

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, October 9, 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; **Thomas Chermack**, 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; **Tony Frank**, President; **Dan Bush**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Absent: **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President (excused)

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

NOVEMBER 6, 2018 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

- I. **Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – November 6, 2018 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 - 4:00 p.m.**
 - A. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
 1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – December 4, 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**
 1. Faculty Council Standing Committee Elections – Undergraduate Student Representatives – CoFG
 - 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 meeting minutes –

F. ACTION ITEMS

G. DISCUSSION

OCTOBER 9, 2018 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. September 18, 2018

Executive Committee unanimously approved placing the September 18, 2018 Executive Committee meeting minutes on the Faculty Council website.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: October 16, 2018 - 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration.

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on October 16, 2018.

B. *Action Items*

1. UCC minutes – September 21 and 28, 2018

Lenk moved (Hayne 2nd) to place the September 21 and 28, 2018 UCC minutes on the November 6, 2018 FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

C. *Reports*

1. President – Tony Frank

Frank reported on the following:

Frank reviewed points about the presidential search as discussed at the October Faculty Council meeting.

Frank's report was received.

2. Dan Bush, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Bush reported on the following:

There are a lot of questions regarding NTTF new policies out there relating to percent effort and other things. Bush has formed an Implementation Committee to solve the problems. They are talking about solutions to move us forward.

Avery: Supervisor training program. Is anyone overseeing that process for the surveys overall?

Bush: Talk to Marsha Benedetti.

Lenk: We understand you are right at the heartbeat of where everyone is. Any information or advice on areas to help us with others for updates.

Bush mentions the potential problem with the offset of the appointments. Differential around classes of NTTF.

Bush's report was received.

3. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Gallagher: We had the ballot that went out to all voting EC meeting and No was pull it and put it on the November agenda. Thanks to EC for participating. Share with EC about meeting with Marie Legare and Jenny Morse. A very positive meeting. Touched on some of the things Bush referred to. CoRSAF has been firmly supportive of the promotion structure since mid-spring. Morse was upfront about the reaction of the NTTF that was majority supportive of the offset but not unanimous. There are good people with views that will be heard at the FC meeting, Asked Legare if she would put together a document in consultation with rest of CoRSAF and with CoNTTF addressing some of the many issues kicked around and get ahead of it. This would provide more than just making the proposals, give a rationale and be done with it. It would be better to get out ahead by a week or two to explain some items. She is going to create such a document and that CoRSAF will discuss what should go into the document. This may positively impact the process. Gallagher's agenda is to

facilitate the process so that thoughtful conversations can occur so that we know what the issues are.

Lenk: Supports the idea of discussion. It might be tweaked into a better solution.

Gallagher: We have had two full-blown discussions on this and CoRSAF has reached out a lot. This is not something that nine people are trying to ram down the throats of people but have instead have sought various perspectives.

Kroll: What do we tell department and colleges until and unless we know what that outcome is in November? Some are already in motion.

Gallagher: They move ahead at some risk. E.13 hasn't been approved yet. One of the things Legare emphasized is that CoRSAF has bent over backwards to try to not be prescriptive. Trying to provide latitude. I think we have a culture of allowing colleges and departments a high level of autonomy. CoRSAF has been attempting to reinforce this through their processes.

Chermack: It would be helpful for my unit to see the document Legare produces.

Teel: Would Legare provide an overview at the FC meeting?

Gallagher: Both Legare and Morse have been thoughtful and have worked to reach out to various constituencies and stakeholders. They are trying to find the right thing for the whole campus.

Gallagher's report was received.

4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

Board of Governors meeting was last Thursday and Friday (October 4-5, 2018). Lenk will provide a summary that will be added to the November FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. 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

Gallagher discussed with some faculty re: reports at FC meetings. We need to discuss keeping FC reports shorter.

Lenk: Do our business at the beginning and leave the reports at the end as some faculty feel held hostage?

Miranda is willing to look at the light system for reports so time is not exceeded.

Lenk: Feels that faculty don't have access to the Provost.

Shulman: I think for a lot of faculty in FC, it's too long and creates a difficult environment to get people engaged in FC. I agree with putting the reports to the end. I think the Provost should give a written report and the Provost can answer questions afterwards. I support doing action items first.

Avery: Feels all the reports should be written and then questions answered after reading the reports.

Mary Meyer proposes they give PowerPoints, and if faculty wants to ask questions, they can contact them later.

Gallagher: Will follow up with this discussion next week.

2. UGO evaluation

Gallagher: The calendar says we start the process for the UGO evaluation. Linda Meyer has been very generous in taking over the work that Nancy Hunter did using Survey Monkey. Gallagher wants EC members to contemplate if these questions are reasonably good, or whether new questions are needed. The ball is starting to roll. The actual report is in the spring semester that goes to the Provost and the Chair of Physics.

Teel: Is the target population for people that have gone through the grievance process? If the grievance did not go in the right direction, then does this bias the evaluation?

Gallagher: We deal with that very issue every year. EC members have seen the results through the appropriate lens. EC has done a good job with writing the final report with that objectivity in mind. For those of you that are new, it is kind of an interesting process. This survey goes to everyone who has interacted with the UGO during the year.. He is the only one that knows who interacted with him throughout the year. Once the survey is completed in Survey Monkey, the results will go to Linda, who will bring the results to EC.

Hayne: So is this people that called with general questions and a grievance?

Gallagher: If you want to give some guidance to Eykholt, as to what constitutes a contact, we can do that if the group feels this is desirable.

Hayne: There must be more than 17 who contact the UGO so can we capture the information from the many who are not represented in this 17?

Avery: There were a number of people who last year were unhappy with outcomes but indicated satisfaction with the UGO.

Gallagher: There's a little bit of checks and balances since there are numbers from each.

Lenk: The UGO should have a staff person who supports him.

Avery, Hayne and Chermack: There could be an accountability and verification system. This is Lenk's area of expertise.

Lenk: The data that's missing: What are the obstacles to why people are not contacting the UGO?

Gallagher: There are many people who just want to be heard and few who actually need the formal services of the UGO.

Lenk: Do we evaluate the person or the position of UGO?

Gallagher: The person. Did this person perform well as the person who oversees the office of UGO. This is the UGO's annual evaluation in regard to this position.

Shulman: We could add some questions that would suggest the range of ways in which people interacted with the UGO. The person who is being evaluated shouldn't be able to exercise any authority over who is doing the evaluation. Could someone be tasked to keep track of calls?

Dan Bush: That compromises the people who don't want to be known.

Lenk: There are ways this can be outsourced so that it's not an in-house person who collects the information

Hayne: Two things: there are other items of measurement that could be used beside the one managed by the officer. Some governance oversight OR some kind of technological solution.

Shulman: Collect survey information from the whole campus to see who has interacted with the UGO.

Lenk: What about asking people who don't contact the UGO why that is?

Dan Bush: Only those who have interacted should be contacted to assess his performance. What was the nature of the contact?

Gallagher: There are often good outcomes without formal grievance. Come next week with suggestions for changes to the survey. What the group decides is what we will do.

Discuss the order of elements in the Faculty Council agenda
(Faculty Council Operating Procedures)

Gallagher: We do have Operating Procedures for FC and can change them if we want to. We have to figure out the details of how this is going to work and, if so, what will the new wording look like. There is a problem that needs to be solved is what I am hearing.

Lenk: Bring possible templates of what the new Operating Procedures could be.

Chermack: It is predicated on whether faculty reads the reports or not. We want to get to the dialogue faster is what I am hearing. However, if faculty is coming unprepared, we are missing the point.

Hayne: Likes the red light, green light idea. It's more agnostic on the person that has to deliver the message.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:18 p.m.

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