

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, please call, send a memorandum, or E-mail immediately to Rita Knoll, ext 1-5693.

NOTE: Final revisions are noted in the following manner: additions underlined; deletions ~~over scored~~.

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
December 4, 2018 – 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences – Room C101

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Tim Gallagher, Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – February 5, 2019– Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 – 4:00 p.m.

Gallagher announced that the Faculty Council meeting would be held on February 5, 2018 at 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences Building, Room C101

2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – October 30, 2018

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

Gallagher announced that the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes are posted on the FC website.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – November 6, 2018

Gallagher asked for any corrections or additions.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Page 5 has a misspelled word. Pedros-Gascon will email the correction.

Faculty Council approved the FC meeting minutes by unanimous consent. The minutes will be placed on the FC website.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. University Grievance Panel Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance

Ruth Hufbauer for Steve Reising, moved, on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance that the following faculty be elected:

SUSAN TSUNODA CVMBS 2021
(Nominated – Committee on Faculty Governance)

The University Grievance Panel nominee was unanimously approved.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC meeting minutes – November 2, 9 and 16, 2018

Brad Goetz, Chair, UCC, moves for the approval of the consent agenda.

The Consent Agenda was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

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

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the motion and stated that the rationale is pretty straightforward. Making this a uniform process.

Karen Barrett (HDFS): Will the faculty member, at the time they are told of the decision, be told they only have 10 days to get their appeal in?

Richard Eykholt (UGO and CoRSAF member): Yes. When someone is notified and there is an intent to terminate, there is a meeting. The department chair is supposed to inform them what the appeals process is. If they were not notified, it would be grounds for an extension.

Karen Barrett (HDFS): I was wondering if that language should be in the proposal.

Jenny Morse (Chair, CoNTTF): Along that line, we have asked if that language could be implemented in their initial appointment letters.

Miranda: It is certainly possible but I am reluctant to put this in an offer letter when we are trying to recruit people. We could still consider it.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): On page 26, questions regarding why notification of all persons involved in the appeal is not required. Concerned it may affect the person making the appeal may not be well defended.

Richard Eykholt (UGO and CoRSAF member): There is no current process so this creates a process. It's a parallel process to Grievance and E.15. The people doing the investigation are given latitude for what is relevant and not relevant. You don't want to give the person the opportunity to tie up the process with a ton of material, including irrelevant materials, in their defense to drag things out.

Dawn Duval (CVMBS): So this only applies to termination prior to the end of the contract? Regarding the appointment types from the spring, why is there an automatic movement from contract into a continuing appointment when a termination ends? Why doesn't a contract just end at the end of it?

Richard Eykholt (UGO and CoRSAF member): This is not relevant to the current motion on the floor, but to terminate a continuing appointment requires approval of the president. This is intended to strengthen what is proposed.

Subject: Faculty Manual E.11 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT THE CURRENT SECTION E.11 (Granting of Senior Teaching Appointments) OF THE *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL* BE REPLACED WITH THE FOLLOWING:

E.11 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments

A contract faculty member may appeal a recommendation to the President to terminate their appointment prior to the ending date of the contract. This section of the Manual sets forth the procedures for such an appeal. The University Grievance Officer (UGO) shall be charged with overseeing this appeal process. At the discretion of the UGO, any of the time limits in this section may be extended for reasonable periods. Such extensions shall be reported immediately to all parties concerned.

E.11.1. Initiating the Process

When a Recommendation to the President to terminate a Contract Faculty Appointment prior to the ending date of the contract is sent to the Provost, a copy of this

Recommendation shall be provided in writing to the faculty member by the person making the Recommendation (hereinafter referred to as the Recommender). The faculty member then has ten (10) working days to submit to the UGO an Appeal in writing of this

Recommendation, along with the Recommendation itself. If an Appeal is submitted within this time frame, then the UGO shall notify the Provost within three (3) working days, and the Recommendation shall not be sent to the President until the conclusion of the Section E.11 process.

If the faculty member fails to submit an Appeal within this time frame, then they shall forfeit the right to appeal the Recommendation for termination (unless the UGO decides that extenuating circumstances justify an extension of this deadline). If the Provost has not been notified by the UGO of an Appeal within twenty (20) working days of receiving the Recommendation from the Recommender, then the Provost may assume that no Appeal will be filed, and they may forward the Recommendation to the President for a final decision.

The Appeal should provide all of the information that the Appeal Committee (see Section E.11.2) will need in order to make its decision whether to support or oppose the Recommendation for termination. This may include relevant documentation and persons that the Appeal Committee may contact for additional supporting information. The relevance of each person should be stated in the Appeal. The Appeal Committee is not required to contact all of the persons listed in the Appeal. The UGO will review the Appeal to make sure that the information included is relevant to the issue of termination. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Appeal to the Appellant for editing before it is acceptable.

Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Appeal from the Appellant, the UGO shall forward the Appeal to the Recommender and to the members of the Appeal Committee. The Recommender shall then have ten (10) working days to provide a Response. This Response should provide all of the information that the Appeal Committee will need in order to make its decision whether to support or oppose the Recommendation for termination. This may include relevant documentation and persons that the Appeal Committee may contact for additional supporting information. The relevance of each person should be stated in the Response. The Appeal Committee is not required to contact all of the persons listed in the Response. The UGO will review the Response to make sure that the information included is relevant to the issue of termination. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Response to the Recommender for editing before it is acceptable.

Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Response from the Recommender, the UGO shall forward the Response to the Appellant and to the members of the Appeal Committee.

E.11.2 Appeal Committee

The Appeal Committee shall consist of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the Chair of Faculty Council, and the Chair of the Faculty Council Committee on Non-Tenure-Track Faculty. The Chair of Faculty Council shall serve as the Chair of the Appeal Committee. After receiving both the Appeal and the Response from the UGO, the members of the Appeals Committee shall begin their consideration of the Appeal. As part of this consideration, they shall meet with the Recommender, the Appellant, and any other persons that they consider relevant to their consideration of the Appeal. All three members of the Appeal Committee must be present at each of these meetings. At their discretion, the members of the Appeal Committee may request additional information from the Recommender and/or the Appellant, and they may choose to meet more than once with some persons.

E.11.3 Report of the Appeal Committee

After the completion of the process described in Section E.11.2, the three members of the Appeal Committee shall meet to discuss the case and to reach a final decision by majority vote whether to support or oppose the Recommendation for the termination of the Appellant.

After the conclusion of this meeting, the Chair of the Appeal Committee shall prepare a final Report. This Report shall include the overall vote of the Appeal Committee and the reasons supporting its decision. If the vote was not unanimous, then the Report shall also summarize the reasons given by the dissenting member. The Report shall be submitted to the UGO within twenty (20) working days of the receipt from the UGO of both the Appeal and the Response by the members of the Appeal Committee.

E.11.4 Final Decision by the President

Within three (3) working days of receiving the Report from the Chair of the Appeal Committee, the UGO shall send the Report to the President, along with the initial Recommendation, the Appeal, and the Response. Within twenty (20) working days of receiving these materials from the UGO, the President shall make a final decision regarding the termination of the Appellant and send it in writing to the UGO. This written decision shall include the reasoning that supports the decision. The UGO shall forward this decision by the President to the Appellant, the Recommender, and the Provost. This decision by the President is final.

Rationale:

1. The Senior Teaching Appointment no longer exists, thus the current Section E.11 (Granting of Senior Teaching Appointments) has no purpose and needs to be deleted.
2. We are proposing to insert this new section into the now vacated Section E.11. The proposed E.11 above deals with NTTF on contract appointments. A contract appointment is not an at-will employee. Thus, the early termination of such a contract should require more due process than the termination of an at-will employee. This new section creates such due process and strengthens the meaning of a contract appointment. Also, it makes sure that NTTF have representation on the appeal committee.
3. Previously there have been very few faculty employment contracts across the campus. With recent changes to faculty appointment types (E.2), we now have a significantly larger portion of the faculty on contract appointments. Thus, it is logical that there will be appeals to early termination and an appeals process is needed. A standard process will ensure equity in treatment across the colleges that make up our campus.
4. Both TTF and NTTF have access to the Grievance process. However, termination cannot be grieved (stated in section K and E.15) thus this Appeals Process was written to help ensure a level of due process if early termination of a contract appointment were to occur.

The motion was unanimously approved.

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

William Sanford spoke to the proposal.

Adding one sentence to clarify that admission decisions are final and not subject to appeal.

RE: Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – Application: U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents

ADDITIONS - UNDERLINED - DELETIONS ~~OVERSCORE~~

Application: U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents

Students apply [online](#). In addition to the online application, a non-refundable application fee must be electronically submitted.

The on-line application will be electronically submitted to the Office of Admissions and then forwarded to the appropriate academic departments. With this system, most documents are uploaded directly by the applicant. Regarding letters of recommendation, recommenders will be notified and prompted to provide a recommendation letter through the online system. The letter of recommendation will be automatically processed and submitted to the student's online file.

The following must be sent directly to the Office of Admissions at Colorado State University, 1062 Campus Delivery, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1062.

1. One official transcript of all collegiate work completed post-high school. Additionally separate transcripts are not required for study abroad credits if the GPA and credits are recorded on the transcript of the university that sponsored the study abroad experience. CSU transcripts are not required. Training course transcripts from branches of the U.S. military that show credit received with neither grades nor degrees awarded are exempt from the transcript requirement.
2. Test scores such as GRE or GMAT, if required by department, should be submitted with institution code 4075.
3. Any other materials that individual departments or programs may require of applicants.
4. Regardless of citizenship, applicants may be required to demonstrate proof of English language proficiency, if they do not have a degree from an institution where the primary language of instruction is English.

General deadlines for the receipt of complete applications are as follows: Fall Semester, April 1; Spring Semester, September 1; Summer Term, January 1. Please submit the on-line application and all supporting documents by the appropriate date. Note that individual departments may have earlier deadlines for certain programs. Please consult appropriate sections of this Bulletin or a department contact person. Applications completed later than these published deadlines may be considered depending on space and resources available. Late applications that cannot be considered will be updated by the Office of Admissions to a later semester or term. Except for Integrated Degree Program (IDP) Admissions, applications cannot be accepted more than fifteen months in advance of the term in which study is to begin.

Students who wish to be considered for fellowships, assistantships, or other forms of merit- or competency-based financial support may be subject to earlier deadlines. See [Application for Financial Support](#).

The application fee is not refundable even if the application is withdrawn or admission denied, nor is it applied to tuition and fees if the applicant subsequently enrolls. The non-refundable application fee must be received by the Office of Admissions. Your application cannot be submitted until the fee is received. Only persons with bachelor's degrees from colleges or universities accredited by one of the major regional accrediting agencies are eligible to apply. Degrees from schools which do not possess overall, institutional accreditation or which have only specialized accreditation cannot be accepted. This policy does not apply to

**Page 8 - Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
December 4, 2018**

admission for combined degree programs (CDPs, see [Sequential Degree Programs](#)), however, CDP students must earn their bachelor's degrees prior to, or concurrent with, the award of their graduate degrees.

An undergraduate grade point average of 3.000 (A = 4.000) is required by CSU regulation for admission. The various departments may have requirements in addition to or more stringent than those of CSU. Higher undergraduate grade point averages may be required, specific GRE minimum scores may be specified, or GRE advanced tests may be required, for example. Once again, applicants are strongly urged to contact the department in which they intend to study.

CSU may waive its 3.000 minimum undergraduate grade point average requirement under unusual circumstances or if the applicant is applying through Track II Admissions (see below). Applicants must present strong countervailing evidence that successful completion of a degree program is likely. Examples of the kinds of evidence that might be considered are high scores on the GRE aptitude test, high scores on the GRE advanced test, excellent letters of recommendation, relevant professional experience, and other indicators of exceptional motivation and performance. A positive recommendation by the department is required in such cases. Some departments may waive their specific requirements under similarly unusual and compelling circumstances. However, they are not required to do so and many cannot, due to space and resource considerations.

If the minimum GPA requirement is waived and the applicant is accepted by the Graduate School, the applicant will be provisionally admitted and placed immediately on academic probation. The student must achieve a term GPA of 3.000, averaged across all coursework that is traditionally graded (A through F), in the first semester, or the student will be dismissed from the Graduate School. This policy applies to all provisionally admitted graduate students.

Meeting the minimum CSU or department standards does not entitle an applicant to admission. Meeting such standards only insures consideration of the application. Since CSU cannot accommodate all who meet the minimum standards, it reserves the right to select individuals for admission on the basis of merit in such a way as to promote the best interests of CSU and the society as a whole and to maximize the potential for individual accomplishment.

Decisions made by the Graduate School to deny admission are final and not subject to appeal by the applicant.

Rationale:

This added language clarifies that admission decisions are final and not subject to appeal.

The motion was unanimously approved.

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

Bill Sanford spoke to the motion.

Sanford said the first part is changing the wording of definition of faculty; second part is on the Graduate School website for how non-CSU employees can become part of a committee.

RE: Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – Advisory System

ADDITIONS - UNDERLINED - DELETIONS ~~OVERSCORE~~

The Advisory System

Since thoughtful planning is vital to a graduate student career, a comprehensive arrangement for advising has been established. Each student is initially assigned a faculty member as advisor by the head of the department in which the major is pursued.

A permanent advisor will be selected from among departmental faculty once initial entry to the program has been completed. (The temporary advisor may assume this role if appropriate.)

The advisor is the chief source of advice in the planning process. This individual works closely with the student throughout the graduate career on all matters related to the degree program.

A close, cordial, and professional relationship is therefore of the utmost importance. Both student and advisor should work at achieving mutual understanding and respect.

Except for those pursuing Plan C master's degrees, each student has an individual graduate advisory committee. Members of the committee should be chosen on the basis of the student's interests, the student's experience with faculty members, and the advisor's knowledge and expertise. The makeup of a graduate committee must be approved by the department head and, of course, agreed to by the potential members themselves. It is well for the student to assume the responsibility of securing these approvals and agreements.

The purpose of the committee is to make available to the student a broad range of knowledge and expertise. It aids in general advising of the student and assists in planning the major elements of the program. The committee also evaluates student progress throughout the graduate career. It may provide assessments at various stages and it administers the examination. The committee is not responsible for reminding students of published deadlines nor for monitoring procedural details. The student should manage such matters independently.

The committee must consist of at least three faculty members for a master's degree program and at least four for a doctoral degree program. The members are as follows:

- 1. The advisor who serves as chairperson of the committee and who must hold academic faculty rank as a professor, associate professor, or assistant professor of any appointment type within the department or program granting the degree;**
- 2. One or more additional members from the department;**
- 3. Any non-departmental faculty member who may be appropriate; and**

4. One member from an outside department who, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, represents the Graduate School. The outside committee member appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School must hold a ~~regular, special,~~ tenured, tenure-track, contract, continuing, transitional, joint, or emeritus/emerita faculty appointment at CSU. The outside member should serve as an impartial external evaluator on the committee, ensuring quality of scholarship and fairness in process.

5. Non-CSU employees may obtain faculty affiliate appointments in an academic department in order to be eligible to serve on graduate committees. They may also be appointed to such committees through a nomination process that is reviewed and approved by CoSRGE (Faculty Council Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education).

Please contact the Human Resource staff member of the appropriate department to determine the appointment designation of a potential committee member.

Due to the interdisciplinary nature of some scholarship at CSU, conflicts of interest in advisory committees between members or between the student and one or more members may not be avoidable. When a conflict of interest exists, a written report must be submitted by the chair of the advisory committee to the Dean of the Graduate School that includes: 1) the names of those involved in the conflict of interest, 2) the nature of the conflict of interest, 3) a plan to manage the conflict of interest. Failure to disclose a conflict of interest is a violation of CSU Policy (Faculty and Staff Manual: D.7.7., Appendix 2, Appendix 6). Individuals who are not academic faculty but who have special expertise may serve on committees in addition to the prescribed members, but may not vote regarding examination results.

Plan C master's students are required to have an advisor but not a committee. The advisor is identified and the committee is appointed through filing a GS Form 6 with the Graduate School. It is the student's responsibility to identify an advisor and a committee, all of whom are willing and qualified to serve. The student's department chair or designee will use his/her best efforts to facilitate selection of the committee and subsequent changes therein. With notification, temporary replacement of a member may be arranged. A member, including the advisor, may resign from the committee in accordance with any applicable provisions in the student's departmental code. In such cases, the affected student and his or her department chair will be notified promptly by the departing member. It is then the student's responsibility to obtain a replacement. Any permanent changes are recorded through the filing of GS Form 9A with the Graduate School.

Persons who are not academic faculty (as defined in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual) of CSU may be appointed full voting members of graduate student advisory committees in the following manner. A person may be nominated for membership on a specific student's committee. This is accomplished by submission of the following materials to the department head: 1) a resume, 2) relevant supporting material, 3) a statement from the nominated individual that indicates whether or not there is a conflict of interest with any of the committee members or student. If there is a conflict of interest, the chair of the advisory committee must submit a written plan to manage the conflict of interest. If, using procedures and criteria outlined in the departmental code, the department head judges the appointment appropriate, they shall forward a recommendation and all materials to the Dean of the Graduate School. The Dean of the Graduate School shall bring the nomination to the appropriate

Faculty Council Committee, which shall act on the nomination.

A person so approved shall be eligible to serve on the committee for the duration of the student's work toward the degree. The Graduate School shall maintain a roster of such appointments. Although approval is granted with respect to a particular student's committee, such members may serve on other student committees in the same department with additional departmental approval provided that such service shall not extend beyond five years of the original appointment.

Such non-faculty appointments are subject to the following restrictions.

Such an appointee may not serve as an outside member of graduate committees. Service may not be as the sole advisor of the student.

The appointee must have a degree equivalent to that sought by the student and must not be a student at CSU. No more than one such person may serve on any graduate student's committee. The person appointed should be an addition to the minimum number now required on graduate committees and not a replacement for required faculty. The advisor may invite others to participate in the examination in a nonvoting advisory capacity,

Rationale

1. The first set of revisions updates the language according to the newly approved U. policy, that removes the old language, "regular, special" and replaces it with "tenured, tenure- track, contract, continuing,"
2. The second revision includes the language listed on the Graduate School webpage, which indicate the instructions for non-CSU employees, to obtain faculty affiliate

The motion was unanimously approved.

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

Mo Salman, Chair, CUP, spoke to the motion.

Discussion:

Tom Chermack (SOE): In the proposal, the bulk of the center's activity will be in degree programs--Master's degrees and workshops?

Mo Salman (Chair, CUP): It's not related to graduate programs. Mainly for activities related to the State for enhancing cyber security.

Tom Chermack (SOE): It's not positioned as a research center in terms of securing grant research money? It's not clear to me then.

Mo Salman (Chair, CUP): It is as I understand it. I cannot explain as thoroughly. It is a very good initiative to support.

Miranda: We are not intending that the Center would sponsor degrees, departments would do that. The Center would serve as a coordinating function—initially funded by the State and seeking other funding for our IT department for cyber security and hiring interns (undergraduate and graduate) who may be in those departments. Not intended to offer graduate degrees.

Mo Salman (Chair, CUP): Asked Gallagher to show the second paragraph about the Center as proposed and the desire to create synergy.

Gallagher showed the second paragraph on the overhead to faculty.

Gallagher: Any more discussion? All in favor of accepting the recommendation of CUP?

The motion was unanimously approved.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

The Board of Governors meeting starts tomorrow. Will update the budget. Parameters have changed due to additional funding from the Governor, along with a constraint on tuition. The total effect was almost a wash for the plans we had made for the summer and October Board meetings. We go down in tuition and up in state appropriations.

The INTO student satisfaction survey was quite good. Many satisfaction indicators were 90% or above. Will be executing a faculty survey as well.

We have been in conversations with Qingdao University for one year, and whether we should enter into a more intimate program to offer degree programs. We share faculty to faculty and university to university connections on thematic interests. MOUs to establish student exchanges. We already have 2+2 programs and are looking at a 2+1 Master's program. Could more curriculum occur in China? We have international aspirations. If we did this, we would have a base of operations in China and enhance our diversity and offer opportunities there. We could have an alumni network there. The financial benefit would be good.

Our goals for this partnership: 1) quality, 2) a commitment to the partnership, 3) matching CSU in thematic interests, 4) support of ministry of education in China.

We looked at five universities. We have strong relationships at all of these universities and have a number of joint programs. Looked at these five and Qingdao came out on top. After doing due diligence, we began talking to Qingdao and they were receptive. 46K students, large faculty, and physical space. Active in medicine and bio materials, many active international collaborations. We already have 2+2 and 2+3 programs with them. On the faculty side, they have hired our alums. We already have a visiting professor presence there from CSU faculty. Campuses are very attractive, city is attractive, and it's on the coast. A small village of 9 million so it's one of 13 so-called central cities. City of Qingdao was a German colony and Germans established breweries that continue to be important. The Beijing Olympics held sailing events here. Located on a beautiful bay (Miranda displayed a map on the overhead). They are putting in a high-speed train between Qingdao and Beijing.

Miranda will visit in January and can take a direct flight from San Francisco. Shows pictures of the city. They are building a new airport, and a new bridge over the bay. The city is ready to invest. They are enlarging in space and expanding. The province is 120 million people so Qingdao is a small city by Chinese standards. Their medical college is associated with the University of Montreal in a model not unlike the direction we are going.

The partnership is not brand new. Have been talking to them for a number of years. Over two years ago, established a joint research center. MOUs have been signed for collaborative efforts. CNS (Jan Nerger) and Margarita Lenk went on the trip to try to understand the possibilities on the ground there. They signed a letter at that time to explore the possibilities for further collaborations. The Board is supportive. Later, also signed a letter indicating the possibility of a joint college effort.

In order for Qingdao to happen, they need the letters to help convince their government for approval. There are a few strategic committees at CSU looking at academic programs that might be possible there. What makes the most sense? Leverage what they teach. Operationally, Lynn Johnson will lead on administrative things that have to be addressed. We also have a working committee focusing on academics--chaired by Mike Palmquist and Jan Nerger. What programs should we introduce, etc.?

We are thinking of starting with seven majors. Faculty from each major college will be invited to travel there in January to help get curriculum

down. Business and various STEM areas. Core curriculum will need to be provided by CLA and CNS. May bring some facilities folks to see their plans for facilities. Another trip planned later (February) for core curriculum and electives we might want to offer. In March there will be another visit, hopefully with Tony attending.

What does student support look like? What would the tuition be? Are there taxes to be paid? How split? What legal matters must be addressed? What faculty will be needed? How would admissions work—apply to Qingdao and then to CSU programs? How would Banner work for registration? How would IP work as collaborations get going? What about academic freedom?

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): I think that last point you mentioned is huge. It has always concerned me with regard to human rights violations there, not to mention our relations with China are strained at this point.

Miranda: If we can't get this right, it will be a deal breaker.

Karen Barrett (HDFS): We've all heard about cyber espionage. My question is--what are the plans for detecting problems, abuse of IP, etc?

Miranda: We cannot be in a position of restricting our faculty or students to publish. On the other hand, our question goes more to the ability of the folks in China to get easier access to our curriculum and research projects, etc. We have to develop that carefully. We don't do classified research here. Your concern seems also to be in regard to their access to our IP. The risk level is not zero already because we have 600 Chinese students here on this campus already, and students from places that have tense relations to the U.S. already. What additional exposure we will incur is uncertain. We are not the first university to do this and will consult with NYU, Duke, etc

Peter Harris (CLA): I've been very impressed since being here at CSU in regard to our relations with China. I draw the line with regard to setting up permanent residence there. Harris then goes on to explain the various threats. I'm not sure it's possible to have academic freedom in China. 1 million Muslims in Chinese concentration camps.

Miranda: The Chairman of Board is always an appointee of the Communist Party. Their level of control of the universities is much greater than their control of us. All I can tell you is that is what I am concerned about too. We have to figure this out and have assurances that students and faculty would have access to the library, the Internet, VPN. We are not going into this with rose-colored glasses.

Ruth Hufbauer (Agricultural Sciences): I think that these issues are crucial but also it's an amazing opportunity and there are more Honors students in China than there are students in the United States from the College of Agriculture. I noticed there is nothing about agriculture. Is there any research in agriculture there?

Miranda: They have strong Ag universities in other locations. We might be able to set up some ancillary programs. But you're right, they're not the Ag school.

Mo Salman (Chair, CUP): We do have a research group there. We work with the central government and they have a research entity there. Clinical Sciences signed an IMOU. We have published with the central government technical people. It also has a major center for research from the central government related to animal disease. They have huge pharmaceutical and vaccine initiatives. Everything is confidential, but they allowed us to visit.

Steve Reising (COE): I wanted to mention that the U.S. Congress has passed restrictions. One of the departments hoping to offer degrees. VPR and export control and NASA collaboration. Has had to sign a statement disclosing everything, and signing a statement that says we have no relations with the Chinese government.

Mary Meyer (CNS): Budget question. Your statement that State appropriations are going up but tuition going down is a wash.

Miranda: The State is asking us NOT to increase tuition. What the Governor's budget says is keep the tuition flat and you will get more State appropriations. Tuition will be the same.

Mary Meyer (CNS): Enrollment is going up though?

Miranda: Yes.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): I have several questions. Regarding the salary exercise we did recently on November 28. I believe you may be aware. We get the worst pay. Also addressed CLA numbers in regard to student numbers and salary. Are you doing anything with salary compression between assistant professors and associate professors?

Miranda: In conversations with the Dean on not only internal equity, but also the equity relative to other departments around the country that are peer universities. We are trying to establish a methodology for a peer set

for each department to help us understand, rather than just institutionally, whether we are failing to be competitive. Will apply in the CLA this spring.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): FLL equivalent to English historically but \$64K in FLL vs. \$74K in English.

Miranda: It's about who do we make the comparison to. FLL to English or FLL at CSU to other institutions that are peers for FLL. The methodology is to compare same or similar departments at peer institutions. The all-university comparisons preferred by the Board is not adequate.

Michael Pante (Anthropology): Dean Withers said at our faculty meeting that it would cost \$1 million dollars to make our salaries equitable. That would be a rounding error at an institutional level. The small raises we get are even smaller when you consider where we start in the CLA. Is this number an underestimate? Hard for faculty to even buy a house. Even at an Associate's level, we are not at the cost of living level. To not be able to make a \$1 million dollar commitment seems rather silly.

Miranda: It's probably a bit high, but we need to do this right. I have committed funds from the Provost's Office, and the Dean has committed funds. I don't want to throw money without having a solid methodology to use--need systematic and transferrable options.

Michael Pante (Anthropology): Data shows that CLA is having issues. All the departments in CLA are affected. Is the goal to get to 100%?

Miranda: Not exclusive of just CLA getting to 100 percent. We are not at 90% yet and I would like to get there first. Looking at the whole university, getting our departments into the 90s would be a good goal to start with, then using the salary exercise would be helpful.

