MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, February 12, 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; Brad Goetz substituting for Stephan Kroll, Agricultural Sciences; Stephen Hayne, Business; Steven Reising, Engineering; Thomas Chermack, Health and Human Sciences, Steven Shulman, Liberal Arts; Linda Meyer, Libraries; Mary Meyer, Natural Sciences Anne Avery, CVMBS, Dan Bush substituting for Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF; Jennifer Martin, CoRSAF and Provost’s Council for Engagement; Tony Frank, President

Absent: Stephan Kroll, Agricultural Sciences (excused); Chad Hoffman, Natural Resources (excused)

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

MARCH 5, 2019 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

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

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – April 2, 2019 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 – 4:00 p.m.

2. Upcoming Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award (presented at May 7, 2019 Faculty Council meeting). Nomination materials will be emailed early March.

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 –
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
FEBRUARY 12, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

   A. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

      1. January 15 and 22, 2019

         The January 15 and 22, 2019 EC meeting minutes were approved by unanimous consent and will be placed on the March 5, 2019 FC meeting agenda.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

   A. Announcements

      1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: February 19, 2019 - 3:00 p.m. – Note new location for this meeting only: Room 402 - Michael Smith Natural Resources building (located in southwest corner of the building)

         Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for February 19, 2019 – Room 402 – Michael Smith Natural Resources building. This meeting location was suggested by Stephan Kroll.

   B. Action Items

      1. UCC meeting minutes – January 18, and 25, 2019; February 1, 2019

         Gallagher: Goetz can answer any questions regarding the UCC minutes.

         Doe moved, (Chermack 2nd) to place the January 18 and 25, 2019 UCC meeting minutes on the March 5 FC meeting agenda.

         Doe’s motion was approved.

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

Reising moved, Linda Meyer 2\textsuperscript{nd} to place Section E.12 on the March 5, 2019 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Reising’s motion was approved.

Questions:

Chermack: Not in every department code?

Legare: Kept Section E 12.3.6. Guidelines for each rank and title. Explains that this is not in many codes so it was thought that it would be good to have suggestions.

Avery asked about the section on use of course surveys and asked where we stand on this.

Legare says that they have talked with Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL and agree that their ideas on course surveys are not in conflict. However, CoRSAF has not changed the section mentioned specifically, and today we are only concerned with changes CoRSAF is proposing.

Gallagher indicates that we are approaching a day of reckoning on the issue of course surveys. He would be surprised if there’s not a motion on the floor of FC at some point soon recommending total erasure to course surveys. The Executive Committee does not decide these matters.

Dan Bush: There’s not a great deal of disagreement on the Committee on Teaching and Learning, which he can speak to because he’s on the committee. It’s not a tool for measuring someone’s effectiveness.

Avery: Give it to the faculty member then, not the department head.

Bush: A department head could have a conversation with a faculty member, though no one thinks the surveys should be used for evaluation.

Legare: Common and coherent teaching issues regarding Section 12.1.
Lenk: A little clarification from Dan. I’ve long felt that surveys tell you if something major is broken. However, there are ways in which lower ranks people are inordinately affected.

Bush encourages EC members to see what CoTL has to say.

Gallagher: Back to the original point: Is E.12 ready to sustain debate on the floor of FC?

Legare: Section E.12.3 service and Section E.12.4 outreach and engagement are the major thrust right now, so if you think removing 12.1 and 12.2 for now, we would be OK with that but didn’t want to create multiple proposals.

Gallagher asks again about specific areas--Are these areas ready to sustain debate?

Hayne: Let’s discuss it further.

Avery: Public service needs to be clarified. Community service not related to the university is detrimental to the career packet.

Legare: Researching service at many institutions, the description is informed by that research.

Avery: I’m not opposed to people being involved in service, but personal things not related to the university should not be rewarded.

Bush: You might be bringing your professional background to a community need and that would be.

Shulman: I’ve said this before, but one page of teaching, one page on research, and five pages on service doesn’t work for me.

Lenk: It says that each unit will make its own decision, so you should be reassured by that.

Gallagher: All in favor of placing this on the March FC agenda?

Executive Committee voted and approved by unanimous consent.

Hayne and Gallagher: There’s no way to prevent the department head from using this for evaluation.
3. Dawn DeTienne, Sesquicentennial Committee and Jennifer Welding, Incontro Events, request a Report to FC talking about year-long events for CSU’s upcoming 150th year celebration.

Gallagher asks if we wish go give 5 – 10 minutes to this committee on the floor of Faculty Council to report on upcoming events.

Lenk has seen most of the material and feels what they would like to present is very important.

Gallagher: We can add this for a report.

Linda Meyer moved (Lenk 2nd) to place on the March 5 FC meeting agenda as a Report.

Meyer’s motion was approved.

Reising: Can they limit it to no longer than 10 minutes?

Chermack: I think we should ask what they are going to present.

Lenk: I think we could have a suggestion for them to put this all on the website.

Bush and Gallagher were at Cabinet this morning. There was a slideshow of what the events were going to be.

Hayne thinks it would be nice to get more of a formal heads up with what is going to be presented to FC. I think that it’s professional courtesy.

Bush: Is this your typical practice when inviting others to present to FC? Is this a policy change?

Gallagher: All in favor of placing this on the March FC agenda.

Executive Committee unanimously agreed to place this as a Report on the March 5 FC meeting agenda.

C. Reports

1. President – Tony Frank

Frank reported on the following:
Presidential search: process now formally closed--77 applications in the pool so far. Have not looked through them all—would guess 3/4 are technically qualified for the position but probably many are not viable. Of the candidates that are qualified, close to 60 approximately--12% are sitting presidents (some from AAU); 20% are Provosts; 25% are VPs for research, etc., and most often have been successful faculty members, and, 31% are Deans; 11% are other (nontraditional candidates), and 28% are women or under-represented minorities.

The committee will meet soon and sort through for final recommendations for airport interviews. After that, recommendations will be made to the Board. Semi-finalists will come back in March. At the end of March or beginning of April, there will be an announcement. The process is still on track.

Gallagher: When the new president is introduced, there’s going to be a big learning curve. Do you have any advice as representatives of the faculty to make a good impression on the president and help that person understand the faculty perspective and get off to a good start, seeing the faculty as important partners?

Frank: Initial response. We’re going to have every Cabinet member and the colleges prepare a budget breakdown and SWOT analysis—things that keep them up at night. We will identify the person before we select the format of the presentation of the information. Anything the President of EC or this group would like to share is fair game. There might be visits to select groups before their start date. It’s a little trickier if the person is not coming from an academic background. Assumes they’re on the same page as you on the matter of shared governance. Trust until you have reason not to. Beyond that, I’m not sure I have more specific things right now but I’ll think about it.

Lenk: Shared governance has been on the top of everyone’s minds on the search committee.

Reising: Do you have any concerns about a CEO who might be among the 11% of non-academic candidates?

Frank: The Board is not especially interested in a nontraditional candidate. They actually feel this should be a more academic person given the separate Chancellor role. There are always other university VPs who may not have the breadth of experience to lead the rest of campus. Then you’ve got some candidates who
don’t have any administrative experience so they won’t be viable candidates, probably.

Other things regarding the budget. The Polis administration is supporting the Hickenlooper budget so things are as we thought they would be—a 4.5% salary pool increase. We don’t know much of that, we want to take off for equity, or for salary compression, but we are starting from a better place at 4.5% than at 2.5% where it gets kind of silly. Look for tradeoffs between equity/compression and the base and weigh in on those. Another question: A 1% reallocation leads to push back from academic units but there’s a revenue sharing agreement. We will also get push back from non-academic units that don’t have a revenue sharing agreement. Take a look at those lines and the quality enhancement discussions. The things on the top of the quality enhancement are weighed against the rest, so look closely at these to consider the balance.

Legislative issues. Will be visiting the delegation. Going to D.C. and keeping our eye on the Title IX issues, and DACA. Our highest priority has been to keep government open to keep research funded. At the state level, we are in the phase of monitoring legislation.

Governor Polis pulled back all Board and Commission nominees that the Hickenlooper administration had put forward. Candidates were re-interviewed by the appropriate executive director. We should know the status shortly.

Lenk: Can you give us any indication of what the Department of Higher Education might prioritize?

Frank: They’re worried about small struggling state institutions. This has all focused a lot of attention on the funding formula.

Chermack: And what thinking is going on for student enrollments for 2024? Should we be building?

Frank: There’s about 50 years in front of that next big decision because of the duration of buildings. In that time, things will change. Birthrates bounce around. Out of state positions us in a good situation with in migration to the SW U.S. Many parents still want their kids to have the same college experience they had. The pressures of demographics are a bigger deal for comprehensive state colleges, and small liberal arts colleges without name recognition.
Frank’s report was received.

2. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Miranda entered the EC meeting late as he was in Denver earlier this afternoon.

Attended the BOG meeting-February 6-8. The Manual changes for Section E.11 passed--early termination of contracts.

Albert Yates was awarded the Founder’s Day medal.

Miranda’s report was received.

3. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Marie Legare has asked Richard Eykholt to come to the next week’s EC meeting to talk about more CoRSAF items.

Matt Hickey will also attend for CoTL for E.12 and I.8 motions to consider as well. We will hopefully also have a conversation on LENS, and whether we could have a LENS discussion item on the Faculty Council agenda.

Regarding the Supervisor Training discussion, Gallagher followed up with Diana Prieto regarding Supervisor Training. Prieto said that the feedback has been overwhelmingly positive.

Avery: Can she provide the data?

Gallagher: Depending on how you feel about the CoTL and CoRSAF motions, will we have time to do a discussion item at the March meeting? Since the number of action items is larger than a week or two ago, we will have to look at how to budget the March FC meeting time.

Gallagher also went to the Founder’s Day event celebrating former President Al Yates—it was impressive.
Gallagher: As you all know, the FC officer elections are at the March FC meeting.

Gallagher: The last word that I had was Gallagher and Doe have put their names in. Stephanie Clemons is putting her name in for the BOG rep. Steve Reising, do you know anything new.

Reising: No

Lenk: Nominations can also be made from the floor of Faculty Council, correct?

Gallagher: Yes they can.

Gallagher: We will need the Faculty Council meeting agenda wrapped up as closely as possible next week. Gallagher is planning on having the UGO evaluation material put on the February 26 EC meeting agenda so it doesn’t get in the way of the March meeting items.

Gallagher’s report was received.

4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

Attended the Board meeting. Pueblo and Global are working hard to figure out what they can provide at a great level to really focus on their strengths. The Stock Show was successful. We will not participate in 2020, due to construction, but will be back in 2021. Clean reports from external auditors---good for external partners. No deficiencies were noted. Student Success has many different measures and is being considered in careful ways. The system has been doing some huge improvements to help us become a strategic leader. The system now has reserves to protect all the campuses.

Fabulous set of strategic initiatives to work with. There are a lot of new CEOs at the system level and investments are giving us a good return. Global’s success is also making an impact here. The State Treasury has always held a lot of our funds but there is some movement towards putting our system in charge of those funds increasingly. Getting tremendous returns on our investments and lowering our debt percentages. CSU-Pueblo is trying to become solar
powered. Curriculum and everything passed at the Board meeting.

Lenk is excited by the energy the Board shows in terms of the new president. There are new voices onboard. As mentioned previously, Kim Jordan is a new important voice. The new Board members are going to be important forces for good—excellent assets. Lots of good things are happening.

Hayne: Re: Treasury. Is that part of the funds that have the rate of return that can be spent for other things?

Miranda: Endowment is set up by the CSU Foundation.

Lenk’s report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. Honorary Degree Candidates

Hayne moved (Lenk 2nd) for Executive Committee to enter Executive session.

Executive Committee unanimously approved exiting Executive session.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

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