

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, December 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; **Ali Pezeshki** substituting for Steven Reising, Engineering; **Carole Makela** substituting for Thomas Chermack, Health and Human Sciences; **Steven Shulman**, Liberal Arts, **Michelle Wilde** substituting for Linda Meyer, Libraries; **Tara Teel**, Natural Resources; **Anne Avery**, CVMBS, **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: **Marie Legare**, CoRSAF; **Frank Garry**, Extension Specialist for CVMBS and Provost's Council for Engagement; **Don Estep**, Chair, CoFG

Absent: **Steven Reising**, Engineering (excused); **Linda Meyer**, Libraries (excused); **Tom Chermack**, Health and Human Sciences (excused); **Mary Meyer**, Natural Sciences (excused)

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

FEBRUARY 5, 2019 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – February 5, 2019 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 - 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – March 5, 2019 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 – 4:00 p.m.
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website:

[\(http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/\)](http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes –

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

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

DECEMBER 11, 2018 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. November 13 and 27, 2018

Doe moved (Hayne 2nd) to place the November 13 and 27, 2018 EC meeting minutes on the Faculty Council website.

Doe's motion was approved.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: December 18, 2018 - 3:00

Gallagher: Does Executive Committee want to meet on December 18, or wait until January 15, 2019 for the next EC meeting? We will have two more EC meetings after January 15--before the February 5, 2019 Faculty Council meeting.

Executive Committee unanimously agreed not to meet on December 18 and convene again on January 15, 2019.

B. *Action Items*

1. Proposed revisions to Section E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Legare spoke to motion. CoRSAF started working on this about four years ago. Frank Garry, Extension Specialist and member on the Provost's Council for Engagement, also joined Legare.

Legare: Substantial changes with new verbiage. Two years in the making.

Teel: On page 5, Section E.12.3.6. It lists serving as an undergraduate advisor as a service. Wondering if that is something our school should reconsider or if it would be moved to teaching?

Legare: It wasn't just advising a single undergraduate student. May need more clarification.

Teel: More for a certain type of appointment?

Legare: Yes. Maybe dealing with all graduates from a department.

Avery: What prompted this big change?

Legare: Puts more pressure on the faculty member to clarify the effort associated with service with evidence needing to be provided.

Gallagher: You are talking about a proposed link?

Legare: It was for engagement. We thought if we put a link in here, it would show different types of engagement and outreach. Not part of the *Manual*, but a part for better definitions.

Garry: We felt we did a good job explaining what engagement was, but giving them access to a link for other ideas is what we felt was a good idea. We didn't want to clutter the *Manual* with this. We have an entire Office of Engagement for the university, making it easier for others to explore.

Lenk: Digital measures provides opportunity for documenting engagement and also to suggest how people might deepen their involvement in engagement.

Doe: Brought EC's attention to certain features of the organization of the document—E.12 and extension.

Legare: We did add extension to E.12. It was never in the original service piece.

Shulman: Glad to see some emphasis on the different expectations for service for people in different ranks. Full professors need to step up to the plate and carry their full weight. There is nothing wrong with Associate Professors on Faculty Council, but as you go up in rank, you are expected to carry more service burden. Good to have in here.

Doe: Asks Shulman: How do you reconcile these two things—more senior faculty taking responsibility for service but the job of

documentation not falling on chairs? How do you document or evaluate that?

Shulman: States concern about piling on responsibility on chairs. Enumeration vs. evaluation of service—now a more elaborate enterprise that falls onto shoulders of Chairs. Wouldn't it be enough to enumerate? Number of committees you are on, professional associations.

Legare: The idea is to put more burden on the shoulders of the faculty member to do the documentation.

Gallagher: When we talk about enumerating, it doesn't tell the whole story. There is a qualitative element there that the department chair has an obligation to see if the faculty was involved and if they have done anything. Not all service or even committee work is the same, so enumeration is not enough.

Makela: There may be too much here for the *Manual*. There might be more delineation in department codes instead of all the information occurring here.

Miranda: I have a few remarks to make. This goes to the categorization question. I don't think of extension service as a separate service. 12.3.5 may not be conveying what it needs to convey. 12.3.6 too much detail written here around exactly what's expected, which constrains rather than assists. It would be more useful to stay simpler.

Legare: We have limited expertise in this area. May have Ashley Stokes look at this. Like before, there wasn't even clinical service in this before.

Hayne: Associate Professor guidance is too much spelled out and in worrisome ways since Associate Professors are in the prime of their productive period and the message seems to be that the Associate Professor should be stepping up for more service.

Teel: Along the lines of it being a lot of detail, as Carol suggested, more of this could go into department codes since every unit would be different rather than a generalized expectation.

Legare states back what she heard about more general information for the *Manual* and detail moving into the department codes.