Naomi Lederer (Libraries): It isn't pure salary, it is the cost of living in the community. \$60,000 does not go as far here.

Silvia Canetto (Psychology): What other internal equity ideas are you considering? Time in rank and making sure that distribution reflects length of time in rank?

Miranda: I cannot remember all of the variables for the committee. We are going to stick with the committee's recommendations before considering alternative recommendations.

Mary Meyer (CNS): In the Mountain West coaches are the highest paid.

Michael Pante (Anthropology): Is the goal to get us to 100 percent?

Miranda: I wasn't there when the Dean made that statement so cannot comment.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Can you let us know what principles you will be using for the salary compression?

Miranda: We do have a system whereby we don't have automatic cost of living increases here but instead all raises are based on performance evaluations and a merit-based system. Some natural variance is not necessarily evident of inequity. It is incumbent upon us to consider each salary individually, and it is not the case that it's inequity that people have different salaries.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Salary raises from 1.8 to 1.9 based on merit creates a ludicrous situation. And when you have an assistant professor at \$64K and also an associate at \$64K, this is a problem.

Miranda: All valid points.

Doug Cloud (CLA): Timeline for changes?

Miranda: Talked to Laura Jensen in time for the next fiscal year. Have already started working on collecting information from peer institutions. We have plans for changes next year-- April and May.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Have been hearing about Qingdao for a while and thought this would be a good opportunity to hear the good questions you have asked.

One comment about the salary exercise: It seems to me that they were budgeting a certain tuition increase earlier but then learned that the Legislature wanted universities to freeze tuition and make it up through an appropriation. The VOICE survey indicated that many employees are struggling to make ends meet in Fort Collins. Gallagher recalls that the

recommendation from the VOICE survey was to request something like a 5% raise to make a dent in dealing with the problem. The administration, in very early budget discussions, suggested that a 5% salary increase might be a possibility.

All of these things have their components. Every year we hear the justification for increasing the cost of parking and insurance. The explanations makes sense, but it takes more money out of the pockets of employees. You have all these costs and then get a 2% raise, you are probably worse off. A 5% raise might make a difference but Gallagher hasn't heard this number mentioned in more recent budget discussions. Rick, have I said anything incorrect here?

Miranda: In the summer we were trying to figure out how to get to 5% but that doesn't seem possible--4% may be possible and is in the model that will be presented to the Board tomorrow.

Gallagher: Executive Committee will meet several times before Faculty Council meets again. If there are some big issues you would like EC to dig into, let your EC representative know. Included are some things like the fact that we don't use terms like regular and special any more. There are many other places in the *Manual* that need to be fixed in light of the changes with regard to NTTF.

Finally, as I have said the last few meetings, please give feedback to the Presidential Search Committee. The closed search means we need to provide frank feedback to our representatives on that search committee.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

Wishing everyone a great end of the semester. The Presidential Search Committee had good forums. Faculty wrote in a lot as well. Lenk also mentioned the links on the CSU website as a one-stop shop on the search, and the presidential website has great information. Thank you all.

Lenk's report was received.

DISCUSSION

1. None

Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

Tim Gallagher, Chair
Sue Doe, Vice Chair
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant to Faculty Council

December 4, 2018

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2019
Jason Bruemmer	Animal Sciences	2021
<u>Cynthia (Cini) Brown</u>	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management	2021
<u>Adam Heuberger</u>	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2019
<u>Thomas Borch</u>	Soil and Crop Sciences	2020
<u>Jane Choi</u>	College-at-Large	2019
Ruth Hufbauer	College-at-Large	2020
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2019
Health and Human Sciences		
Nancy Miller	Design and Merchandising	2021
Brian Tracy	Health and Exercise Science	2021
(Raoul Reiser starts term January 2019)		
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2019
Karen Barrett	Human Development and Family Studies	2020
Bolivar Senior	Construction Management	2020
Matt Malcolm	Occupational Therapy	2020
Thomas Chermack	School of Education	2021
<u>Anne Williford</u>	School of Social Work	2019
Business		
<u>Bill Rankin</u>	Accounting	2019
Stephen Hayne	Computer Information Systems	2021
John Elder	Finance and Real Estate	2019
(substituting for Tianyang Wang – Fall '18 sabbatical)		
Dawn DeTienne	Management	2021
<u>Kathleen Kelly</u>	Marketing	2021
Joe Cannon	College-at-Large	2019
John Hoxmeier	College-at-Large	2019
Engineering		
Russ Schumacher	Atmospheric Science	2021
(substituting for Kristen Rasmussen)		
Travis Bailey	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2019
Peter Nelson	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2021
Ali Pezeshki (substituting for Siddharth Suryanarayanan Fall '18 sabbatical)	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2019
Shantanu Jathar	Mechanical Engineering	2020
J. Rockey Luo	College-at-Large	2019
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2019
Jason Quinn	College-at-Large	2021

