MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, March 26, 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, 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: Bradley Goetz, Chair, UCC

Absent:

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: February 19, 2019
(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 – February 22, 2019; March 1, 2019

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Elections - University Grievance Panel - Committee on Faculty Governance

2. Elections - University Disciplinary Panel - Committee on Faculty Governance

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 26, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

1. February 26, 2019

Gallagher: Any corrections or additions?

Linda Meyer sent a minor correction to Rita.

The amended minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

B. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

1. March 5, 2019

Gallagher: Are there any changes or corrections?

Linda Meyer: Bottom of Page 36. Karen Barrett was making a comment and there was a motion to move. Is there something more following?

Gallagher’s recollection is that Joseph DiVerdi made the motion to call the question and it interrupted Karen, so we went ahead and had the vote on the motion. If the question was called, it should be inserted.

Gallagher: We will do a little digging and bring it to EC again in two weeks.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on April 9, 2019.

Gallagher announced that the next meeting for Executive Committee will be on April 9, 2019.

B. Action Items

1. UCC meeting minutes – March 8 and 15, 2019
Gallagher: Had a brief meeting with Brad Goetz 30 minutes before our meeting, so if anyone has questions, Brad will be here at 4:00 p.m.

Gallagher: Is there a motion to place on the UCC minutes on the April FC meeting consent agenda?

Lenk moved (Linda Meyer 2nd) to place the March 8 and 15, 2019 UCC meeting minutes on the April 2 FC meeting agenda.

Lenk’s motion was approved.

2. New Degree: A new Master of Professional Science Master’s in Biomanufacturing and Biotechnology, to be established **effective Fall 2019** in the Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering – UCC

Avery: What is the definition between a Professional Master’s and a Master’s?

Miranda: Professional Science Master’s is a branded nationally accepted title. It requires a certain amount of discipline courses as well as Business courses and it is certified nationally. This is in engineering with a professional doctorate.

Chermack: The degree we approved is the Doctorate of Systems Engineering?

Chermack: This is a PPP, so this is a preliminary proposal. There is a preliminary and a comprehensive proposal.

Gallagher: I learned that there was some miscommunication. I didn’t know that the Council of Deans stopped using the Phase 0 terminology and have moved to preliminary and comprehensive reviews.

Miranda: We are not using Phase 0 anymore. We will have concept papers, then comprehensive with details of curriculum and a budget, but sometimes people throw this material to strengthen their case. There is some confusion as the preliminary looks more like a comprehensive. Unfortunately, there can be years in-between these proposals. So, we have tightened this up and identified these issues.
Gallagher: Jeff McCubbin has dug a little deeper. Some things we thought were preliminary, or Phase 0 were not. Rick, are you comfortable with this moving forward?

Miranda: Yes.

Gallagher: Thanks for asking the question, Tom.

Mary Meyer moved (Avery 2\textsuperscript{nd}) to place the New Degree: A new Master of Professional Science Master’s in Biomanufacturing and Biotechnology on the April 2 FC meeting agenda.

Mary Meyer’s motion was approved.

3. Proposed revisions to Section C.2.1.9.5 of the \textit{Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual} – CoFG

4. Proposed revisions to Section D.2 of the \textit{Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual} – CoFG

Gallagher: Regarding the Policy Review Committee, Don Estep has asked that Sections C.2.1.9.5 and D.2 be moved forward. It requires a Code change.

Lenk moved (Hayne 2\textsuperscript{nd}) and discussion ensued.

Avery: So this is only being changed since this is a new committee? Would D.2 need to go through first?

At the Faculty Council meeting, Gallagher can move for a vote for approval of D.2 first, then vote on C.2.1.9.5 next, the latter requiring approval of at least two-thirds of the votes.

Lenk: What can you all imagine from your colleges that a faculty member would object? How can we be sure our Policy Review Committee voice will have an impact?

Hayne: Some colleges will feel unrepresented. That could be an objection.

Lenk: Could we have a rationale?

Gallagher: I will make sure Don is present in May to speak to the motion. Personally, I was on the fence about this at first, but when he came to EC, I found that he was very convincing.
Lenk: Is APC okay with this?

Gallagher: I did have a meeting with the APC officers as well and they are good with this.

Gallagher: All in favor of placing these two motions on the May agenda as action items?

EC approved by unanimous consent.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

   Miranda had no report.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

   Gallagher reported on the following:

   Gallagher reported on conversations between Richard Eykholt and Marie Legare regarding concerns with E.12 service guidelines. Gallagher feels they are making good progress, and hopefully there will be something for the May FC meeting.

   Another item: E.17 – This is the part that has to do with terminating tenure-track faculty who are in the probationary period. Miranda mentioned questions about whether a department head would want to terminate due to conduct but departments wanted to state that the faculty member was making progress. Richard Eykholt has an appointment with Jason Johnson in the Office of General Counsel later this week. Hopefully something will be coming back to us soon.

   Gallagher was in communication with Don Estep. As you may know, we have two types of standing committees (regular and special). There is only one special committee –NTTF. A number of NTTF are asking if they may be considered to serve on regular standing committees. These conversations are happening. In the future, we may have something more concrete to look at (i.e., if a college wanted to send a NTTF to represent that college and they voted to have that NTTF on the committee. Would a college be able to send a NTTF member to serve on Executive Committee? This is an example of the kinds of questions that are popping up. We may need to discuss this down the road.
Gallagher: Any questions?

Shulman: What is the reason for excluding NTTF colleagues?

Gallagher: It’s more of a historic thing. I have had extensive conversations with Don Estep. When many of the standing committees were formed, the NTTF represented a very small portion of faculty--mostly teaching a class here or there and were not as woven into the institution, and this is why this is now being suggested as an area of review. There are some things in the Manual that say “faculty” and it doesn’t differentiate with either TTF or NTTF. We need to make sure we let NTTF serve where they need to and decide on where they shouldn’t serve.

Lenk: For the future, what is the benefit of keeping NTTF as the special committee instead of regular?

Hayne: What is the reason for excluding NTTF colleagues?

Gallagher: We passed verbiage regarding membership of Faculty Council based on membership in special committees. At first it was only the Chair of NTTF who could serve as a voting member. Today, all NTTF serving on committees are voting members on Faculty Council. If we move them to a standing committee, we don’t want the unintended consequence of not having them serve on Faculty Council.

Gallagher’s report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following

Lenk inquired about the EC Operating Procedures that we were going to vote on.

Gallagher noted it will be ready for the next EC meeting.

Lenk asked Miranda about the Faculty Council request for feedback from the faculty with regard to their experience with INTO students. The purpose is to find out what the impact is on academic classrooms to have INTO students in the room, sometimes because of difficulty with language. It’s unethical to collect revenues from student who are not having good outcomes. Stories about top students may be
too anecdotal but more information is needed about the success of the program.

Kroll: Success of the program was not mentioned.

Hayne: To highlight any hidden costs that are not accounted for. He hears from peers about the extraordinary effort and cost required to deal with these students. He would like to know whether this is a broad problem or isolated stories.

Lenk: I would like to survey non-INTO faculty to learn what the INTO experience was from their point of view. What she hears is that students are staying in their native languages and not gaining the proficiency they need. What is happening to the disappointment of students who are not obtaining the proficiency they need, and what effort is being required to meet their needs?

Miranda: Fabiola is executing the survey.

Hayne: Students are remaining in their silos so fully that they are not getting the learning that they need.

Miranda: Statistical success is comparable to native students.

Lenk: How is it impacting the academic classrooms? We just wanted some feedback to make sure the output is at the standard where students can succeed. Want to make sure of the outcome of INTO and make sure it is accurate.

Lenk hears that students are talking in their native language way too much and not immersing themselves enough in English. When enough complaints come to me, then we need to check on this.

Hayne: My working hypothesis is that these students are silent and not getting the intended purpose of the program. Having trouble learning what we want them to learn.

Lenk: Believes in independent data but none has been produced by INTO. The goal is to provide the supportive structures to make this successful.

Lenk’s report was received.

