MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday August 14, 2018
3:00 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Present: Tim Gallagher, Chair; Sue Doe, Vice Chair; Margarita Lenk, BOG Faculty Representative; Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant; Jason Bruemmer substituting for Stephan Kroll, Agricultural Sciences; Steven Reising, Engineering; TBD, Health and Human Sciences; Steven Shulman, Liberal Arts; Linda Meyer, Libraries; Alan Bright substituting for Tara Teel, Natural Resources; Mary Meyer, Natural Sciences; Anne Avery, CVMBS; Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: Carole Makela, School of Education; Barb Wallner, Ph.D., Education and Outreach, Retired

Absent: Stephan Kroll, Agricultural Sciences (excused); Stephen Hayne, Business (excused); Tara Teel, Natural Resources (excused)

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

SEPTEMBER 4, 2018 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – September 4, 2018 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 - 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – October 2, 2018 – Plant Sciences building – Room C101 – 4:00 p.m.
2. President’s Fall Address and University Picnic
   October 3, 2018 On the Oval – 11:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
3. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website: April 24, 2018
   (http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)
4. Schedule of 2018-19 Faculty Council Meeting Dates
5. Faculty Council Membership
6. Faculty Council Standing Committees Membership
7. University Committees Membership
8. Parliamentary Motions – Quick Reference
9. Parliamentary Motions – What They Mean
10. UCC Minutes – April 27, 2018 and May 4, 2018
   (Approved at May 8, 2018 Executive Committee meeting on behalf of Faculty Council)
B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes -

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

4. Faculty Council Standing Committee 2017-18 Annual Reports
   a. Faculty Council Report to the Board of Governors
   b. Committee on Faculty Governance
   c. Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
   d. Committee on Libraries
   e. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty
   f. Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty
   g. Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education
   h. Committee on Scholastic Standards
   i. Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning
   j. Committee on Teaching and Learning
   k. Committee on University Programs
   l. University Curriculum Committee

5. University Benefits Committee

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Confirmation of Faculty Council Secretary – Rita Knoll – Executive Assistant to Faculty Council

2. Confirmation of Faculty Council Parliamentarian – Lola Fehr – Professional Registered Parliamentarian

3. UCC Minutes –
F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Proposal for Lory Student Center as Polling Site for Midterm Elections – Tom Hoehn, Retired CSU Admin Pro

G. DISCUSSION
AUGUST 14, 2018 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

1. May 1, 2018

The May 1, 2018 Faculty Council meeting minutes were approved by unanimous consent and will be placed on the September 4, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

B. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

1. May 8, 2018

The May 8, 2018 Executive Committee meeting minutes were approved by unanimous consent and will be placed on the Faculty Council website.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: August 21, 2018 - 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee would be held on August 21, 2018.

Gallagher apologized for meeting so soon instead of meeting on August 21. He understands that 9-month contracts don’t start until the August 16. However, this week and next week are important to organize the majority of the Faculty Council meeting agenda. We need to email the agenda to faculty one full week in advance.

B. Action Items

1. New CIOSU: Geospatial Centroid at CSU – CUP (pp.)

Lenk moved (Reising 2nd) to place the New CIOSU: Geospatial Centroid at CSU on the September 4, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda.
Lenk’s motion was approved.

Questions:

Reising: On page 27. Did the Chair of CUP think this was fine?

Gallagher: Yes, there were some individuals that had issues. It was a strong majority that felt this should go through and strong support from CUP to move this forward for Faculty Council approval.

2. Proposal for a 15-minute Report from Jody Donovan to Faculty Council – Suicide Prevention Program called “Notice & Respond”

Gallagher: Jody is going around to many different groups on the campus and wants to get this in front of Faculty Council. I feel this is a good idea, but I have to bring this to EC first. Is there any discussion about this program?

No discussion ensued.

Reising moved (Avery 2\textsuperscript{nd}) to place the Report from Jody Donovan on the September 4, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Reising’s motion was approved.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Had a good Board of Governors retreat in June and good Board of Governors meeting last week. Everything proposed passed, including revisions to Section K.

The big news is the start of the academic year. It looks like enrollment will be up about 5%. This is better news than anticipated. Admissions had been estimating lower. Leslie Taylor said students were saying yes but later and later this year for some reason.
Housing and dining is having to schedule various places like lounges for housing for a week or two. Shakeout after a week or so will generally take care of this. If not, there are a few tricks left like renting apartments and getting hotel rooms. The other challenge is finding 15 good credits for students to take starting Monday morning. Which courses are oversubscribed? Kelly Long works with academic support advisors and others to try to make things work. Example: LIFE 102 is required for a lot of majors so people want to take it in the first semester but it’s okay to take it in the second semester. They work on balancing to try to even out work for GAs and faculty. We want to spread the load over the year. Composition and Math are two key courses also.

Dan Bush is working on the NTTF policy implementation. Difficult details. Phase Two has not yet been passed by CoRSAF. There will be additional guidance on promotion pathways.

Questions: None.

Miranda’s report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Gallagher is an Ex officio non-voting member on the Administrative Professional Council and attended their retreat last week.

In spring 2016, Faculty Council passed a Manual provision that APs would vote first and approve motions also affecting APs before FC would approve. It passed unanimously in FC without discussion, but it’s been problematic. Faculty Council meets on the first Tuesday of every month while APs meet the second Monday. There’s also a problem with amendments. Any motion to amend on the floor of FC is ruled out of order by the Chair of Faculty Council because the APs haven’t approved it first. Richard Eykholt and Sarah Olson were asked to work on this. They will bring the proposal approved by APC to
CoRSAF and then to EC and Faculty Council soon. The proposal includes changes to the current *Manual* Preface language combined with new related material in Section H of the *Manual*.

Makela asked if this would be two motions or just one. Gallagher indicates that time will tell.

Ram Welcome starts this Thursday. Convocation happening later in the week. Worked with Katie Kalkstein and President Frank will attend the October 2 Faculty Council meeting. He is also attending the Executive Committee meeting on October 9.

On Wednesday, August 22, Gallagher will hold an orientation for the newly elected FC members from 12 p.m. to 1 p.m. – Provost’s Conference room. Procedures will be reviewed.

A handout was distributed re: Section C. Gallagher wanted to remind everyone of why we do what we do. EC members have the authority for preparing the FC meeting agenda. The *Manual* is filled with checks and balances.

Gallagher distributed another handout on Executive Committee Operating procedures. It has been awhile since reviewing our operating procedures. These EC meetings are closed. It’s very important that each college and the Libraries are represented.

Gallagher pointed out the following items:

Under #4. The Chair is the official spokesperson; very soon, a trial will start at the Larimer County Courthouse. There will likely be a lot in the newspaper and there may be inquiries.

#7 is the most recent change. The “nuclear option”. Sometimes a standing committee has to review a proposal but doesn’t want to do anything about the item. EC can send it to the full Faculty Council despite the standing committee’s objection. If EC does this it must notify the standing committee that chose not to bring the proposal
forward and give that committee the right to speak against
the motion.

#10 Have a certain authority where we try not to use too
much. We don’t like to act on behalf of Faculty Council
unless there is a good idea to do it. Late in the spring
semester, after the last FC meeting, we have to act on
behalf of FC in those cases.

#16. When the University awards honorary degrees. EC
is actively involved and there is an honorary degree
committee. The conferring of degrees rests with the
faculty so it’s good to remind ourselves that there are some
areas where faculty have a big share and this is the one.

Lenk asked Gallagher about priorities for this year:

Gallagher’s intention is to reach out to all areas of the
campus to see how the NTTF changes are being received.

Next week’s agenda: Over the summer, Gallagher gathered
numbers from IR and is looking at NTTF and TTF
percentages. Tony has indicated that the ratio of TTF to
NTTF numbers should stay roughly where they are.
Gallagher will bring some data to us next week for
some discussion. The topic deserves an airing. EC will be
asked what we want to do with the data.

Shulman: Applauded Gallagher for taking on the NTTF
issue. Since you mentioned the new policies that were
recently passed, I encourage you to go to CLA.

Gallagher assured Shulman that he is in conversations with
CLA, and Sue Doe has been very active in multiple issues
with NTTF. These conversations are well underway.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita
Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

Lenk mentioned concerns about CoTL being trapped in the
Course Survey discussion when there are many curricular
and pedagogical opportunities and issues that should be
addressed. Lenk’s full BOG meeting report is not ready to present yet.

Lenk’s report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. Campus climate - Feedback to determine policy effectiveness to inform revisions
   - Carole Makela and Barbara Wallner

Carole Makela sent a memo Gallagher in mid-July regarding levels of stress on campus and people being frustrated. Some of it goes back to inactive policies and we don’t have a very good basis to what extent the policies are working and how intended. Now with the actions of Principles of Community, that could be connected. Makela pointed out that we don’t get information or follow up about problems, challenges, successes, etc., regarding grievance, academic integrity, and other indicators of campus climate. I think we need to see if policies have a checks and balances system. For example, the health insurance dependent audit—what happened? Has everyone’s data been purged?

Gallagher: Attended a meeting of the University Benefits Committee and they found a few cases where dependents were not eligible. The benefits audit was completed and some problems were found. Gallagher expects that Diana Prieto will give a report at some point about this item.

Reising: It would be interesting to look at the cost to the university.

Gallagher: They had some numbers and were fairly pleased with the outcome.

Wallner: President Frank started the effort for Principles of Community in May 2014. Mary Ontiveros was charged with doing professional development around Principles of Community and Wallner has participated in facilitation. Wallner discussed a few examples that relate to poor treatment by supervisors, denial of family leave, etc., although not necessarily bullying. She states that there are a lot of questions left. Might we get exit interviews, bullying complaints reports, etc., so that we have some of that information? Wallner also mentioned that having a single investigator of bullying complaints is undue pressure on that investigator. Also, could the Principles of Community be moved so that it appears on both the President’s website and on the current Provost’s website--where it is currently housed. She feels that the most important
thing is reporting and enlarging the group of investigators, similar to what happens with the Student Conduct Office Panel.

Avery: Was the implication that the supervisor was acting inappropriately?

Wallner: Some behavior was not bullying, but not treating someone well (i.e. switching someone’s supervisor without notifying them). Wallner suggested there are different records and interviews. Maybe it would be good for people that have retired to share their thoughts. If everyone got more reports on exit interviews and bullying issues, etc., you could start connecting the dots. Wallner has also been told that only a few people are asked to investigate bullying reports.

Wallner: To raise awareness of the policies, the Faculty Council could ask for a couple of things—putting the Principles of Community on the President’s website, and adding a link with the policy. Who are the advocates for Administrative Professionals? Faculty? State Classified personnel?

We could also do a presentation for groups. There are people that are not happy after retirement and they are the people that could help with graduate students. Students have the Conflict Appeals Committee. Having a multidisciplinary panel would be helpful. Wallner would be happy to work as an employee advocate. Sometimes it just take me talking to them and the supervisor, and things can be resolved.

Makela: It points out the question of what do I do? Where do I look for help? On the sheet that was passed out to EC members, there are some things that we know have occurred, and in some cases it is creating inequity. There are basically six alternative resolutions between the person reporting and sometimes with a supervisor involved. There is no central place to find out anything.

Makela’s recommendation: Some kind of monitoring system so as to know what becomes of cases. Perhaps at the Dean’s office level, they could report a summary of situations they have dealt with to the Provost or the Ombuds. The challenge, as Barb mentioned, is that many of these cases involve many areas. It may be students and TAs, or faculty and administrators. These problems cut across all job classifications that we have. What do we need to know? The best process could then be thought of and accompany, or built in.

Wallner: Data is very helpful, but who can keep track of those various reports? Some of these other reports could be intersected. As far as the
bullying policy, how many complaints? If there are a lot, we need to raise awareness. HR has been wonderful for helping. Some people don’t want to go to their personnel representative. Our bottom line is that we want people to be working here and to be happy.

Reising thanked Makela and Wallner and asked what guidance they would suggest for how to set up a panel.

Makela argues for competencies (vs. standards) which could then appear in annual evaluations. Use a Likert Scale and foster personal and professional growth rather than treat as an attribute saying either you “have it” or you don’t. She recommends an interdisciplinary team.

Lenk pointed out that what they’re asking for is something a bit different that what is used for student conduct, which only goes to a panel if a student requests it after adjudication has occurred from one investigator. In this case, with a situation relating to bullying, the case would go straight to the panel.

Gallagher explains how items come to him as Faculty Council Chair. The Chair goes to Dan Bush to oversee some issues. Let’s find the facts, and if in fact the department is violating University policy, then we need to do something about it. Sometimes the Deans can help. Some issues often involve confidentiality elements to them.

Makela says that we need to ask what the purpose of confidentiality is. Are we getting confidentiality confused with non-disclosure? Also need to recognize that there’s a role for employee advocates. If they want to bring someone to a meeting, they wouldn’t have to do it alone.

Wallner points out the May 2014 message from President Frank that calls for intervention training. She then points out a good article on tools and advice for those experiencing bullying. She offers to send us a copy of the article, which has validated many persons’ experience and called to awareness bullying behavior by certain persons and raises their awareness.

Lenk: Do we have controls without monitoring, or even a baseline grasp of where climate was and then shows improvement?

Mary Meyer: More information would improve the situation even for those not experiencing bullying or other behaviors.

Makela and Wallner: We should know when isolated events are occurring all in one location. There’s no bringing together of information from exit interviews so there’s no accountability.
Avery: Administration is the group who must address these kinds of problems, not us.

Wallner appreciates the work Executive Committee has done to create policies that have helped the campus.

Reising: Make the information anonymous and report in aggregate. Exit interviews for everyone might be a place to start.

Shulman: It seems that the Provost should be collecting this information routinely and report to FC. I feel this is just not the administration, but certain issues have to be addressed by faculty. But in terms of collecting information, the Provost's office is the way to go.

Miranda: I would be happy to take on this responsibility. We don’t have a template for what such a report would look like, but I can take responsibility for constructing such a report. A lot of the information resides in HR data and the employee assistance program, including the Ombuds office, so there would be a variety of places to go to collect.

Miranda added that the Campus Climate Survey is every two years. On the basis of the last one, several new programs were created, such as the supervisory training program, faculty Ombuds representative, and resources were added this year to that position. So, we have been taking some initiatives to move the needle on campus climate. The next Campus Climate Survey will be a clarifier in this area.

Gallagher: I suggest that we close this conversation for now but discuss it in the coming weeks and months.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

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