Miranda: Addressing instructor ranks. Questions about the statement that no service is required is an over-reach since it suggests that they are forbidden from service. Also, the section on department heads needing to maintain their teaching and research also over-reaches. The dean's job is to set the expectations for the chair's activities. Workload variations should not be forbidden through the language here. In 12.3.8, in terms of the section on department heads being responsible for the dossier, this is not necessarily the case. 12.3.9 somewhat problematic. If you're on leave without pay to take advantage of some other opportunity or activity, then it shouldn't be necessary to show exceptional strength in the area associated with the leave reason, only that you have acceptable strength. Then under Public Service in this category, why shouldn't this be ok? If you're the primary editor of a journal, then that's not local service but instead it's professional and national service. You don't jump into something like this for a year—rather you coordinate this with your chair and dean and that should be just fine for meeting service needs.

Shulman: I'm a little confused why sections 12.3.7 and 12.3.8 need to be in here? There's not an equivalent for teaching. This is the section on job responsibilities, not tenurable activity.

Legare: Many are not credited for service they do for P&T. For the service that we do, we need some recommendations for how this is presented and evaluated.

Lenk: Some places on campus are putting 10% service for NTTF but then requiring more than 10% of them.

Gallagher: Deans should be putting pressure on department heads to prevent this kind of thing from happening and keeping an eye on these things.

Legare: We can add a sentence. CoRSAF will bring this back for EC to revisit in late January or early February.

Garry: Any further questions about engagement?

Miranda: Also, 12.4 is fine.

Gallagher: Let's plan on revisiting Section E.12 late January or early February.

2. Proposed revisions to Sections C.2.1.9.5 and D.2 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* - CoFG

Don Estep (Chair, CoFG): I will give you some history of how this proposal was written. Two problems came up at the same time when Mary Stromberger was Chair of FC and Dan Turk was Chair of CoRSAF. Issue 1: How do we get faculty input into complex policy issues? 2) When someone (a faculty member) has a problem with a policy and wants to address it but eventually the issue reaches someone, a supervisor, who has a conflict (of interest) in terms of the question. Estep reports that CoFG had a working group that worked on this for a long time and included state classified, admin pros, faculty, and Bob Schur, who checked for consistency. CoFG got feedback from CoRSAF. The document addresses getting input in a systematic basis and the problem of getting input when there's some conflict that emerges.

Estep is suggesting that this committee would meet on an as-needed basis on only large-scale university policy issues.

Lenk: It seems like we've grown to the point where this kind of policy committee is needed. Likes that there's a shared governance approach being proposed here.

Avery: Would this address an issue like parking?

Estep: It could. It's very difficult to get faculty input on policies or even on changes to the Code. How do you do that? Would assure that stakeholder input is obtained.

Makela: Policy and policy change is not generally understood and so this committee would also assure dissemination of information on policies.

Gallagher: Part of this is Section C and part is Section D. It doesn't make sense to have one part pass and not the other. How should we handle this? Would Section C go first, which requires a 2/3 vote (Code), followed by Section D with a simple majority vote?

Avery: How would input be obtained—Survey Monkey, going out to departments, or what? There's good ways to gather data and not so good ways.

Estep: We would need staff support.

Miranda: Policy proposals currently go from a stated need and then Cabinet decides who should take responsibility for the policy—who should develop it and who should implement it? The Cabinet hears the data and then makes a proposal, followed by the President. Once a need has been identified, this committee might be important to the stakeholder representation of data. How many entities would be involved? How to use the committee?

Estep: This proposal doesn't preclude getting any stakeholder input. The committee will identify stakeholders. Once they've identified a policy need, the policy committee then determines stakeholders and divides up the responsibility.

Lenk: Maybe the policy office would go out and get the stakeholder info.

Avery: There's development of policy and unhappiness with policy that needs correction—two different parts.

Gallagher: Would someone wish to make a motion to create these two changes for the February Faculty Council meeting?

Avery moved (Teel 2nd) to place the proposed revisions to Sections C.2.1.9.5 and Section D.2 on the February 5, 2019 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Avery's motion was approved.

Lenk: Do we have two meetings before the next FC meeting?

Gallagher: Yes, but we would need to email Section C.2.1.9.5 by January 22 to faculty for review as this is a Code change and two weeks in advance is required.

Estep: Robert Schur, Executive Director, Office of Policy and Compliance, has had enormous input into this.

Lenk: This would only function well if there were good relationships with the policy office.

Estep: The committee would represent the faculty, so it's functioning well if it's representing the stakeholders.

Miranda: Bob Schur indicates he could use some help getting stakeholder input.

Gallagher: If we think this is ready to sustain debate then we can put it on the agenda for FC; if it's not ready then we don't.

Shulman: Would policy proposals be required to go through this committee?

Estep: I guess someone could propose a policy and not use the committee, but they wouldn't be able to claim stakeholder input. This committee could refer things to other committees such as CoRSAF.

Lenk: When working with organizations, Lenk finds that there are structures that sometimes become locations for working around.

Gallagher polls EC members. Doe would like more time to think about it. Shulman is not sure what more might be added. Avery is okay either way. Makela wonders how the committee would work with groups like the libraries. Pezeshki has not heard substantial changes but also has not heard enthusiasm. Lenk would like more time.

Kroll: What would happen between now and January 15?

Gallagher: We would have to make all changes on the 15th.

Kroll: Would we be doing some homework between now and January 15?

Gallagher: We would have to ask Don to do some homework.

Estep: There could be friendly amendments. It has been written by committee.

Teel: I would be supportive and have no comments to address.

Shulman: I'm confused by this but I don't have a strong feeling about holding it up.

Gallagher met one-on-one with Bob Schur and he thinks that the people who put this proposal together did a good job, but there's a part of him that thinks it is his job to get the stakeholder input. But if Faculty Council thinks that more and better stakeholder input could be achieved this way, then Bob Schur doesn't object.

Estep repeats: This came out of situations where there's no committee for addressing the policy in question. Estep's example: GTA training that was required for gtPathways.

Kroll: Even if it passes, we could still revisit it, right?

Estep: All this input is great.

Gallagher calls for a motion to place the proposal on the February FC meeting agenda.

The motion unanimously passed.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Attended Board meeting. Everything passed.

CCHE meeting. Miranda is an advisory member this year. Voted to ask the Colorado Department of Higher Education to request a funding formula for the Department of Higher Ed. Every institution thinks they don't get enough funding, so they want to change the formula.

At Cabinet this morning, Lynn Johnson gave a presentation on the fringe rate, which varies by job classification.

Hayne: Are we in the pact of our peers?

Miranda: Yes.

Lenk: Regarding the Honors college ideas being floated around-- what is this about?

Miranda: The idea is more of an umbrella-type honors college. Might include other leadership and mentoring programs. Raise visibility of these special programs for special subpopulations that would consolidate the whole suite of opportunities for students who have the talent and motivation to take advantage of them. Whatever we do, it's not a revision of the Honors Program, but more of a step up.

Lenk: Exciting to hear. Arizona State University has a great honors college, if you want to look at it.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Gallagher was contacted by Mary Ontiveros, VP for Diversity and Inclusion. Ontiveros is reaching out to Faculty Council for volunteers to serve on a brand new committee--Committee on Class Issues. We need some faculty who have an appreciation for class-related issues. Gallagher encouraged EC members to reach out to faculty in their colleges and the Libraries.

Pezeshki: Is there a description of this role/position?

Gallagher: Not yet, but I will ask Mary Ontiveros.

Gallagher: We have more time than usual leading up to the next Faculty Council meeting. We need to come up with a process to go through the *Manual* and deal with wording relating to "regular and special faculty", which is obsolete wording, and replace with gender-neutral wording.

We are going to have to figure out who is going to fix things once the language discrepancies are found. Who is going to make the motion and such on the floor of Faculty Council? We should think about this so that we know how to move forward.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

Lenk reports that Miranda has already reported on everything from the Board meeting. Right after the meeting, there was a presidential search meeting. Good due diligence being done. Encourages EC members to give input on possible candidates. Every name will be reviewed. We need to get the biggest, best pool possible.

Lenk reported that an undergraduate student, Sarah Grecian (a CoB major in finance and minor in economics), did a great lunch presentation at the Board meeting regarding her non-profit that addresses differing abilities. She was inspired by her brother, who is on the autism spectrum. Her nonprofit made one two-minute commercial and got 50K views. Gaining momentum in leaps and bounds.

Lenk's report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. UGO evaluation

Made Qualtrics totally anonymous. Lenk had hard copies to show the basics of the new survey that can go to every faculty member through a Qualtrics survey mechanism.

Avery: Are questions connected between who you are and whether you were satisfied?

Gallagher: Let's check to see if the survey covers all the possible variations. The UGO tries to resolve through mediation first and, if unsuccessful, only then does it go to grievance. Sometimes a complainant is satisfied just with a conversation. Others go to a Mediator. If mediation doesn't work, then the complainant decides whether to pursue a formal grievance, then it goes to the full formal grievance process.

Lenk: Split out those who got mediation. Check all that apply?

Teel: Could do yes/no?

Some discussion followed.

Hayne: Be sure to cascade the survey questions from most to least.

Gallagher suggests running this by Eykholt to see if we have covered all the possible paths. When you walk into the UGO's office the first time,

you have a grievance (lower case “g”, which is basically just a complaint or cause for concern) but this is different from a formal grievance.

2. Faculty Council Chair evaluation
-Sue Doe

Lenk moved (Kroll 2nd) to go into Executive Session.

EC unanimously agreed to exit Executive Session.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

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