MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, March 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; Stephan Kroll, Agricultural Sciences; Stephen Hayne, Business; Kristen Rasmussen substituting for Steven Reising, Engineering; Thomas Chermack, Health and Human Sciences, Steven Shulman, Liberal Arts; Linda Meyer, Libraries; Chad Hoffman, Natural Resources; George Barisas substituting for Mary Meyer, Natural Sciences; Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: Bradley Goetz, Chair, UCC

Absent: Steven Reising, Engineering (excused); Mary Meyer, Natural Sciences (excused); Anne Avery, CVMBS (excused)

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

APRIL 2, 2019 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – April 2, 2019 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 - 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – May 7, 2019 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 – 4:00 p.m.

2. Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award nominations due by: Friday, April 5, 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 –

E. ACTION ITEMS

1.

F. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. President – Tony Frank
2. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda
3. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher
4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

G. DISCUSSION
MARCH 12, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

1. February 19, 2019

Gallagher: Any corrections or additions?

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting will be determined at the March 12, 2019 meeting.

Gallagher: Before leaving today, we will decide if we have an EC meeting next week—March 19.

B. Action Items

1. UCC meeting minutes – February 22, 2019; March 1, 2019

Gallagher: Any comments or questions of Brad?

Executive Committee approved the UCC meeting minutes by unanimous consent.

2. Examine issues related to CoNTTF Report at February Faculty Council meeting – Jenny Morse

Gallagher speaks to his plans for inviting Morse into the meeting. Morse will explain the February meeting and then will talk about how things are going with the policy changes and their execution for NTTF. Gallagher indicates that she will have 10-15 minutes of comments prior to inviting the EC to make comments, ask questions, or state views afterwards.

Morse: Thanks for having me. Will start with addressing the slides used in the February FC meeting. In terms of the slides, the goal was to provide FC an update on the status of colleges. Many NTTF representatives to each college have been involved in some
way to help with the writing of the codes for each college. The idea was to report back to Faculty Council on how things are going. Morse explains that as the COB rep to CoNTTF, she is not connected with groups in her department or college on NTTF matters. Presented motion to form a college committee for her own college to COB Dean in 2015 at the request of the previous CoNTTF Chair. The way the representative to CoNTTF works is as a member of the college committee. The CoNTTF rep from the college was meant to be incorporated onto the college NTTF committee when it was formed. Asked to have a channel of communication but this did not happen. Has sought repeatedly to be involved and has asked to be a communication link but mostly there isn’t a link. This fall, Morse presented at the Fall Forum upon invitation, and made a point to talk to leadership about being a link to the college. Has not been involved. The idea is to have a link between colleges, college committees, and CoNTTF. The college committee chair indicated that “nothing is happening.” Morse asked prior to her report for an update (one week prior to the meeting, as well as a follow up). She did not wish to have a blank slide. The way that this relates to the slides is that Morse sent a letter to Dean Walker for the slideshow and she responded that she would get it to Morse. Morse followed up, but did not get that information. Morse didn’t receive a report until two days after the FC meeting--on February 7. As a result, Morse went in to find what the college is doing but had no direct access.

One of the things that is going well is that there is a lot of progress being made in many colleges. The movement has been positive over the last 4-5 years, although there are still some pockets where NTTF are not involved. Morse reports that she came to CSU wishing to be a full participating member, but the relationship is quite strained with her department, including revocation of voting rights.

Because of the position of NTTF, one of her roles is to take the risk that many NTTF do not feel that they can. Her own contract is ending this spring and she has no indication of renewal. She reports on similar challenges to 2017—NTTF sharing offices with 3-5 people. Excessive service loads. Parental leave, ADA accommodations not provided, people phased out of jobs due to shrinking programs, which replaces with younger and cheaper labor, injured faculty who aren’t provided resources, sick and medical leave problems, people who are told they must perform professional development to be promoted but this isn’t in the workload distribution or compensated. Research faculty being told they must publish in the area of the scholarship on teaching
even though they do no teaching. Contracts allow people to plan their lives for 3 years, as well as the ability to speak one’s mind.

