirement is not completed within 60-credits on the May 1, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Makela's motion was approved.

3. LENS update:

Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL explained the last Committee on Teaching and Learning meeting is next Monday. He has laid out some items for CoTL to think about. 1) Think strategically. It's not good to push this forward for May. Zinta Byrne let CoTL members know in January that she has to step away from her role at the end of May.

Two pilot tests have been run and a couple questions will not work. One question is on diversity and the students are pointing in different directions with it. The second item was from the open forum: 20 minutes of 2 hours were spent on one question, which illustrates the ongoing messaging from CoTL. Some requests from the students--what percent is discussion, lecture, etc.? Hickey feels some faculty felt threatened by it, but it's more for the students. That overhanging specter of

how we used to do the evaluations could seem to harm versus help. This new tool is not designed to replace the old course survey, etc., but there is some inertia. We can do a better job of messaging.

Not quite ready to have a LENS dummy class on a website for faculty yet. When we have it to you, in September or October, we want to make sure a live demo is ready for everyone across campus. There is a sense that there are some meaningful domains that are not in the core of the survey.

You will recall the December 2016 charge was for a Phase 1 and Phase 2. Some voices I heard was that they were reluctant to vote on Phase 1 without having Phase 2 ready yet. We will work to get everything together into one packet, and I will have a better sense of what the CoTL members think on April 30. Our IT friends have the platform ready to run. We need appropriate questions in useful ways. Happy with feedback that has been received. There was a little bit of survey fatigue, but the feedback has been really good.

Questions:

Hunter: I may have missed remembering this, but I thought there was some discussion to administer the survey at the middle of the semester?

Hickey: The mid semester version was piloted one month ago. Will make both available. Meant to be midstream feedback. Packet should include both. The instructor questions were not in the original charge. The fall pilot had the end of semester LENS only. More concern about the instructor survey versus the core LENS survey. We have to think carefully about our original charge and how will this be helpful. Other concerns were two mid semester surveys and two end of semester surveys.

Kroll: Do you feel you have had enough feedback, as it seems the attendance was not great at the open forum. Do you still want input on the next version?

Hickey: Point well taken. The feedback can't go on forever, however; a period early in the fall, it will be

available as a live demo. We are also close to delivering on what the report will look like. Made the promise that it will not report means on any of these items anymore. Frequency distributions instead and categorical data. We are trying to keep it simple. Hoping for a vote in September.

Avery: Regarding the validity of the survey. What is the hesitancy in making it mandatory? I went to the forum and liked the direction it's going.

Hickey: Can consider the tools that we pilot. How do we equip the faculty and department chairs, given the changes in the *Manual* that this can no longer be the sole voice of faculty reviews. We are concerned about providing tools for department heads. How can we get a coherent, sensible cover sheet without relying on a 4.5 or 4.6?

Hayne: If there are no other measures, and the evaluation cannot be used, what does someone do?

Miranda: Can someone observe the faculty?

Makela: It would be in the department code.

Hayne: I know what should happen but I'm telling you what I have heard that does happen to some faculty. Nothing else may have been done and the poor applicant has nothing.

Mumme: Puts more pressure on the departments to find alternative methods, otherwise we don't have a good system. Faculty evaluations are an entirely different situation. In the abstract, that is information worth having, but in the task-driven world of the chairs, you have to find a measure, and I want this person to reconfigure the time of this, that, or the other. Professors have to be in the position of knowing their subjects and delivering them. Can't give chairs the option of gaming that option.

Reising: I appreciate your comments. Tell us again about the chairs?

Mumme: Chairs have a difficult job. They are in a time-driven, decision- making situation and looking for

ways to find out how to distinguish what one faculty member does from other faculty members. Maybe this should be what we should achieve, and this professor didn't do this so they get a lower evaluation, and the other professor did that, so they get a higher score. Left undetermined, certain subjectivities will creep in.

Gallagher: I meet with Dan Bush regularly and we talk about many areas. I think we need some sort of internal controls to be used for annual performance evaluations and P&T. I don't see any way for this to be achieved without the Provost's office helping with this.

Miranda: It will require additional training and oversight by the Dean's office and Provost's office. Faculty members can provide evidence.

Avery: Do you have any examples?

Miranda: Syllabi, self-reflections.

Stromberger: Also, student learning outcomes and how to increase those outcomes. Did the students master the material?

Miranda: Evidence that new courses were developed; participation in TILT workshops; there are lots of things that faculty members can do that help with teaching effectiveness.

Stromberger: Struggling but striving—and these are the improvements that have been made.

Hayne: This is the first time I have heard of some of these measures. There are a couple I don't remember reading.

Stromberger: P&T template on Provost's website may help.

Stromberger: Letters that go out look at teaching excellence and some are sent to referees re: research aspect.

Avery: I think part of the angst is related to the environment you are working in.

Stromberger: Goes back to faculty believing what the survey is used for. We don't need to nit-pick the survey.

Hayne: One way to get that trust, you put it out the chairs to see this loop. Would recommend putting Phase 2 up and allowing faculty to examine it side by side and go through it to see the differences.

Avery: Re: Phase 2. Any thoughts about letting each college develop their own?

Hickey: Yes. There is some rationale with this. AAUP side of it too. Again, the same temptation applies. Here are some questions Not inconceivable. Up to autonomy of individual faculty members.

Miranda: We have learned that the construction of these questions can be tricky though.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Budget issues, Board issues, and ceremonies and celebrations mainly. Not too much to report. Budget in flux. Board meeting next week. Three upcoming celebrations.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

At our last EC meeting, there was some discussion about CoRSAF motion, D.7.1 with problematic wording. Gallagher contacted our parliamentarian, Lola Fehr, and asked for guidance. She said that amending something that is not related to the main motion is out of order. That is not to deny that good points were brought up, but it's not what CoRSAF is bringing up. We can ask CoRSAF to look at it at a later time.

Some of you know that CoRSAF was saying that once E.1 and E.2 makes it through Faculty Council, they would look at Section E.13. Gallagher made the call that the FC agenda had to go out today and EC could not adequately discuss E.13, nor others, for placement on the May FC meeting agenda at the last minute. This will be discussed in Faculty Council this Fall.

Gallagher also looked at the wording of the agreement that Sue Pendell entered into the FC Rosenberg Award. The award is to be given out annually.

On Friday, Gallagher will attend the CFAC Meeting (Colorado Faculty Advisory Committee), which is tied to the Department of Higher Education. You have Faculty Council, and/or Senates that meet to talk about higher education issues. They had a meeting last Fall semester but Gallagher had a conflict.

Prior learning assessments is one of the discussions in the CDHE per Miranda.

Standing Committee proposals and the next academic year. It is a standing policy that Standing Committees need to get proposal requests to the Faculty Council Office two weeks in advance to be added to the Faculty Council meeting agenda. Gallagher intends to communicate with all the Chairs Unless it's a very compelling case to allow us to consider one week before the FC meeting, the intention will be to require motions be submitted so that the two week requirement is met.

Makela: Could you follow up on the CIOSU from the last meeting?

Gallagher: CUP has withdrawn the request.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Gallagher spoke with Margarita Lenk. She had to be at her department for a meeting during the same time as Executive Committee today. Lenk hopes we can have the

President's evaluation conversation at our last EC meeting. Lenk wants to be present to hear what other EC members say.

No urgency at all per Gallagher, and time deadlines are okay.

Hayne: I had two emails from faculty saying they will never give written feedback.

Stromberger: We have accepted anonymous feedback before.

Hunter: From Libraries, I accept feedback from faculty, and comments are anonymous.

D. Discussion Items

1. President's evaluation (delayed until May 8 EC meeting).

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

Tim Gallagher, Chair
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant