

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, October 16, 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**, CVMBBS; **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: **Kelly Long**, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs

Absent:

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: September 18, 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. University Grievance Panel Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance

3. 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

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

G. DISCUSSION

OCTOBER 16, 2018 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. September 25, 2018

Executive Committee unanimously approved placing the September 25, 2018 EC meeting minutes on the Faculty Council website.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: October 23, 2018 - 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration.

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on October 23, 2018. We have this week and next week to make substantive changes to the Faculty Council agenda. When we meet on October 30, we have to make sure the agenda is ready to go.

B. *Action Items*

1. UCC minutes – October 5, 2018

The October 5, 2018 UCC minutes were unanimously approved by Executive Committee and will be placed on the November FC meeting agenda.

2. Proposed revisions to the All-University core curriculum (AUCC) language and requirements – UCC

Kelly Long, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, also serves as *ex officio* on UCC. We were engaged by the Department of Higher Education, all who are part of the gtPathways transfer protocol. We were asked to consider learning outcomes that could be shared across institutions. Smooth transfer and better coherence and academic rigor around the core. We began to talk about a set of outcomes deriving from the LEAP out of AAC&U, which was a set of 11 learning outcomes around which students should develop good outcomes. 11 was a lot to ask

of every course, so peers were brought together at Face-to-Face meetings. We talked about our disciplines and content criteria. We assessed whether the content criteria fit the disciplines, then looked at learning outcomes for various disciplines. We divvied them up, parsed them out as reasonable. So for history, they allowed inquiry to go to the sciences and information literacy was kept. Math was comfortable with quantitative reasoning. CDHE said we should deploy these outcomes in a staged manner. We have been working steadily on these SLOs. For instance, faculty could either use the language lock, stock and barrel, or map their own preferred language that addressed the same thing. Composition, QN reasoning, sciences –all are mostly all done. Now moves into the other areas and addresses the substance of the proposal before us.

Parts B, C, D, and E are mostly in the liberal arts. The UCC decided to use this opportunity to map diversity and global awareness (a university strategic planning objective) onto not just one area but instead would incorporate diversity throughout. Also, 25% of the course requirement must be completed through written work. This was already in place. Also, oral communication of importance so both written and oral modes of expression are both in there. Would call the shifts to the core as “fundamental” instead of “basic.”

The long section of the proposal has this all in full form, “blasted out,” for faculty review. It won’t show up this way when it goes into the Catalog but would instead be a link. Provost’s office felt we should get the whole thing in front of the Faculty.

Gallagher: From a logistical point of view, when we are asking to make changes to the *Manual*, we strike out words and underline additions. So what is Faculty Council being asked to do? Would this be a link that would go to the full explanation?

Long: We will be very explicit about this. We are proposing what we would like the Catalog to look like, which is a kind of contract which gives faculty guidance on what is assured. There are amendments that never made their way into the Catalog in 2007, but in this case, we would make these things more visible than they were made then.

The UCC has debated how to present this to Faculty Council. Let’s move this ahead so that we can get on with business. The CLA is waiting on the approval to FC to approve the changes so that they can make the changes to the courses.

Miranda has to sign that he verifies that every course that is on the

gtPathways transfer list that embraces these outcomes has incorporated—at the level of the syllabus declaration—the student learning outcomes.

Shulman: So this is a State mandate. What happens if FC votes it down?

Long: I'm not sure. People could say pull out writing or pull out diversity, so I guess it would go back to the AUCC. Long doesn't believe FC will vote it down.

Gallagher: What is it exactly that Faculty Council is being asked to approve?

Long: Asking for approval to the preface and the slate of changes to the curriculum. Now because we're adding more than the state required, diversity and writing, we thought we should bring this in front of the FC.

Lenk: Held to an "academic mindset." Put responsibility on faculty.

Long: We can clarify.

Linda Meyer: Is this to appear at November FC meeting?

Long: Yes, we hoped it would be on the October agenda.

Linda Meyer: Last points were most important: This is mandated by the State.

Long: This is mandated by the State but these items are not required currently—writing and diversity. This makes overt the policy that has been in place since 2007. The writing is not without support. GTAs at 1:90 students.

Lenk: Requests that "academic mindset" be defined.

Gallagher: Requests that Long get a revised memo to us by next week.

Shulman: Appreciates that Long will come to CLA. String of learning outcomes, but what are the consequences of not achieving these SLOs? How is this going to affect my life?

Long: There are no consequences for students not achieving the outcomes, but in terms of the syllabus, if it is not addressing the SLOs will result in being called up (by the State). The LEAP agenda came with a "values rubric" which are assessment measures. The faculty elected not to

use the rubric. But in a department like Sue Doe's, there's a wide conversation about outcomes.

Lenk: There are various people who have risen to make this come to an agreement and the exciting changes that it articulates. This is a chance to thank those faculty who have done the hard work for this.

Miranda: Regarding consequences. It was proposed that the Provost would sign that this was being implemented. He resisted this. Catalog and syllabi language could be verified, but not what faculty are actually doing in classrooms.

Long is proud that CSU has decided to take this up a level and make it reflect local values, like diversity.

Gallagher will address the AUCC proposal again at the October 23 meeting.

3. New Degree: Master of Agribusiness Innovation Management, Plan C, be established *effective Fall 2019* in the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics Resources, Warner College of Natural Resources – UCC

Reising moved (Kroll 2nd) to place the New Degree: Master of Agribusiness Innovation Management, Plan C, be established *effective Fall 2019* in the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics Resources, Warner College of Natural Resources on the November 6 FC meeting agenda.

Reising's motion was approved.

4. New Degree: Master of Conservation Leadership, Plan C, be established *effective Spring 2019* in the Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources, Warner College of Natural Resources – UCC

Hayne moved (Linda Meyer 2nd) to place the New Degree: Master of Conservation Leadership, Plan C, be established *effective Spring 2019* in the Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources, Warner College of Natural Resources on the November 6, FC meeting agenda.

Hayne's motion was approved.

5. New Professional Doctorate: Doctor of Systems Engineering, be established *effective Spring 2019* in Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering – UCC

Chermack had a series of questions regarding the first professional doctorate. Why is this shift occurring and can this degree be done completely online?

Miranda explains the history of this new doctorate. The next one is likely to be the professional doctorate in Occupational Therapy. The professional doctorate is sometimes the more appropriate terminal degree than the doctorate.

Gallagher: The structure was approved last year.

Avery: Is there a licensing body associated with this?

Miranda: ABET accreditation involved but not a license.

Hayne: There's neither yet. (Hayne has been involved on several committees.)

Chermack: Should this be called a Ph.D.? This might work for folks in the School of Education. Maybe an EdD could be offered as a professional doctorate.

Hayne: How is this funded? Who funds the faculty who oversee these students? What will be the size of the cohorts?

Miranda: Students pay. These are mostly mid-level or senior professionals in the field. There is tuition sharing when offered online. Provost's office has also funded a few faculty lines outside of the sharing. Affected departments were asked to sign an MOU.

Chermack: A big question is how many students can we take under this program?

Gallagher: Are we ready to place this on the agenda for the November meeting as an action item? Is this item ready to sustain debate on the floor of Faculty Council?

Lenk moved (Mary Meyer 2nd) to place the New Professional Doctorate: Doctor of Systems Engineering, be established *effective Spring 2019* in Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering on the November 6, FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

Gallagher: One more item. We had a conversation about trying to go through the *Manual* to create gender-neutral language throughout the *Manual*. Who is going to do it? What will the process be? This item will be discussed at a future Executive Committee meeting.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Apologized for missing EC last week and explained that he was at a longer than normal Department of Higher Ed meeting. Stated that it's a good initiative by the state and he will give a fuller briefing about it at a later date.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Reported that Marie Legare has written a document with involvement of all of CoRSAF and that document will be distributed to the FC membership. The document will be distributed in time for Faculty Council to digest it before the next Faculty Council meeting.

Gallagher will send a note to all of the FC membership encouraging participation in the Climate Survey. He is planning to send a reminder one week before November 1.

Avery finds the survey not entirely appropriate for faculty and their concerns.