Senior Teaching Appointment was supposed to convert automatically to Contract appointments at the Senior Instructor or equivalent rank, but STAs on contract are sometimes being converted to Continuing appointment at Senior Instructor or equivalent rank.

Morse added that the policies are good moves but they’re not in place yet. There is a deadline for March 25 for colleges to get information. Coordinating with Dan Bush and passing those policies down the line.

Gallagher: Any questions or comments for Jenny?

Hayne: Thank you for sharing.

Morse: I’m representing approximately 780 people now, and it becomes personal.

Gallagher: It’s good to hear directly from Jenny. I have heard these things at the fall forum, at receptions for NTTF, etc. I think some important information is not getting out to all of the colleges.

Hoffman: What are some sticking points you are hearing now?

Morse: The money. We put things in place for funding, but we don’t have a way to make this happen. How are we going to fund professional development? Promotions? Central administration has promised, but there are questions.

Miranda: We are trying to understand how to promote hundreds of people. Phase in promotions but not raises.

Morse: Dan Bush is going to come to a meeting in a couple weeks. Morse indicated that the cost might be around $3 million dollars for those who are eligible.

Gallagher: I think there was many people who were very pleased with what FC did with regard to the FC Manual, and the BOG approval. There was a lot of optimism for our NTTF. When it comes to actually implementing the new policies that are now possible, there is a widespread disappointment. It is not happening the way it was envisioned. There are some who believe that
things are getting worse. People who have been on contracts and have done a good job have contracts that are not being renewed.

Hayne: We discussed this and that there would be unintended consequences to these contractual agreements. We were concerned about this.

Morse: The challenge/discomfort around NTTF. They are a solution to a problem, and they are not always treated like people. The unintended consequences are--what are we doing to make things better? To make them feel more secure? Talk about ones who teach. Teachers feeling insecure while teaching their jobs in their classroom, and how do you (NTTF) make students feel welcome if they don’t know if they have a job here next week. The tenuous of this has a widespread effect all over the campus.

Barisas: One thing, I haven’t been following this closely, but there are two limiting distributions. Either people who were brought in for small chunks--one course--or people whose job is fulltime. What is the distribution for people in a fulltime capacity vs small chunks?

Barisas: Are there many NTTF whose responsibilities are substantially research?

Morse: In Veterinary Medicine. Out of 785 total NTTF, there are something like 500 that are fulltime. I teach a 4/4 and have for seven years. This is most of the people I am working with and we are carrying the primary teaching load.

Doe: This has been this way for a long time.

Barisas: It is easier if they think of them as a fulltime regular faculty person. I would think this would make it easier for the department head.

Gallagher: Any other questions?

Linda Meyer: In the Libraries, there is a fair amount of equality between NTTF and TTF. I am curious which colleges have more difficulty creating equity/equality.

Morse: CLA, CoB and HHS are the colleges with the most NTTF. CLA has done a lot of work to integrate NTTF. We certainly have examples of where the work is being done very well.
Linda Meyer: Is it more of a factor for the department head and dean, or the type of work that is being done?

Morse: I don’t have access to all those things. There are places where they are doing innovative things to integrate the NTTF as well. How do we make an inclusive community?

Doe: The ability to make a projection. CLA, or Department of English. So much of the teaching is done by NTTF. There has to be a projection into the future—2 or 4 years out. I give the chairs credit to make that effort in thinking that through, but not to overcommit either. Something about the new changes has created a new sense of vulnerability. I feel that my chair even has become more timid and it feels more risky. People who have been senior teaching appointments on contracts are being told there won’t be any more contracts unless they are at a certain level. It is felt as a diminishment and increased risk. I cannot explain this either.

Kroll: Question on staff. You have 780 NTTF and about 1100 TTF. How do you compare to P&T, or 1997? The TTF line has not been increasing but has gone up substantially for NTTF.

Miranda: If you go back 30 years, there was zero NTTF.

Kroll: Is this a national trend.

Doe and Gallagher: Yes.

Hayne: There is this horrible tension between TTF and NTTF due to budgets within departments. Our department has some NTTF, but not many, and we have no idea where the money is coming from. We replaced the people that retire with NTTF people. The TTF do teaching and research. We recruit nationally for those people with research. When we don’t get those TTF lines, we have to fill with NTTF lines. This changes the mix and means that it’s threatening to both communities. The lack of budget clarity at the department level causes issues. I am just trying to characterize this for the minutes and from my viewpoint.

Lenk: I appreciate what everyone is saying. We have four of five departments sitting here (from CoB), but it’s not from my department. What Jenny described is very different in my accounting department. Every department is different. I am a cost accountant. In terms of the chairs, a huge amount of budgetary change has come. We are very happy and supportive of NTTF. The reality for the chair is that their budgetary choices for teaching
has changed. It would be good if we could have some training for these departments.

Doe: My question is--what changed overnight? You see enrollments shrinking but no change happened overnight. Went from feeling confident, to offering a dozen contracts, to hardly any.

Miranda: Similarly, in CLA, until about 2 to 3 years ago, the Department of History decreased, but the Department of English is bolstered by composition a bit. I think it is a little easier for English to project. The last two to three years has caused CLA to be a bit nervous. We are trying to influence these changes for job security, etc. I can appreciate the confluence of these events.

Hoffman: We were very liberal with our NTTF until we were forced to vote on this, everything was fine. The voting side is good to have those discussions, but now things have changed.

Gallagher: My own view is that some of the issues were not financial. I think that there are financial issues that are real, but collectively we can do better on the things that don’t cost anything.

2. Executive Committee approval of Faculty Council presentation and/or discussion topics – Faculty Council Executive Committee Operating Procedures

Gallagher: We took Margarita’s motion and put it into the EC Operating Procedures word for word.

Lenk: Didn’t we want it separate from the reports?

Lenk moved that we take the shaded area on agenda, page 21, and it becomes the new #9 and everything that follows is numbered accordingly and that the words “that directly involve faculty responsibilities and processes” be deleted.

Barisas seconded Lenk’s motion. When I look at this, the notion of reviewing contents. Why isn’t this just a freestanding item? This addresses things that go into Faculty Council. Re-number as 9A or 9B.

Kroll wasn’t sure about the placement of this document.

Gallagher: This is part of EC’s decision for what goes on the FC agenda so it should be under the EC Operating Procedures.
Unanimously approved.

4. Corrections to Biennial Reviews for Discontinuance and Continuance of Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (CIOSUs) – CUP (hard copy will be disbursed to review so all needed corrections can be made)

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

At the Council of Deans, we heard eight presentations on new degree proposals--four were preliminary and four were comprehensive and approved to move forward. We have tried to have these happen only twice a year, in October and March was the plan; however, there are so many of them at one time, it hasn’t been especially effective.

Shulman: Is there going to be money available for gender salary equity adjustments this year?

Miranda is not sure. At some point, the units will be expected to do this themselves. Departments created inequities so central will look to the departments to unmake the inequities. Doesn’t want to speak to Dan Bush’s budget. Central can’t commit to addressing the inequities indefinitely. Now we’re in the process of revising the methodology for determining inequities and in October, they do the snapshot and IR puts out a report. The last report showed no statistically significant differences due to gender. At this point, most inequities will need to address various other things such as the living wage, disciplinary differences, NTTF raises, and a whole list of things that might broadly be construed as equity. Miranda says he will check with Dan Bush on this and report back.

Shulman: Most departments have been told there are no resources. There is no money and it’s on the departments.

