

**MINUTES**  
Executive Committee  
**Tuesday, January 22, 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, **Antonio Pedros-Gascon** substituting for Steven Shulman, Liberal Arts; **Linda Meyer**, Libraries; **Chad Hoffman**, Natural Resources; **Mary Meyer**, Natural Sciences **Anne Avery**, CVMBS, **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President

**Guests:** **Brad Goetz**, Chair, UCC. **Richard Eykholt**, UGO and CoRSAF committee member substituting for Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF

**Absent:** **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](mailto:Donald.Estep@Colostate.edu))  
*Nominations close Friday, February 22, 2019.*
    3. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website: December 11, 2018  
(<http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/>)

**B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – December 4, 2018

**C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**D. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. UCC meeting minutes – November 30, 2019 and December 7, 2018
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 22, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

### **I. Minutes to be Approved**

### **II. Items Pending/Discussion Items**

#### **A. *Announcements***

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: January 29, 2019-3:00 pm

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting was scheduled for January 29, 2019. If we get everything organized today, and EC members are feeling comfortable, we may be able to cancel next week's meeting.

#### **B. *Action Items***

1. Proposed revisions to Appendix 7 – Bullying in the Workplace of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Per Richard Eykholt, when the Bullying Policy was first put into the *Manual*, Faculty Council couldn't amend things but could only say yes or no. Antonio Pedros-Gascon (At-Large representative for CLA) suggested changes to this document. Everything was added, except for one item. With the Preface change now, APC doesn't have to okay everything first, but Marie Legare and Eykholt met with CoRSAF and made a few more revisions. Robert Schur, Office of Policy and Compliance, wanted to do some rearranging. The Policy Office has two documents, divided into procedures and policy. The changes in the draft reflect this rearranging. Many of the strikeouts and underlines in this document are mainly just moving things around—i.e., changing he or she to "they". The APC has approved this, which doesn't mean that it can't be amended. These revisions are supposed to go to Cabinet on February 29 per Robert Schur. Several groups need to approve this first; however, now there is no particular order which group approves the revisions first.

Gallagher: Any discussion, or questions of Richard?

Linda Meyer: In the Policy Office, there will still be two documents?

Eykholt: Yes. The Policy Office will have two documents, and for the purposes of putting this in Appendix 7, we have grouped the two together. It is word for word identical.

Pedros-Gascon would like to propose an amendment.

Gallagher: I would first like to clarify that EC is charged with deciding whether a proposal is ready to sustain debate on the floor of Faculty Council. If we change something in Executive Committee, we have to send it back to CoRSAF. However, this doesn't mean you can't suggest proposing an amendment on the floor of Faculty Council.

Pedros-Gascon clarifies that he will ask for an amendment at the Faculty Council meeting--Item #17 (everything after "and such" be removed), and also proposes removing telephone numbers on pages 3, 7, 8 and 14.

Gallagher asks for a motion to place the proposed revisions to Appendix 7 on the February 5 FC meeting agenda. He indicated that Pedros-Gascon may move to amend the motion on the floor of the Faculty Council meeting. The wording of the proposed amendment can be projected on the screen in the Faculty Council meeting room if that amendment is provided to the Faculty Council Office before the meeting.

Reising moved (Doe 2<sup>nd</sup>) to place the proposed revisions to Appendix 7 – Bullying in the Workplace on the February 5, 2019 FC meeting agenda.

Reising's motion was approved.

Miranda asks Eykholt if he consulted with Robert Schur.

Eykholt worked closely with Robert Schur. It has gone to the Office of General Counsel (OGC) and to Diana Prieto, with OEO, and also to the Classified Personnel Council. Those are the only groups we have sent it to so far. Schur said he had all Oks, except for the Cabinet.

EC unanimously approved placing the proposal on the February 5 FC meeting agenda.

Gallagher clarified that just because EC members vote to have the proposal placed on the FC meeting agenda doesn't mean that they will support the proposal on the floor of Faculty Council.

**C. Reports**

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Miranda reports that the Martin Luther King Day events went well yesterday.

