

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday September 25, 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; **TBD**, Health and Human Sciences; **Steven Shulman**, Liberal Arts; **Linda Meyer**, Libraries; **Tara Teel**, Natural Resources; **Mary Meyer**, Natural Sciences; **Anne Avery**, CVMBS

Guests: **Bradley Goetz**, Chair, UCC; **Richard Eykholt**, UGO; **Marie Legare**, Chair, CoRSAF

Absent: **Steven Reising**, Engineering (excused); **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President (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. President’s Fall Address and University Picnic – October 3, 2018 – on the Oval – 11:30-1:00 p.m.
 3. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website: August 21, 2018
(<http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/>)
 - B. **MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**
 1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
 - C. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
 1. Faculty Council Standing Committee Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance

2. Standing Committee Elections – Graduate Student Representatives – CoFG
3. Faculty Council Standing Committee Elections – Graduate Student Representatives – CoFG
4. Faculty Council Standing Committee Elections – Undergraduate Student Representatives – CoFG

D. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. President – Tony Frank
2. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda
3. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher
4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk
5. Faculty Council Standing Committee 2017-18 Annual Reports
 - a. Committee on Libraries
6. Neighbor to Neighbor
 - Deborah Mayer, Housing Solutions Coordinator
 - Emma Chavez, CARE Program Coordinator

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC meeting minutes – August 24 and 31, 2018; September 7, 2018

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Proposed revisions to Section C.2.1.9.3 Membership and Organization of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG

This requires a 2/3 vote. If an amendment were to be made on the floor, Gallagher has learned that only a majority is needed for the amendment, followed by a 2/3 vote on the amended proposal.

2. Proposed revisions to the Preface and Section H of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* - CoRSAF
3. Proposed revisions to Section E.13 Advancement in Rank (Promotion) of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* - CoRSAF

The email vote Gallagher solicited from EC to put Section E.13 on the agenda or pulling it. The vote was 4 approving; 2 opposed, and 6 members didn't vote. Needed a majority of 7 votes.

G. DISCUSSION

SEPTEMBER 25, 2018 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Faculty Council Meeting Minutes*

1. September 4, 2018

Lenk moved (Teel 2nd) to place the amended September 4, 2018 Faculty Council meeting minutes on the October 2, 2018 FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

Corrections: Mary Meyer could only find one question, not two questions that she asked. Would like to have her whole context of the question as follows:

Mary Meyer (CNS): I have a follow-up question. Most people, when they hear the stadium is making a profit, would assume that is after the mortgage. If that is not the case, then how do you define a profit?

B. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. September 11, 2018

Mary Meyer moved (Avery 2nd) to approve the September 11, 2018 EC meeting minutes. The minutes will be placed on the Faculty Council website.

Mary Meyer's motion was approved.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: October 9, 2018 - 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration.

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on October 9, 2018 and Tony will be attending.

B. Action Items

1. UCC minutes – September 14, 2018

The September 14, 2018 UCC minutes were unanimously approved by Executive Committee and will be placed on the October FC meeting agenda.

No changes or comments to the minutes per Goetz.

Lenk moved (Teel 2nd) to place the September 14, 2018 UCC minutes on the October 2, 2018 FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

2. Proposed revisions to the All-University Core Curriculum (AUCC) language and requirements - UCC

Gallagher talked to Goetz this morning and there possibly may be more changes. We can wait one more month for this to go on the FC meeting agenda for November.

Section E.13 discussion ensued: Gallagher wants EC members to have their say with what goes and doesn't go into the FC agenda.

Linda Meyer: Can we bring this up as a discussion item versus an action item?

Gallagher: This could be an option.

Legare and Eykholt speak to what they would like to happen.

Legare: CoRSAF fixed a paragraph and approved the changes, which came back to EC. Also thought about some of the verbiage from the Council of Deans being "taken by surprise" The substance really hadn't changed since last spring. Legare did talk to the Dean of Engineering, and he felt better about E.13. The Dean of CLA had some constructive concerns and comments. Legare will meet with the Dean of CNS this Friday. She also met with HR about pay scale concerns. HR said this is not an issue.

