

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, November 13, 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; **Brad Goetz** substituting for Stephan Kroll, Agricultural Sciences; **Stephen Hayne**, Business; **Steven Reising**, Engineering; **Thomas Chermack**, Health and Human Sciences; **Michelle Wilde** substituting for Linda Meyer, Libraries; **Tara Teel**, Natural Resources; **Mary Meyer**, Natural Sciences; **Anne Avery**, CVMBS, **Dan Bush**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair, UCC; **Matt Hickey**, Chair, CoTL; **Marie Legare**, Chair, CoRSAF; **William Sanford**, CoSRGE

Absent: **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President (excused), **Linda Meyer**, Libraries (excused); **Stephan Kroll**, Agricultural Sciences (excused); **Steven Shulman**, Liberal Arts (excused)

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

DECEMBER 4, 2018 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

- I. **Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – December 4, 2018 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 - 4:00 p.m.**
 - A. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
 1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – February 5, 2019 – 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/>)
 - B. **MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**
 1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes –
 - C. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
 1. University Grievance Panel Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC meeting minutes –

E. ACTION ITEMS

F. 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

G. DISCUSSION

NOVEMBER 13, 2018 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: November 27, 2018 - 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration.

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on November 27, 2018.

B. *Action Items*

1. UCC meeting minutes - November 2, 2018

EC unanimously approved the November 2, 2018 UCC meeting minutes. The minutes will be placed on the December 4, 2018 FC meeting agenda.

2. Proposed revisions to Section E.11 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Sue Doe, Vice Chair, made a request to CoRSAF to edit the title of Section E.11 and add “Appeal of” Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments instead of “Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments”. CoRSAF approved Doe’s suggested title change.

Gallagher explained that this is intended to take the place of a grievance procedure, which doesn’t apply to NTTF.

Gallagher: Is this ready for debate on the floor of Faculty Council?

Legare: This proposal was written, predominantly, because there is no appeal process. It was something that was necessary. We needed some type of streamlined appeal process. We are replacing the old Section E.11 with this.

Lenk: Suggests that adding some information about contract employees would help since this is a newly enlarged group of employees due to the category of contract faculty.

Lenk also asks whether diminishing enrollments would be a major reason for using termination of a contract.

Legare: Clarifies that it has to be related to financial exigency.

Gallagher: There are Colorado statutes as well.

Legare: There are a couple things that have come up recently, so it was deemed necessary.

Wilde: Is there an equivalent process for those on continuing appointment?

Legare: Continuing appointments are not under contract. In my opinion, a contract gives you a bit more protection.

Lenk moved (Reising 2nd) to place the proposed changes to Section E.11 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* on the December 4, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda

Lenk's motion was approved.

3. Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – Application: U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents – CoSRGE

Bill Sanford spoke to the motion. This simply clarifies that admissions decisions are final.

Chermack: So ultimately, the decision comes to the department? You accept however many students you are going to accept.

Sanford: Yes.

Lenk moved (Avery 2nd) to place the proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin – Application: U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents* on the December 4, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved

4. Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin – Advisory System – CoSRGE*

Bill Sanford mentions his questions about the verbiage of faculty categories and discussion ensued.

Gallagher mentions that there are many locations where updates to faculty category types are needed.

Chermack asks about the initial (temporary) assignment of advisor and committee. Executive Committee agreed to come back to this.

Lenk moved (Reising 2nd) to place the proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin – Advisory System* on the December 4, 2018 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

5. New CIOSU: The Colorado Center for Cyber Security – CUP

CUP has not considered this proposal yet so we cannot consider this CIOSU. Tim sent an apology to Salman that we had inadvertently put this on the agenda. Mo Salman, Chair of CUP, says that CUP will review and will have it ready for our next EC meeting.

Chermack asks about approvals of committees on issues and how these are handled. He felt that his questions about a recent FC motion regarding a systems engineering doctorate were brushed off at the FC meeting. He is questioning the processes of FC. Is the floor of FC simply one of rubber stamping the work of committees. His question was "has the department considered the personnel implications" of the proposal and he didn't feel that he got a fair reading. Where are these questions asked if not on the floor of Faculty Council?

Reising had to miss the last FC meeting and asked for clarification. What is the real question relating to concerns about the new doctorate in systems engineering?

Chermack states that he had two main concerns about the systems engineering degree. He restates them as being faculty load and preventing a watered down Ph.D., and thus a concern about quality.

Lenk states that she felt bad about the absence of answers on the floor of FC. She explains that there actually are checks and balances on the floor of FC. On this case, relating to the systems engineering doctorate, those questions should have been asked on the University Curriculum Committee. We have a committee structure for the purpose of doing the vetting.

Avery states that someone wouldn't have proposed a program unless it was proposed by the program or unit.

Gallagher attends the Council of Deans meetings and they went through great details of the budget, the academic need, and a lot of vetting was done in the COD as well. There was significant vetting when they talked about the doctorate program. As Lenk pointed out, vetting occurs in many places.

Chermack is concerned about the research mission of CSU. I'm missing the alignment to what is the overarching mission of research at CSU.

Gallagher encouraged everyone on EC to share concerns with the committee in question on matters relating to any item that is proposed.

Dan Bush: The concept of a professional doctorate is that it is not a Ph.D. and is not dependent on generating original knowledge.

Gallagher encourages anyone with questions about the CIOSU proposal to talk to Salman, who represents CUP.

Lenk: I feel we are going to see more alternative forms of badges and such that do not look like traditional academic research.

Dan Bush: There are many scholarly missions relating to transmitting information out that are not consistent with a traditional research, new knowledge mission.

6. Review order of agenda in the Faculty Council Operating Procedures

Gallagher asked if EC members like having the Reports at the end of the Faculty Council meeting agenda. If so, on page 27 of today's agenda, we can change #4 to #6 and rearrange the agenda order.

Lenk moved (Mary Meyer 2nd) to change the order of the Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

C. Reports

1. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs – Dan Bush

Bush reported on the following:

No report. Bush and Miranda were at the APLU meeting. Attended the Cabinet meeting today and heard an update on the open forums for the presidential search. Think about these forums as a way to communicate your interests in the new president.

Bush's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

The Honorary Degree Committee has been formed. The Chair of FC is the Chair of the Honorary Degree Committee. The committee will be meeting soon. The nominations come through the Provost's office. Once the recommendations have been made and come to Executive Committee, we will pass along our recommendations to the Board of Governors.

The December FC meeting is on December 4. The Board meets December 5-6 at the system office in Denver.

The Board is being asked to change the super veto of the Administrative Professional Council. The Board is expected to approve this. There are two things that would have been subject to veto: 1) the University Review Committee, and; 2) Appendix 7, the Bullying Policy, which CoRSAF wants to amend.

Gallagher went to the APC meeting yesterday (as a non-voting member). He had given the APC Chair the proposal from CoRSAF and was surprised that Appendix 7 was voted down unanimously by APC due to a strikeout of wording about what a bystander is supposed to do if bullying is witnessed. AP members were convinced that due to the strikeout that you are not allowed to say “Hey stop that.” The proposal from CoRSAF does not say this. APC thought the language was precluding a bystander from pointing out a problem. He believes this is fixable so that CoRSAF and APC will have a conversation to iron this out.

Gallagher had a request from HHS for a special dispensation (waiver) to appoint a NTTF to UCC. Gallagher said he does not have the authority to do this. Gallagher pointed out that the Faculty *Manual* is clear on this so he has zero authority to granting waivers.

Gallagher’s report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reports that she was successful in making a case for private sessions for the Councils in regard to the search. Also requested a shorter intro to allow more time for questions since the informational sessions are only 45 minutes. Minutes will be taken and shared.

Lenk’s report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL will discuss the following:

Proposed changes to Section I.8 Student Course Survey.

Hickey is getting feedback, which is the main strategy. This survey is a carbon copy of the one we have already formatted but is on Qualtrix. It's an ongoing saga is with bugs and working with ACNS.

There are four documents with proposed changes. Reinforces language that was approved by FC last spring. No change in direction from last December.

The two Excel files have Phase 1 language when Stromberger was Chair. We needed to do Phase 1 (core set of questions; 25 or so questions). The other Excel file was a Phase 2 charge with reasonably accurate headers and classroom dynamics. A key point is that no one has to use all of these questions.

When test driving last April, there was no progress on Phase 2. Some of the discussion was more directed to the Phase 2 pieces. Have been in touch with other institutions. Stanford is ahead of us. How did it go? What was your rationale? They used an online platform as well.

One thing we are wrestling with is-- do we want to put out Phase 1 first, or position both at the same time?

Lenk: Has heard large resistance to just Phase 1. Phase 1 is about classroom instructors. Faculty Council may have a hard time with just one phase. Faculty want to see both phases before agreeing to the first one. It is a movement to say "students cannot evaluate teaching" so there's a clear perspective, adopted by the institution, to say that you cannot rely singly on student feedback.

Hickey explains what is going on at Southern California. Explains also that Ryerson in Toronto is changing their metric from number to letter. The national scene is that we are consonant with what others are doing. We are not putting disproportionate emphasis on student voice but are also not discounting the students can tell us something about our teaching. Clarifies that there is a difference between HR processes vs. T&P processes.

Avery: I'm very conflicted on this. People who are good teachers benefit from student feedback. At the same time, there is often an inverse relationship between high ratings and effectiveness of teaching.

Hickey: We have some time now and I can provide this group with all the information you need. TILT is determined to provide a toolbox of effective ways to providing evaluation data. This is a multifactorial process and TILT is working hard on it.

Bush: They are working on these things in TILT. This is being spearheaded to some degree by changes to NTTF and promotion processes. Units are going to need to be much more serious about their methods for evaluating faculty. A great time for our institution to have all the departments reviewing how they do reviews on success. Points out that course evaluations are highly unreliable measures of teaching effectiveness.

Avery : Then why are they included in the packet at all?

Bush: There is usually some discussion. I have never seen any evaluation with just student course surveys.

Gallagher points out that the conversation that is occurring here is a microcosm of what happens on the floor of FC. We need more conversations with Matt before the FC meeting—to have a rationale and organized debate on the floor of FC. Everything related to this topic is hard.

Avery: There are two questions: How do you use this to make your course better, and how is this used to evaluate faculty?

Mary Meyer: I don't think Student Course Surveys should be used at all for faculty evaluations.

Gallagher: Maybe the student opinion should go only to the faculty member and that no one else should ever see the course surveys--while others think the survey should be part of the process. How are we going to handle this? How is CoTL going to handle this?

Mary Meyer: Can we separate the two issues. Maybe replacing the old system with the new system and whether it can go in the file.

Lenk: One thing to consider is the cost of any alternative.

Bush: We judge ourselves all the time. If we're not using the same tool or not asking the right questions, then shame on us for not looking actively at peer evaluation, to have a form that looks at appropriate things.

Gallagher: Regarding question 23. My concern is that there are department heads who know that are changes afoot and pretend that they're using various tools when in fact they are using question 23 only. There is no way to catch them. Take question 23 away from them. If you don't take it away, they will use it and continue to use it.

Goetz: Is there something that requires a course survey of the institution? I thought the original course survey was administered by ASCSU. There's nothing that restricts a faculty member from asking these questions any day. What is requiring the institution to do this?

Hickey: Required in the *Manual* to be done.

Gallagher: You must do them according to the Faculty *Manual*. The problems of surveys in regard to race and gender with these suggests that we shouldn't do these at all. We should completely get rid of it. I'd like to see CoTL come forward with Phase 1 and 2 LENS and provide a way for faculty to receive feedback direct from students to improve classrooms but that administrators will have no way to access. Administrators shall not be permitted to ask for that information since this information is for the individual faculty member.

Mary Meyer: In the last 10 years, the university has grown by over 30% while TTF numbers have only grown by 7%. The student body has grown more than faculty.

Gallagher, Lenk, Meyer and Hayne recommend that the language shift/move from allowing administrators access to course survey information.

Hickey: Or we need to persuade you better.

Gallagher wonders if eventually OEO would see a suit forming due to a faculty member not getting tenure due to course evaluations when they are discriminatory.

Bush: Never have student evaluations been involved in a T&P decision in his experience.

Gallagher: Believes it happens but never reaches the Provost's office due to the way explained.

Avery doesn't want good teachers who are rigorous to be maligned.

Gallagher: On page 33 regarding "must be shared" quality of course surveys might be countered on the floor of FC with a counter position that "must not be shared." Recommends to Hickey that his committee think about this further which could put the entire LENS at risk.

Bush: There are alternative methods listed in the FC *Manual* already. Feedback such as "consistently shows up 20 minutes late" and this would be important.

Hayne: Couldn't that information simply be sent forward to the Chair by email?

Chermack: Does it need to be different processes for undergraduate and graduate students?

Gallagher: Would like to suggest that Hickey go back to his committee and share Executive Committee's remarks. We will have more EC meetings before February. When we ask Hickey to join us, we can see how this conversation has progressed.

Teel: How is it going to work to do the online evaluations? Do we allow class time? How do we ensure participation? It will be immediately available via your CANVAS page even if you're not using CANVAS as your platform.

Hickey: They will see the link for two weeks but faculty will designate a date to administer and hence on that day students should bring their tablet. There will be a narrative that Hickey and TILT send out to be helpful with offering a preface when administering the surveys.

2. UGO evaluation

Lenk said it is coming along.

Chermack apologizes for taking the meeting in the direction about how agreements are made and desiring more time for discussion and the sense of being divorced from most of the discussion and decision-making.

Gallagher states that this group can raise questions, ask questions of the standing committees, or ask questions that come from EC, which we have the right to do.

Chermack: My intent only was to achieve some consistency in regard to the professional doctorate. For instance, if we lose track of the research mission, then I'd like to join the committee that deals with such questions earlier in the process. Do we really want to get into the business of awarding online doctorates?

Gallagher: There are some good conversations that go on around our table where there's a good record kept in terms of detailed minutes while on the Council of Deans there is a very sketchy record maintained.

Bush: We could request that Kathy Duquoin capture a bit more.

Gallagher: It would make our decision-making better if we saw more details. These are lengthy conversations so it would reflect admirably on the Deans and Provost if this information came out.

Chermack: And what about NTT faculty growth?

Gallagher: Doe has pointed this out that we need to address the ratio of TTF to NTTF. Tony has been promising to hold the line on this for 10 years.

Chermack was disappointed with the Q&A around the implications of the professional doctorate. Chermack is advising eight online graduate students who are not counted in any way in terms of his load.

Bush: CSU Online—we have to also be aware of student learning outcomes, research and the value of flipped classrooms and models that relate to the delivery of instruction in ways that go beyond traditional classroom delivery.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

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