Have been in discussions with the Mountain West regarding E-sports, which is making its competitive debut. Margarita Lenk will be leading a task force on curricular implications. We will participate in our first intercollegiate games this spring, which may culminate in a match or matches in Las Vegas during the NCAA Mountain West basketball tournament. Some people like to participate and others like spectating. Lenk reports a positive academic effect in student-athletes involved in this. There are three games: League of Legends, Overwatch, and Rocket. Many STEM students involved.

Miranda states his interest in the curricular possibilities. Impact on the arts, a possible way to expand out our Sports Management minor, and event management.

Miranda working on the upcoming Board meeting preparations and student success initiatives.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Gallagher had two follow-up exchanges with Matt Hickey regarding LENS as a discussion item at the February Faculty Council meeting. Hickey wants to bring to the entire CoTL first. It doesn't look like the LENS discussion will occur at the February FC meeting.

Gallagher found a course survey article in The Chronicle. A significant negative relationship was found between the results of the course survey and the performance of students in the follow-up class. Also, how the students did in a follow up course when taught by female professor significantly (statistically) better than

when taught by a male professor. The article makes reference to an arbitration hearing resulting in no longer using course surveys.

The Offices of General Counsel, at some universities, are ruling out course surveys due to too great liability.

Lenk: Can you send out this article to the rest of us.

Gallagher: Yes, I would be happy to.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

Lenk would like feedback on UGO survey.

Gallagher pointed out that this topic is upcoming and listed under our Discussion topics today.

Lenk's report was received.

4. Pathways to Understanding and Mastery of Statistics: A new program in statistics  
Memo: Advice to first-year students is based on statistical fallacies  
-Mary Meyer

There have been two requests for a report to be given. Could we have a report from Mary Meyer about changes to the Statistics curriculum?

Gallagher asked Mary what the objective would be for talking about the Statistics curricular revision. Gallagher points out that we have information from Mary in the agenda packet.

Gallagher: How much time do you think would be needed?

Meyer: 10-15 minutes.

Gallagher? May I have a motion to put this on the FC meeting agenda?

Lenk moved (Hoffman 2<sup>nd</sup>) to place Meyer's Report on the February FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

Gallagher: More discussion?

Avery: Not a required course for every student?

Mary Meyer: Statistics or Algebra--these are service classes. The more feedback we get, the better. Don Estep is going to every department for feedback.

Lenk asks if Statistics will be offering support to departments and faculty to provide training that faculty need for how to use these curricular changes—specifically how to use Statistics in classes to support student needs. Mary points out that this effort involves their survey courses, so it is intended to help our students, not majors in Statistics.

Pedros-Gascon mentions that there is also a graduate class that could be mentioned.

Gallagher: Could we vote to place this on the February FC meeting agenda?

Executive Committee unanimously approved adding Meyer's report for the February FC meeting.

5. Request from Jenny Morse, Chair, CoNTTF to add a Report to the February 5, 2019 FC meeting re: progress of approved *Manual* changes for NTTF

Some departments and colleges have completed their revisions to Codes and might be good models for other units, so Morse would like to report on this, as well as data on NTTF, providing a kind of status report from the CoNTTF on the progress made in regard to the local changes as result of the Faculty *Manual* changes.

Reising moved (Linda Meyer 2<sup>nd</sup>) to add Morse's report on the February FC meeting agenda.

Reising's motion was approved.

Avery: Is there something on this topic that as a whole the Faculty Council needs to hear?

Gallagher: They want to inform and educate how the CoNTTF sees the implementation of the *Manual* changes going. Since Faculty Council might be asked to review more changes, knowing how things have gone so far in terms of implementation, this might be helpful.

Reising: The reason this is important is because it has been incumbent upon FC to implement changes to NTTF circumstances and this report would provide an opportunity to learn about the progress being made.

Hayne: I would love to see a status and best practices report but I'm a little concerned about data. Potential for blindsiding? What is the data that would be reported?

Gallagher: Morse has been approached by many colleges for assistance and has provided beneficial advice.