Miranda: Dan has his own budget. I have oversight over his budget, but I don’t want to speak for Dan’s budget. Sometimes he contributes for special cases. I don’t want to make a blanket statement.
Shulman: I thought it was on central to address these inequities.

Miranda: Yes, we put monies in at the beginning. We have done this for the past 3-4 years. This year we are reviewing the methodology, and every October we do an equity analysis. When we identified the last report, we did not identify any significant gender equities in any college. At this point, I am not sure what is happening.

Miranda’s report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Richard Eykholt was put in charge of the Section E.17 Manual language. There are still some problems with this. There are recommendations from Jason Johnson, in the Office of General Counsel. Johnson talked to Miranda, and Johnson would recommend it not go to the Board if approved by Faculty Council. Eykholt wants to meet with Johnson, and cannot meet with him until the end of March, so E.17 won’t be on the April FC meeting agenda. Hopefully, in April, the Office of General Counsel will be happy with something for the May agenda.

Gallagher has been talking with Don Estep and Shannon Wagner, Chair of APC, regarding the University Policy Review Committee. Gallagher attended the APC meeting and suggested that the two employee groups (APC and FC) approve the University Policy Review Committee language in Sections C.2.1.9.5 and D2. Wagner wants the entire APC to vote on the motion that Don Estep put together before FC votes on it. Gallagher looked up Section H and the new wording says Faculty Council has a working group and the APC has a working group. Gallagher feels that if this is managed in this way, this would mean that there would only be marginal improvement over the previous policy that was overturned regarding voting processes. So, the University Policy Review Committee progress is stalled somewhat while this is worked out.

Section E.13 was sent back to CoRSAF by FC at our March meeting. Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF has been reaching out to others for their suggestions. Main issue: guidelines for service for
different ranks. Her initial reaction was that they were only guidelines. The guidelines indicated in E.13 for service were not received positively by all faculty. She is gathering information and addressing these concerns. Some of the criticism was from the CLA, which may be due to the CoRSAF representative from CLA not having attended this semester.

Lenk: I missed the meeting due to the Presidential Search Committee obligation. Lenk suggests that the representatives to CoRSAF go back and report more to their constituencies. Faculty need clarification about how much university service matters. Recommends more discussion.

Gallagher will get back to Legare and nudge the representatives to get back to their groups with information.

Gallagher’s report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

Lenk apologized for missing the FC meeting. Lenk explains how she was nominated and appreciates having been considered. Reports the progress of the presidential search.

Hoffman: Any idea on the announcement time?

Miranda says that it could be as early as the end of March.

Lenk says that the State rules say that when there has been a vote, selecting the new president, then there’s a two-week window of time before it’s official. It’s best just to say by the end of April, we will definitely know. “We” are hoping sooner than later.

Lenk’s report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. University Grievance Officer annual performance review

Lenk moved (Kroll 2nd) to enter Executive Session.

[During Executive Session: The EC reads the draft letter from Gallagher re: Richard Eykholt’s performance and also a letter from
Marie Legare on the UGO. It’s clarified that these letters go to Eykholt’s Department Chair and to the Provost. Lenk wonders if it would be appropriate to address the question of when the UGO is the best office to contact. Gallagher indicates that this may be something done separately from the evaluation letter and after the letter of annual evaluation is sent.]

Executive Committee unanimously agreed to exit Executive Session.

Lenk also mentioned the importance of faculty knowing whether to contact the Ombuds Office, Human Resources, or the University Grievance Officer for grievance issues as there seems to be some confusion. Executive Committee also agreed that the report that was shared with the President’s Commission on Culture be shared with the Provost, Blanche Hughes, and Diana Prieto.

Gallagher asked EC members whether they would like to have a meeting next week, March 19 (over spring break). EC members unanimously decided to not meet on March 19. Gallagher stated that emails could be sent to everyone if the need arises.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

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