Liberal Arts

Michael Pante	Anthropology	2020
Marius Lehene	Art	2019
Julia Khrebtan-Horhager	Communication Studies	2019
<u>Ramaa Vasudevan</u>	Economics	2020
Doug Cloud	English	2020
Albert Bimper	Ethnic Studies	2019
<u>Jonathan Carlyon</u>	Languages, Literatures and Cultures	2019
Thaddeus Sunseri	History	2020
Michael Humphrey (substituting for Gayathri (Gaya) Sivakumar)	Journalism and Technical Communication	2020
<u>Wesley Ferreira</u>	Music, Theater, and Dance	2019
Moti Gorin	Philosophy	2019
Peter Harris	Political Science	2021
Ken Berry (substituting for Tara Opsal – Fall '18 sabbatical)	Sociology	2019
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Steve Shulman</u>	College-at-Large	2020
Allison Prasch	College-at-Large	2020
<u>Lisa Langstraat</u>	College-at-Large	2020
Marcela Velasco	College-at-Large	2021
<u>Del Harrow</u>	College-at-Large	2021
Maura Velazquez-Castillo	College-at-Large	2021

Natural Resources

Monique Rocca	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2020
David Koons	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2021
Chad Hoffman	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2020
Bill Sanford	Geosciences	2020
Tara Teel	HDNR in Warner College	2020

Natural Sciences

Jennifer Nyborg	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	2019
<u>Melinda Smith</u>	Biology	2021
George Barisas	Chemistry	2020
<u>Ross McConnell</u>	Computer Science	2019
<u>Yongcheng Zhou</u>	Mathematics	2020
<u>Dylan Yost</u>	Physics	2021
Silvia Canetto	Psychology	2019
Mary Meyer	Statistics	2019
<u>Chuck Anderson</u>	College-at-Large	2020
<u>Anton Betten</u>	College-at-Large	2019
TBD	College-at-Large	2018
Brad Conner	College-at-Large	2021
Alan Van Orden	College-at-Large	2020

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

DN Rao Veeramachaneni	Biomedical Sciences	2019
<u>Dean Hendrickson</u>	Clinical Sciences	2019
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2020
Tony Schountz	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2021
Noreen Reist	College-at-Large	2020
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2020
<u>William Black</u>	College-at-Large	2020
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2019
Anne Avery	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Tod Clapp</u>	College-at-Large	2019
Dawn Duval	College-at-Large	2019
TBD	College-at-Large	2018
Gerrit (Jerry) Bouma	College-at-Large	2021
TBD	College-at-Large	2018

University Libraries

Naomi Lederer (substituting for Linda Meyer)	Libraries	2019
--------------------------------------------------------	-----------	------

Ex Officio Voting Members

Timothy Gallagher	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2018
Sue Doe	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2018
Margarita Lenk	BOG Faculty Representative	2018
Don Estep, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2019
Todd Donovan, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2017
Jerry Magloughlin, Chair	Committee on Libraries	2019
Jenny Morse, Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Marie Legare, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty	2018
Donald Samelson, Chair	Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education	2019
Karen Barrett, Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2019
Joseph DiVerdi, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2019
Matt Hickey, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2019
Mo Salman, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2018
Bradley Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2018
<u>Susan (Suellen) Melzer</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
<u>Denise Apodaca</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
Christine Pawliuk	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Ashley Harvey (substituting for Patty Stutz-Tanenbaum)	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Daniel Baker	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Leslie Stone-Roy	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
<u>Mary Van Buren</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
<u>Steve Benoit</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Natalie Ooi	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019

Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members

Anthony Frank	President
Rick Miranda	Provost/Executive Vice President
Brett Anderson	Special Advisor to the President
Kim Tobin	Vice President for Advancement
Mary Ontiveros	Vice President for Diversity
Louis Swanson	Vice Provost for Engagement/Director of Extension
Leslie Taylor	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
Dan Bush	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Patrick Burns	Vice President for Information Technology/Dean Libraries
Jim Cooney	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Tom Milligan	Vice President for Public Affairs
Alan Rudolph	Vice President for Research
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Kelly Long	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
Lynn Johnson	Vice President for University Operations
Ajay Menon	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Jeff McCubbin	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
David McLean	Dean, College of Engineering
Jodie Hanzlik	Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Jan Nerger	Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Mark Stetter	Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
John Hayes	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Shannon Wagner	Chair, Administrative Professional Council