Pedros-Gascon: Best practices could be very helpful, although colleges are very different. Eventually the conversation about NTTF needs to address the "right ratio" of TTF: NTTF.

Gallagher: We have started to address this concern about the ratio of TTF/NTTF and so we need to revisit that question. The numbers have continued to go up over the past decade.

Hayne: Would this include a report of perceptions about how everything is going? What if this is very controversial and swamps the status and best practices side of the report? It would be nice to be able to see the report beforehand.

Gallagher does not know what Morse might say, but then you don't know what I might say in my report either. Gallagher does not know what the tone might be in terms of the report. He indicated his support for people to express their views whatever those views may be.

Reising: It would be good if she could come to EC and tell us about the tone she plans to take in such a report.

Hayne does not want to suppress anything but points out that we often ask for a preview of what will be discussed in a report or presentation.

Gallagher: I am a proponent of active and difficult conversations on the floor of Faculty Council.

Lenk: I think this could be a potentially crazy and chaotic discussion. Suggests that Gallagher send out information to Faculty Council members saying that this will be discussed so that members arrive informed about their college and department processes and progress.

Hoffman: Might units send the departmental code committee representative from each unit so that the local lead person is present?

Avery: If Morse is providing opinions, I would like to know how data was collected, and would like to see information before the FC meeting.

Gallagher summarizes the discussion. There are different views as to whether a February or March report would be appropriate. Perhaps delay this until March so that people can collect information?

Chermack is concerned that we whittle this down to too brief a period. People may need to study something and have more time than a 15-20 minute report.

Lenk: Is this a formative or summative report? If we delay too long, we'll get more of the second.

Pedros-Gascon: I don't expect to hear something horrible. It would be better in February because department code changes are happening, and the February meeting could have more impact.

Gallagher: I am not advocating for February or March. We have been finding that we have discussion topic requests. Some topics tend to not be worthy of a full discussion item on the FC agenda and some of the things that are narrow in scope might be better conveyed by a report instead of a discussion item.

Reising: Could we ask Morse to focus on the latter, focusing on the Code changes that have been done and help that might be provided in that regard?

Gallagher: CoNTTF would like to communicate to their TTF colleagues how they see the implementation of new policy going. Morse has been actively involved with several departments and would like to share some of what she's seen. Do you want to vote

February vs. later? If we say February, then it goes on the February meeting agenda.

Chermack: The information is more important than the timing. Could we see the report first and then hear the talk?

Gallagher states that it may be a bad precedent to screen what presenters will say in front of Faculty Council.

Chermack: The idea would be to figure out whether this requires an hour or whether there are issues that need to be debated, discussed, etc.

Mary Meyer: Maybe we could do both. Maybe she could give an informational report followed by discussion the next time. I'm leaning toward a February report. I'm not worried about any problem.

Reising: Responding to Chermack, if we are asking Morse to preview her comments, then we would have to do this next week.

Chermack: It's just depressing that when we have an interesting topic, we wind up rushing through it.

Lenk: Can we amend the motion on the floor: put it on the February agenda if we can review the report? We always see the reports prior to the meetings except from the President and Provost.

Gallagher: Calls the vote: 8 in favor and 4 opposed. This means that Morse will give a Report during the February FC meeting.

Avery: I wonder if there might be some value in formalizing the call for seeing reports before they are delivered?

Mary Meyer: Didn't we talk about this last semester?

Gallagher clarifies that we have sought review when we want to understand the content of a report from varied entities on campus who want to speak

Lenk: Could you ask about the general content?

Gallagher: I've already reported that there are two items: 1) general perception of how things are going; and, 2) best practices for moving forward with department Code changes.

Linda Meyer: Is the concern about “controversial content” actually about stirring up people or about whether we provide enough time for the presentation?

Lenk: I think it would be good to bring in someone who can speak to the wide diversity of units and the varied roles of NTTF. So if they are going to present best practices, is this going to be segmented to reflect varied unit types?

Gallagher: I would not preclude Jenny saying several things that have happened and someone else might stand up and say, “That would never work in my unit.”

