

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday September 11, 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; **Stephan Kroll**, Agricultural Sciences; **Stephen Hayne**, Business; **Steven Reising**, Engineering; **TBD**, Health and Human Sciences; **Steven Shulman**, Liberal Arts; **Michelle Wilde** substituting for Linda Meyer, Libraries; **Tara Teel**, Natural Resources; **Mary Meyer**, Natural Sciences; **Anne Avery**, CVMBS; **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President

;

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair, UCC; **Dan Bush**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Absent: **Linda Meyer**, Libraries (excused)

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

OCTOBER 2, 2018 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

- I. **Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – October 2, 2018 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 - 4:00 p.m.**
 - A. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
 1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – November 6, 2018 – Plant Sciences building – Room C101 – 4:00 p.m.
 2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the 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. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda
 2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

F. ACTION ITEMS

G. DISCUSSION

SEPTEMBER 11, 2018 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. August 21, 2018

Amendment on page 5 of August 21, 2018 minutes per Michelle Wilde. Linda Meyer is the Libraries representative to Executive Committee and is replacing/completing Nancy Hunter's term on Faculty Council as Nancy retired from Faculty Council last spring; however, Linda is *not* on the Committee on Libraries.

Executive Committee approved the amended minutes by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: September 18, 2018 - 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee would be held on September 18, 2018.

B. *Action Items*

1. UCC minutes – August 24, 2018

Lenk moved (Mary Meyer 2nd) to place the August 24, 2018 UCC meeting minutes on October 2 FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

2. Proposed revisions to Section E.13 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual - CoRSAF*

Section E.13 was received after the EC agenda had been sent. Gallagher emailed Section E.13 to Executive Committee members for review before the September 11, 2018 EC meeting.

Gallagher: Any thoughts on this, pro or con? Is this ready to be sustainable for debate?

Lenk: Can this proposal be separated? Lenk believes the processes for promotion for the different appointment types should be kept separate.

Avery: Agrees with Lenk. I am still confused about rank versus level, and I know we had this discussion last year.

Gallagher: Miranda's feedback was that he felt this was perfect as it contains the two parallel tracks.

Avery: Who gets a vote? Does the senior instructor get to vote on a tenure track issue?

Gallagher: They will leave that to the department code. Are the departments being instructed to look at their codes and decide on who gets to vote on T&P decisions?

Bush: Review the codes with what aspects NTTF participate in. The voting piece was not included in the instructions given to our departments. They were told to find the appropriate rank and timelines for review. Bush asks, "How will departments review faculty?" It's a good question regarding this document. In the future, this coming year, they would have to consider those in the context of defining how to review NTTF for promotion (professional development, awards). After articulating timelines for review, how will depts. review individuals within the department? Will they constitute a special committee to do this? This has not been addressed.

Gallagher: The available ranks for TTF is assistant to associate to full. Miranda has recommended a parallel structure for NTTF. Some departments already use the ranks of assistant, associate, and full for NTTF.

Bush: The changes in the *Manual* did not speak to the criteria for using the ranks to reflect teaching or not. Bush refers to a location in the *Manual* that clarifies who is eligible to speak to tenure is an existing faculty member who already has tenure.

Hayne: So NTTF could vote on promotion but not on tenure?

Bush: Tenure track faculty and NTTF are eligible. Eykholt provided further insight that the only people that can speak to tenure are tenured faculty.

Gallagher: Some associate professors don't have tenure.

Bush: They may have been promoted but not necessarily tenured.

Kroll: Only the tenure track faculty are deciding on tenure?

Bush: As currently stated, all members of the department could decide on promotion if they put it into their code. NTTF could be allowed to vote on the promotion of TTF colleagues but a department code could change that.

E.10.5.1 Paragraph 4 - T&P requires eligibility for voting for tenure as those already possession of tenure. Tenure decisions fall only to tenured faculty.

Reising: For the minutes: If you define speak to participate in the discussion, or participate in the vote?

Bush: Participate in the vote.

Hayne: Seeing duplicate language in E.10.5.1, fourth paragraph. Eligible faculty is not defined there either. Even though eligible faculty members are not defined in the *Manual*, but in the code, then we have to look at the code for eligible faculty? Actually, it IS defined.

Gallagher: With regard to promotion, as CoRSAF is proposing, the tenure track or NTTF could be the default for voting on the promotion, but a department code could change that.

Bush: Eykholt's interpretation is that only tenured faculty vote.

Gallagher: That is why CoRSAF is coming up with E.13, which has to do with promotion and NOT tenure.

Hayne: If you have an assistant professor that uses that label and wishes to be promoted to an associate professor, the second paragraph doesn't apply (in E.13) but the other things do apply.

Lenk: I think there would be a lot of resistance seeing it this way.

Wilde: Does that mean when people go up for tenure, then there are two separate meetings?

Gallagher: Depends on what the department code specifies.

Bush: Two things: Question of do you want NTTF on a promotion committee voting in the context of regular faculty; do you want them voting for a promotion to the next level? I'm talking about regular faculty. The way this is written, NTTF would be voted for say associate to full. You can have a NTTF in the rank of professor

Gallagher: The chair of CoRSAF is in a department that does exactly that- the NTTF are voting on promotions of regular faculty. They are the minority. It is not common.

Avery: I am in EHRS. I doubt that it's true that tenure track faculty can vote on NTTF.

Bush: Makes a recommendation for new language for who is eligible to vote on promotion of TTF.

Gallagher: I also have a suggestion. We have had a good discussion. Next week I will ask Marie Legare and Richard Eykholt to come to EC to give the Committee's background on this before placing this on the October FC meeting agenda. CoRSAF has put a huge amount of time into this and it's not our job to second guess any of the standing committees. I think there is clarification that is needed by Legare and Eykholt, then we can make a more informed decision. It may need to wait until November.

Bush also makes the point that there is a need to describe how the committee for promotion of NTTF will be constituted.

Doe: How the committees will be constituted could be a thorny issue.

There are several other pertinent questions that will have to be asked by departments: What criteria shall we use for promotion of NTTF. Departments will have to meet and discuss this and other things.

New Action Item:

Gallagher: There is another proposal from CoRSAF. Hard copy of proposal distributed to EC members

This document is proposed new language for the Preface (re: Administrative Professionals). Section H is currently blank, so the language would be brand new as a new section.

Lenk: Feels this document is very well written.

Reising moved (Hayne 2nd) to place the new language for the Preface on the October FC meeting agenda.

Reising's motion was approved.

New Action Item:

Last item from CoFG. Hard copy of proposal distributed to EC members.

Proposed revisions to Sections C.2.1.9.3 Membership and Organization of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*.

Gallagher: We will begin the discussion today. It's just updating the language in what has already been approved.

NTTF are not on CoFG and other standing committees. CoFG is requesting changes to who can stand on standing committees and specialized standing committees.

Lenk moved (Mary Meyer 2nd) to place this proposal on Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

Because this is a Code change to the *Manual*, Faculty Council members need to receive the proposal two weeks before FC convenes. Knoll will email the proposed changes to Faculty Council members tomorrow morning for review.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Fall Leadership Forum with 120 participants. Went well.

COD had a new marketing campaign. "Proud To Be" marketing campaign. Fixed price agreements. Shown videos on marketing assets related to that and videos will be rolling out. Discussed new academic programs, new concept papers about upcoming proposals in the curriculum process.

Cabinet meeting today. Heard about marketing campaign. Health costs may go up about 6% due to external factors (market) in the health sector and internal factors (what our own population experiences). Hired consultants that know this business well. A little tricky for budgeting purposes as it's calculated on a different calendar cycle.

The decisions that are made about health benefits impact the larger budget items, but the timing is off by about six months.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Doe and Gallagher talked. The October FC meeting is the same day that the Campus Climate survey opens up. This is done every two years. Administration takes this seriously. All confidential. Gallagher will encourage faculty to stick around after the meeting and take the survey before they go home. Faculty participation was very dismal two years ago – 16% of faculty participated. Also encouraged to send out an email recommending that faculty participate.

CoRSAF is in the process of coming up with wording relating to service in an effort to better reflect how service is recognized and understood and rewarded.

Fall Forum: Gallagher was approached about having aggregate data relating to the university's experience with the bullying policy. Something similar to the annual report of the University Grievance Officer. People asked: Why don't we get similar aggregate data regarding the bullying policy? Gallagher spoke with Diana Prieto (HR) and she said that she would be happy to provide this.

Lenk asked whether the diversity and inclusion efforts have similar delivered data, as per this question being posed at the FC meeting.

Avery: The supervisory training is 24 hours (total) of mandated training. Is someone outside of the training monitoring how this is going? 24 hours is a very large amount of time.

Miranda: Is someone monitoring this? Will ask Diana Prieto.

Gallagher deferred to Steve Shulman for information from the CLA Faculty Caucus. Shulman speaks to meeting with the CLA council reps prior to the FC meetings. Most of the representatives attended and it seems to be a worthwhile procedure that others on Executive Committee may want to consider. Some upset with the retirement choice to opt-out of Social Security. The employer makes the decision and either all participate or all don't.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

No report as the Board will not meet until October again. Lenk requested from Gallagher that we request the Free Speech presentation given at the Fall Forum by General Counsel and Tom Milligan, with Tim Gallagher standing by.

Lenk's report was received.

D. Discussion Items

Possible October FC discussion: Partnership w/CSU and Neighbor to Neighbor – looking at affordable housing options.
-Deborah Mayer, Housing Solutions Coordinator
-Emma Chavez, CARE Program Coordinator

This would be a report and not a discussion item: These folks have requested an opportunity for a giving a report at the October Faculty Council meeting. This group is interested in affordable housing. Not only state classifieds and administrative professionals, but also faculty are affected by the lack of affordable housing.

Miranda points out that “affordable” is actually a legal term but there's now a new term: “attainable housing”, which supplants “affordable housing” in some locations due to the federal restrictions on the use of the phrase “affordable housing.”

Mary Meyer moved (Steve Reising 2nd) to place this on the October Faculty Council meeting as a Report.

Mary Meyer's motion was approved.

Lenk asked if we want to put this at the end instead of integrated at the Report point of the meeting.

EC unanimously agreed to allow them 10 minutes on the agenda.

Lenk also mentioned that Employee Appreciation Day is tomorrow so encourages EC members to stop by. It's located at the Sutherland Gardens at the LSC.

Miranda asked if we discussed E13. Gallagher explained that we are inviting Marie Legare and Richard Eykholt to the next meeting.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

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