Gallagher points out that faculty don't think of themselves as employees. We need to participate.

Chermack: A reminder would be helpful. He's not sure why it takes people so long to participate.

Lenk is humbled by being asked to serve on the presidential search committee and is trying to become informed and responsible to the task.

Gallagher: Will the search be closed?

Lenk: Upon doing homework has come to understand the value of the closed search.

Miranda: The official protocol is that the search committee has to decide.

Mary Meyer: Wants to go on record as saying that if it's a closed search, then the faculty need to select their representation rather than representation being determined by the administration. I think it should be the Board representative, but there should be more than two people than rather a number of elected representatives.

Lenk: I was elected to the position as representative to the Board of Governors.

Meyer and others: I understand that but also think we need additional reps.

Chermack: How would we get additional reps?

Meyer: We could elect more reps via Faculty Council.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

No report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. UGO evaluation

Gallagher: Ideas were suggested at the last meeting. Gallagher's idea: the changes could be put into place for the 2019 evaluation. How we track the processes with the UGO. But what are we going to do for 2018? Gallagher passes out to the questionnaire that has been used for several years. Would like to reach closure on the 2018 evaluation. What is it that

we could do going forward? Then let's talk about changes for next year so that Eykholt changes processes for next year. How are we going to conduct the 2018 UGO evaluation?

Linda Meyer: Responses last year went to the survey collector after Eykholt sends the surveys out to people.

Gallagher: Does not deny that this is a somewhat problematic process but we have the immediate problem of 2018.

Reising: So the people who have come to the UGO needing Eykholt's advice have already received this survey?

Gallagher: No, Eykholt is standing by ready to send it out but has not yet done so. When people respond, the UGO does not see the results. Is this printout something we want to use this year, or change some things and leave most to change next year?

Avery: Was the individual responding the complainant, or the person responding? In Survey Monkey, is there a way to clarify who the respondent is?

Reising: You could have two different surveys—one to the complainants and one to the respondents.

Mary Meyer: I was thinking about Margarita's comments last time. What if we had the first one, "I wanted to contact the UGO but didn't for the following reasons." In the preamble or email, if you've never thought about using the services of the UGO, then disregard. This would go out to all faculty and APs.

Miranda: Evaluation of the UGO or the process?

Mary Meyer: It would get more information, plus the information we're already getting. And this would bypass the problem of the UGO sending it out.

Lenk: This would give people deeper belief in the culture.

Doe: We would need a task force to undertake changes since it's somewhat sensitive.

Miranda: What is the period we are evaluating? Why do we do this in October and November instead of later?

Linda Meyer: It doesn't say when we end the evaluation only when we start it. We are beginning the process.

Mary Meyer: It's not complicated to send an email that puts respondents into three categories: 1) I wanted to; 2) I'm a complainant; 3) I'm a respondent.

Gallagher asks Lenk to form a small task force to revise this document, run it by Eykholt, and then bring it back to EC next time.

Linda Meyer: Does anyone have ideas for different questions? They seem pretty good.

Gallagher: It was just revised a few years ago.

Teel: Find out not only about the nature of the interaction but also the outcome. My initial reaction last time was that someone who had a bad outcome might be biased in their answers to the questions. I'm not sure if there's a fix here given confidentiality concerns.

Gallagher: One issue is that in many of these instances, there's often a compromise that the UGO helped to facilitate.

Mary Meyer: It could be--Are you satisfied?

Gallagher : Alternative suggestion: It seems a bit unfair to change this so late in the game in terms of Eykholt. If we're really talking about changing this, do a more systematic look in a not-rushed way.

Lenk: I don't think we're talking about substantial changes.

Linda Meyer: Were you contacted by the UGO? Additional question: I would feel comfortable contacting the UGO?

Gallagher: I think we would lose many responses if we sent one question out to faculty and APs because people ignore these things. If you get a personal email from the UGO, then the response is likely to be greater.

Lenk: Maybe we do both.

Gallagher: I wouldn't want to dump the traditional approach because we get a pretty good response rate.

Avery: One of the goals in the broader email would be to catch anyone who the UGO didn't contact.