***D. Discussion Items***

1. UGO evaluation

Lenk: I sent a Qualtrics link to EC members for the UGO evaluation. We decided that we would ask the entire faculty and AP staff if they want to fill out a broader survey re: the UGO. We added--Are you satisfied with the UGO? If YES, it takes you to a different screen. If NO, it takes you to a different screen.

Gallagher: Is everyone ok with having Linda Meyer and Lenk help solicit these questions? Is there any concern about Eykholt executing his part of the survey distribution?

Lenk: Eykholt could encourage people who interacted with him to complete the survey but otherwise everyone will get it.

Avery: Recommends that a description be added to the email explaining what the UGO does.

2. Discussion topics for Faculty Council meeting

Gallagher: We have already decided to have two additional Reports for the February FC meeting. Possible discussion items are Qingdao, LENS and supervisor training. Does one of the three topics appeal to the group?

Avery: On the topic of Supervisor Training: who is overseeing this and assessing it? Could Diana Prieto provide some summary data about how it’s been received so far? Since this is very impactful--how is it going?

Hayne: I understand that it's 24 hours of time for anyone doing supervisor training.

Chermack: What is being measured in terms of efficacy?

Miranda: You have something like three years to complete the 24 hours.

Pedros-Gascon: Scheduling of training may have been a problem.  
Chermack: The big point I'm hearing you make, Anne, is that there's a lot being asked here so what is being derived.

Avery: Yes, what are the plans for determining if this training is effective?

Gallagher: What is the will of the group in regard to a discussion? Do we want to rethink having a discussion item at all, especially given that we will hear from Jenny Morse?

Miranda: It might be a bit short notice for Diana Prieto to present.

Doe: What about the China campus discussion?

Lenk and Reising: Do we have time for a discussion?

Gallagher: We don't know.

Linda Meyer: Thinking back, Tim brought up the idea of a discussion topic when we had an empty agenda.

Reising: Maybe we should look ahead as to whether we want to have a China campus discussion later. Could we have a representative from each of the colleges who will be part of the rollout, as we discussed at the last meeting?

Lenk: Faculty who just returned could talk about what they see and then a second set of points has to do with academic freedom and other compelling issues and questions regarding our potential involvement.

Miranda: We could provide a panel but not in February—would not yet have the numbers. [Then offers an update on what we could do with this initiative.] We could just offer a few programs as we already do. The challenge is that they want to give a dual degree—a Chinese degree AND a U.S. degree so there are

associated conflicts and complications. This would involve curricular compromises. That's the essence of the curricular issue.

Pedros-Gascon: FLL feels they should be involved but were not invited to participate. If we are trying to be inclusive, then all parts of the university should be involved.

Miranda explains the reasons for why they are interested in some degree programs more than others. They're using a British model—including, for instance, an Art and Humanities COLLEGE, other colleges such as the "International College" which is what we would be part of. They have a vision of differing foci where certain degrees would be offered in certain colleges. This is why they don't consider the whole range of curricula we offer.

Gallagher: Are we ready to put any of these on the February agenda?

Executive Committee agrees that we cannot put any of the three possible discussion items on the February agenda.

Miranda will address the China initiative in the Provost's report.

Lenk: The #1 priority would seem to be LENS. Faculty need this information.

Gallagher: Matt Hickey wants to talk to his committee first about the idea of a discussion item. I am not comfortable asking Matt to do this if he's not ready. CoTL is very much in the research mode collecting information.

Reising: Can pass along Lenk's concerns and request to see something soon.

Avery: On Supervisor Training: Do we need to invite Diana Prieto formally? Would you like me to draft that letter? Key questions: How are they going to assess the effectiveness of the supervisor training, and what has the feedback been so far? What's the level of engagement so far?

Gallagher will follow up with Diana Prieto.

Gallagher: Also, would Executive Committee like to meet next week?

Executive Committee unanimously agreed that there would be no meeting next Tuesday, January 29, 2019. The next EC meeting will be on February 12, 2019.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Tim Gallagher, Chair

Sue Doe, Vice Chair

Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant