MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, January 15, 2019
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, Linda Meyer, Libraries; Chad Hoffman, Natural Resources; Anne Avery, CVMBS, Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests:

Absent: Brad Goetz, Chair, UCC; Mary Meyer, Natural Sciences (excused); Steven Shulman, Liberal Arts (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. Elections for Faculty Council Officers:
Faculty Council Chair, Vice Chair, and Board of Governors Faculty Representative – March 5, 2019 – Committee on Faculty Governance.
*Please send nominations to Don Estep, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance (Donald.Estep@Colostate.edu)
Nominations close Friday, February 22, 2019.

3. 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

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC meeting minutes –
2. Approval of Degree Candidates – Spring and Summer Semesters

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
JANUARY 15, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

1. December 4, 2018

Executive Committee unanimously approved the December 4, 2018 Faculty Council meeting minutes.

B. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

1. December 11, 2018

Executive Committee unanimously approved the December 11, 2018 Executive Committee meeting minutes.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: January 22, 2019-3:00 pm

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on January 22, 2019. At this meeting, we need to have the FC meeting agenda organized. January 29 is when the agenda has to be sent out to the full membership of Faculty Council.

B. Action Items

1. UCC meeting minutes – November 30, 2018; December 7, 2018

Lenk moved (Hayne 2nd) to place the November 30 and December 7, 2018 UCC meeting minutes on the February 5, 2019 FC meeting consent agenda.

Lenk’s motion was approved.

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

Marie Legare contacted Gallagher and asked to withdraw the E.12 proposal (Action Item) from the February 5, 2019 Faculty Council meeting. Additional discussions were needed with the full membership of CoRSAF before this goes on to full Faculty Council.

Gallagher asked Executive Committee to pull E.12 from the FC meeting agenda for February.

Executive Committee unanimously agreed.

3. Review of decision to place the proposed revisions to Section C.2.1.9.5 and Section D.2 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* on the February 5, 2019 Faculty Council meeting agenda

Gallagher stated at the December 11 EC meeting, we did vote to formally place this proposal on the February 5, 2019 FC meeting agenda. Don Estep, Chair, CoFG was present to talk in detail to create a new committee (university committee). Still no problem with what Estep proposed; however, at the December BOG meeting, the Board approved the Preface change, coupled with Section H, which was empty until filled with the new wording re: reaching out to APs when a Manual change was proposed.

Gallagher contacted Shannon Wagner, Chair of AP Council. Wagner had a family emergency and had to leave. Wagner wanted the full AP Council to look at this in greater detail and have a vote on the proposed wording. Now, what the BOG approved says they don’t have to vote, but APC feedback needs to be solicited. Wants APC to vote before Faculty Council moves forward. This is the very first time the new policy comes into force, which affects APs and faculty.

Gallagher wants to do this properly the first time. Gallagher is asking Executive Committee to “undo” its votes to place this proposal on the February FC meeting agenda. Received no negative feedback from Wagner; but there is a feeling that proper protocol should be fulfilled.
Lenk asked if it was necessary to have a vote to remove an item from the Faculty Council agenda.

Gallagher recommends this as the better approach. I need a motion.

Reising moved (Hayne 2\textsuperscript{nd}) to remove Section C.2.1.9.5 and Section D.2 from the February 5 FC meeting agenda.

Discussion ensued.

Miranda pointed out that APC has a policy committee, who may want to address this question. So, this is more than just a matter of protocol and precedent, but is instead a genuine opportunity for APC to inform policy.

Wagner expressed that the full AP Council needs to talk about it as well. Gallagher has reached out to have a personal meeting with Wagner to figure out a good way to handle these situations.

Gallagher asked for a vote. EC unanimously approved pulling the proposal for the February FC meeting.

Reising: When is the next APC meeting?

Gallagher: They meet the second Monday of each month.

Gallagher also talked to Don Estep and he understands why there will be a delay with the proposal.

Executive Committee unanimously agreed to pull the proposed revisions to Section C.2.1.9.5 and Section D.2 from the February FC meeting agenda.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Finishing P&T reviews. Record 95 T&P cases. Will be selecting a few for discussion at Council of Deans, then on to President Frank.
Spent a couple days last week at Qingdao University, where we’re considering the joint initiative. Visited the site where the campus will be built. Had lunch with the mayor of the city. The five degree programs that we brought faculty to discuss were from ecosystem science and sustainability, statistics/mathematics/data-science, electrical and computer engineering, chemical and biological engineering, and finance. The concept is that students will get both a Qingdao and CSU diploma. Their core curriculum is approved by their ministry of education and is quite different from ours, so we will have to understand how that will all fit together (although we have managed this before with other universities in 2+2 programs.

Agreed so far only to establish a joint institute for delivery of a variety of academic and research programs and exchanges, with the possibility of joint degree programs in the future too.

There are obvious details to discuss. Signed a document that we would have a joint institute with research collaborations—student exchange, faculty exchange, 2+2 programs. The next step is having faculty work on alignment of curriculum and logistical details; finances, etc.

Stay tuned. We will likely send another group in February and another group in March; the next visit will likely be centered more around the core curriculum.

Hayne: Thinking from a collaboration aspect, IP being taken. There is a very coordinated understanding that there is a state approach. State sponsored activity. What I worry about for CSU engaging in this relationship is how are we going to protect ourselves just being transitioned? Core competencies, etc. These things need to be balanced. What are we going to say to our constituents about this?

Miranda is more worried about this from the research perspective than from the undergraduate curriculum angle.

Hayne reiterates his concern about “taking material” at another institution now becomes perfectly capable of delivering content on their own. I keep my content inside CANVAS and there are enforceable laws on Copyright in this country. Is concerned about imbalance.

Miranda: What would be the nature of the assurances you would need?
Hayne: We can protect our material but it will leak out. There needs to be some strong, demonstrable arguments about how we are protecting ourselves. We need to be able to state these to our constituencies. I think there should be some strong discussions in FC.

Miranda: We are not yet committed. There could be intellectual, financial, etc., deal breakers in the upcoming discussions. We need to continue to discuss how this may work or not work.

Hayne: If I deliver a course in Australia, or France, I have every confidence that nothing will be stolen. However, in the Chinese environment, this just doesn’t exist.

Avery: Is there a role for faculty making a decision whether this goes forward or not?

Miranda: I think so. We’re not going to go against the wishes of our faculty. Those who visited seem enthusiastic. Miranda asked them to be prepared to come to FC to offer their perspectives. The Board will need to approve this as well.

Avery: Would the University Curriculum Committee have something to say on this?

Miranda: These are our degrees which are already approve; we may make some selected waivers, but this is usually not brought to the UCC. Perhaps in time there would need to be some UCC involvement if major changes are proposed for the curriculum there.

Gallagher reads The Chronicle and Inside Higher Education, and some universities are closing down their Confucius Institutes. There seems to be a trend. I don’t point that out to cause undue alarm, but people all over the country are wrestling with these issues.

Lenk: I understand what you’re saying. I was on one of the original trips to Qingdao University and they showed a tremendous commitment to CSU at that time, but since then, there are other universities in Qingdao that are making partnerships with U.S cities. The question is, are
we losing our foothold? Are they considering other people?

Miranda: There are other universities that are in line that I am aware of. They are ready to jump right in if CSU declines this opportunity. The only other university that I have heard is in serious discussions is the University of Montreal—a partnership with their medical school. If we go forward, our curriculum would be all in English.

Hayne: There’s a lot of money flowing in China right now. The infrastructure is throwing a lot of money at Chinese faculty.

Reising: re: Chronicle of Higher Education. Is there a reason why the U.S. universities are closing Confucius Institutes?

Gallagher: It’s mostly about academic freedom.

Miranda’s report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Gallagher: If anyone has a discussion item that they would like for Faculty Council, we can entertain those topics.

Chermack: I think the Qingdao conversation needs more discussion. These issues are really important and I hope that we can have lengthy conversations.

Hayne: What about whether we as a university have a position on Human Rights and what to do and how to look at human rights in regard to Qingdao.

Kroll: Related to this. Does our university have any human rights stance?

Doe: I remember this came up on the floor of FC.

Gallagher: I don’t have a definitive answer to that questions.
Lenk: Maybe have a faculty panel to field these questions.

Gallagher: Rick needs to be a part of the panel for these questions.

Chermack: If a certain code is established and is violated, it would be good for an exit plan to be involved.

Lenk: My understanding from the meetings is that Rick adds a lot of people from the team before a decision is made. Miranda is in exploration mode. In terms of the legal contract, we have the General Counsel office, who is aware of this as well.

Gallagher: Can still ask Miranda and other colleagues what a discussion topic would look like and whether we could place it on the February 5 FC meeting agenda.

Lenk: Come to faculty with a list of pros and cons.

Avery: I want to see what the advantages are.

Gallagher: We can continue conversations about this next week.

Chermack: How about more discussion on the Campus Climate Survey that was done in the fall?

Gallagher: The campus climate group had a meeting right after the first of the year. There was only one meeting so everything is very preliminary. Additional conversations are needed.

Avery: Perhaps discuss the mandatory supervisor training. The people who are overseeing this training should come with the results of the feedback. Accountability on this training.

Lenk: LENS would be another topic for discussion.

Gallagher: So far, we have supervisor training, LENS, and China initiatives as potential discussion items. Gallagher will contact Matt Hickey re: LENS. We will follow up next week and see where we want to go.

Kroll: Any updates on the Presidential search?
Lenk: There’s no lack of interest from around the world.

Gallagher’s report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

No meeting. The next Board of Governors meeting will be held February 6-8, 2019.

D. Discussion Items

1. UGO evaluation

Gallagher: Next EC meeting we will discuss the UGO evaluation.

2. Faculty Council Chair evaluation
   -Sue Doe

Reising moved (Linda Meyer 2nd) to go into Executive Session.

Executive Committee unanimously agreed to exit Executive Session.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

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