Gallagher not pushing one way or the other with regard to E.13. At COD, Miranda brought up the E.13 proposal and asked for the deans' thoughts. Miranda calls it the "offset" approach. The deans object to the offset approach with instructor with no equivalent at that level and professor with no equivalent at that level. This created concern about two tracks or two tiers of faculty.

CoRSAF had made it clear that they were going to present the proposal in the offset mode.

Eykholt: Without the offset, there was a lot of feedback regarding the idea of an STA outranking an assistant professor. There was also concern that an instructor could be promoted four times, but Eykholt thinks this is a red herring since the concern about three salary increases to NTTF would hardly be a threat or problem. The timeline is a little off. Submitted in the spring. A copy was given to Dan Bush, and they discussed the offset.

Linda Meyer: I don't think they understand why the offset is there.

Avery: Is there a common definition of what an instructor is?

Eykholt: That is a department-by-department or college level determination as is also the case in terms of what constitutes an "associate" professor vs. a "full" professor. The expectations vary. In some units, promotion depends on how much money you're bringing in.

Linda Meyer: Can we help the Provost's office understand "instructor" in a new way?

Gallagher: An overarching goal has been to defer to the colleges as much as possible while seeking key things that should occur in the *Manual*.

Eykholt: We worked closely with the CoNTTF. There are times when a policy like who can vote on tenure-track promotion cases must be stated.

Shulman: Instructor promotions will be paid by Central Admin?

Eykholt: For all colleges but Business that is true.

Avery: But what about fully grant funded NTTF?

Eykholt: Positions where there is permanent base funding will be paid for by central. So perhaps not CVMBS grant-funded NTTF.

Gallagher: How do we want to handle this? Do we want to have this on the agenda, have it as a report, or have it as a discussion item?

Linda Meyer: If we don't have this as an item to vote on in October, in Miranda's email he seems to suggest that we only need more time to sort this out, but what would change in those weeks?

Gallagher: Miranda said that he wants the deans to have some time to think about this.

Lenk: I would like to consider a combination—a preamble from CoRSAF followed by a discussion.

Teel: This would help faculty who don't know anything about this and help them understand this proposal rather than have to vote without a clear understanding.

Mary Meyer: I think we should put it in as a motion with a lot of explanation because it's not clear what's gained by delaying a month.

Eykholt doesn't think that a discussion is the panacea that we would like it to be.

Avery: Were there other things that the colleges are worried about besides what's been discussed so far?

Eykholt: Codes were in the midst of being changed and that's what upset the deans. Eykholt suggests that department codes simply refer to Section E rather than map it all out.

Gallagher: Asked deans to explain why the offset was a problem beyond the changes that were already occurring in codes, which were being redone anyway.

Lenk: There are a few things that really matter to faculty and titles are one of them. So too course surveys. Lenk therefore favors a discussion.

Hayne: There have been plenty of opportunities for representatives to offer their input.

Gallagher: The membership of the full faculty council can return the proposal to committee.

Lenk: There may be a lot of pressure from deans for members to turn it back.

Gallagher: Discussions are usually used early in the process. Committees then hear this and work on the idea. He has never seen a case where discussions were done at this stage.

Eykholt: If presented as a motion, one of two things will happen. Like E2, there are questions and people are satisfied or there are questions and people not satisfied. We can always move to informal discussion through a motion for such. If, for instance, we want to have a more wide-ranging discussion of this without a vote pending. At the end of that informal discussion period, we would then come out of it and the body would either vote it up or down or send it back to committee.

Eykholt continues: the advice on this promotion approach was amazingly consistent from reps to CoRSAF.

Gallagher: Mary, would you like to make a motion for this to be an action item?

Mary Meyer moves that we put Section E.13 on the agenda as an action item.

Linda Meyer seconded.

Avery: Miranda wants to wait. Understands the concern about talking something to death, but states that having some discussion next time might be a good idea.

Doe: Miranda uses the word “deplore” to describe his feelings about what he considers a two-tier faculty.

Mary Meyer: What Miranda says in his email is confusing.

Linda Meyer: CoRSAF is trying to accommodate.

Shulman: Is there a disadvantage to waiting until November?

Eykholt: The Board meets in December.

Mary Meyer: If departments or colleges are already underway changing codes then there’s a rationale for accelerating this, not slowing it down.

Linda Meyer: Would Miranda be more supportive of us in that case if we concur with him now?

Gallagher: Many things could happen here.

Shulman: I don’t see why we wouldn’t slow this down a little bit until such time as the deans and Provost are a bit more ready.

Lenk: There could be a discussion item, too. It’s really about calming the discontent.

Linda Meyer: What would provide the calming influence?

Lenk: The deans are looking for some direction from the Provost.

Gallagher: Are you ready to vote on Mary’s motion?

Avery: I would like to hear from Miranda directly.

Hayne: Would prefer to have the train wreck sooner rather than later.

Gallagher: Miranda can make a motion. He’s a non-voting member but can make a motion. All of the non-voting members have full powers on the FC but just can’t vote. All the options that would postpone it are still on the table. Let the FC membership decide whether to postpone.

Linda Meyer: Is there another Council of Deans meeting next week where someone could make a presentation to them?

Mary Meyer: It would be better for the deans to get this info sooner.

Shulman: It's an opportunity to get more people to understand, not just to cool off. If someone were asking for more time, why wouldn't we give it to them?

Gallagher: Time isn't of the essence but time is a factor. It's better if this is resolved sooner rather than later. FC has a plethora of options available. For instance, FC might decide to send it back to committee. But if FC thinks it's ready, then they can vote.

Doe: Would FC understand these options though?

Gallagher: I would be happy to explain to them.

Lenk: The deans are trying to get their ducks in a row. They want to get things right. Lenk is concerned about damage to shared governance. We have had this request from someone, Miranda, who is witnessing things going on.

Linda Meyer: Someone could pull the action item after Gallagher talks to Miranda.

Hayne: Likes Linda's idea. States: through this method we broadcast to as many people as possible that something is coming and, even if we table it for a month, that train is still on the tracks so people can cool down (or not) but the message still gets out.

Linda Meyer: Sooner is better than later to give people access to the promotions they've been waiting on and to signal to colleges that this is the direction we're going.

Mary Meyer: Possible change to my motion: We could vote to put it on the agenda with the understanding that there's going to be an email vote after we get more information. I'd like to get more information from my dean to know whether this would help my dean.

Gallagher: An amendment to your motion isn't necessary. This body always has the authority to pull something that's on the agenda. If we had an EC vote on Friday and, if we got 7 people to vote to pull it, it would get pulled. Knoll would send it out today and if 7 people say no, then it won't be on the agenda.

Shulman: Would you have time to talk to Miranda prior to Friday?

Gallagher: Yes, I can pretty much guarantee that I would make every effort to have a conversation between now and Friday before we would make this hypothetical vote on Friday.

Linda Meyer: This would also let Miranda know that we took his concerns seriously.

Gallagher: I will take a Friday email vote and will also invite Miranda to communicate with us separately if needed.

Lenk: Thinks that Sue and Margarita should go along.

Doe is leaving town on Thursday so they would have to meet tomorrow.

Gallagher: I would be willing to record the meeting.

Mary Meyer's motion passes.

Gallagher will talk with Miranda prior to Friday and will communicate with us.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda was not present. No report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following

It came up last week, the Section C motion, whether the amendment requires a 2/3 vote.

Mary Meyer: Salary equity study?

Gallagher: I don't have specific information.

Doe: Feels like it's right before the end of the year.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

The BOG has not met yet so no report was received.

D. Discussion Items

Possible report to Faculty Council on alternative transportation for CSU faculty and employees (*30 minutes requested w/PowerPoint*)
-Erika Benti, Parking Services Alternative Transportation Team

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

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