Gallagher: The broader distributed survey would get at not just that but also the people who didn't approach the UGO at all in order to learn why.

Chermack: So there seem to be two different surveys.

Mary Meyer: It could be just one link.

Linda Meyer: The people who interacted with the UGO would get two emails.

Chermack: What I'm hearing is that we would have to build a second survey.

Lenk: One link but two different sets of questions.

Gallagher: If Margarita and Linda are able to find a path, then bring this back to the Executive Committee.

Lenk seeks clarification as to whether the existing survey is okay for those to whom it pertains.

All EC members affirm.

2. Follow-up discussion re: 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:: FC leadership approached by Erika Benti, who would like to talk to the FC about parking services. However, the action items are building up. Last week's discussion seemed to suggest that there are many people who want to get in front of the faculty to get their message out. We at this table are charged with setting priorities since we set the agenda. We don't want to be unkind but membership asks why are we doing this during the FC meeting. It's a balancing act so please share your views.

Lenk: I recall going through strategic planning efforts that led to higher rates for parking which amounts to a cut in pay. Is this about a rate increase?

Gallagher: I don't know. We can make our distribution list available to appropriate users and invite them to solicit information offline rather than during the meeting. After all, what happens is people get worked up about parking? What if we don't get to the action items?

Reising: This particular presentation seems to be focused on alternatives to parking. We could ask them to wait until February.

Gallagher: Does everyone agree that the action items are building up? [wide agreement] Shall I suggest that they come in February?

Mary Meyer: Maybe we need a whole outline of what they want to say in the report.

Chermack: Yes, we need enough information to know whether it's an appropriate topic for a FC meeting.

Lenk speaks to the covered bike locations, bike maintenance, etc. Such information could be distributed by email. Ask for an outline and then we determine if it's appropriate.

Gallagher will contact Benti and request a possible report in February.

3. Follow-up discussion re: Discuss the order of elements in the Faculty Council agenda (Faculty Council Operating Procedures)

Gallagher: Let us continue our conversation from last week relative to the location of reports on the agenda. What are our feelings on this?

Mary Meyer: I don't have a general opinion, but the meeting in May was taken up by awards. We didn't have enough time to do important things.

Gallagher: I'll make a note of that.

Lenk: I would like to put the action items early and put the reports from the FC chair, Provost, and President toward the end.

Gallagher: We could do announcements quickly. I want more thoughts on getting to the action items sooner.

Chermack: Are you talking about the timer idea?

Gallagher: That was one idea. Each giver of a report would have a certain amount of time and we would use a light and timer. The Board itself does this so it's not unheard of.

Chermack: Deliver reports in written form for review and go straight to Q&A.

Reising: The Provost sometimes has breaking information. You're sort of self-regulating, so I would be against timers and advanced reports. I'm conservative and in favor of keeping the current format.

Chermack: Sometimes a report may be lengthy and then the Q&A gets shortchanged and that's frustrating. It would be a shame to kill the conversation around the report.

Gallagher: We could put a time limit on Q&A. If we could enforce that, this would help. For instance, "We will now have 10 minutes for Q&A." I don't want to police or have the appearance of cutting off critical comments but we do have a bunch of action items.

Avery: I am in favor of not limiting the Q&A but rather the reports.

Linda Meyer: I believe there would be value in moving the reports up front. That way the Q&A could go on as long as people want without sacrificing the action items.

Reising moves that we move the Action Items before the Reports.

Mary Meyer: Recommends this change in FC agenda: A, B, C, E, F, D, G

Chermack: If Q&A goes beyond 6 p.m., that's up to people as to whether they stay.

Gallagher: We would need to change our Operating Procedures, which we could do.

Lenk: How about if we try it for a month *without* changing the Operating Procedures and see how it goes?

Gallagher: The motion is to move the Action Items before the Reports.

Unanimously approved.

Lenk moves that D 2 and 3—the reports from the Chair and the BOG Rep, stick to a time limit.

Reising: No need to formalize.

Gallagher and Lenk will try to limit themselves to 5 minutes.

Reising: Except at the beginning of the semester.

Gallagher: Correct. I don't want to have this etched in stone.
There may be a need for more time, from time to time.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

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