**D. Discussion Items**

1. President’s evaluation
Lenk: Recommends that there be a process in each college where the representative from EC would contact faculty to get additional input. The voting members of Faculty Council would be asked to give feedback and each EC member would seek this feedback. States that each EC member would contact the department representative to Faculty Council.

Hayne points out that this is already possible and invited.

Avery: Last year I sent a message to my college representatives.

Kroll: The problem with this is that if I send this elsewhere in the college, it may be seen as junk mail, but if they see it’s from their college rep, it will be more important.

Avery: If the subject line is: Evaluation of the President, they will see it’s more important.

Lenk: But the EC member would send a personal note to get more responses from the Faculty Council members.

Kroll: What if a department member wants to provide feedback? Does this person give feedback to the Faculty Council representative from their department, the college-at large rep to FC, or who? If recognized that this is our department representative, it will be more likely to be read and responded to.

Gallagher: I still need a response deadline (to put in the Memo) for the feedback, and a date when we send the memo to Faculty Council members.

Reising suggested sending the memorandum out on April 1 and proposed April 16 for the response date.

Lenk: Personal reach out helps to get good feedback

2. Proposed resolution to budget cuts to academics.
   -Steve Shulman

Shulman: I sent out a resolution that I tried to get in front of FC a couple years ago, but I was not on EC at that time. I would like to do something similar again. What motivated me was the 2018 fiscal athletic budget. Shulman sees this as a propitious moment as a new president arrives. It would garner some publicity. Doubts that it would change policy but would be a way to stand up for a
principle. States that the original resolution sent out with our packet was the one sent out a few years back. On the new one, he did not request sponsors but did send an updated resolution. He acknowledges that he is making use of his EC membership to make this resolution.

Mary Meyer: I support this resolution. Meyer shows a graph of where the money is coming from, then shows a second graph relating to rates of growth of spending in colleges. Explains that Revenues = Expenses. A third graph shows the subsidy increases since 2005 in comparison to other institutions. Meanwhile, departments are being asked to cut their budgets by 2% so departments are cutting while athletics is getting more subsidization.

Lenk: How much of that red on the graph is scholarships?

Meyer: This from the NCAA finances that they collect. Meyer showed her graph. The athletics revenues are growing way faster than academics. Shows CSU is throwing money at athletics.

Avery: Is this all football?

Shulman points out that sports revenues are actually sports costs with football being the most egregious misuse. The resolution calls for a reduction in the subsidies.

Lenk states that 29 years ago when she first got here she got on the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee. States that we need to fix that committee. We need a Faculty Council oversight committee or group to oversee this stuff. Lenk’s sense is that the reason the numbers are going up is because of the scholarships and so there have been efforts to increase the endowment amounts to address this need.

Shulman points out that he tried to go through the CoIA but they stated that his resolution is outside of their mandate. Scholarships reflect a real cost. Someone pays for these students. The subsidies seem to be the key issue, as Mary Meyer has just pointed out ¼ of subsidies come from student fees, which are voted on by students. He separated this out from general fund monies. Subsidies are large, growing, likely to continue to grow and unrelated to the academic mission of the university. The bonds have been sold, the stadium built, so this may be mostly symbolic and believes that faculty voice matters. When FC could have influenced the actual policy, it was quiescent, but we can avoid this.
Hoffman: The color of money is not all the same. We are not giving “x” amount to athletics, but how can that money be used and not be used within the system? I am just making a point.

Avery: I support this, but the money won’t go to academic units as a result. Is there a way to protect the smaller athletic teams?

Hayne: Title IX will be involved but it will hurt the smaller sports more than football.

Gallagher: I have had great conversations with Mary Meyer and emails with Steve Shulman.

Lenk supports this resolution and has argued for a more sophisticated reporting method to the Board of Governors. The model does not clarify where reallocations are going so greater sophistication is needed. Points out that athletics impact not just the athletes themselves but the engagement and retention of non-student athletes.

Hayne: Before I can vote, I need to see the scholarship side to have a better feel for the subsidies. There may be “unmeasured good will” that is generated by athletics. We need to find a way to measure that. Being on TV, without scandal, and being a good state school might be worth $3-5 million. Overall, this is small potatoes in a billion dollar operation.

Gallagher: This is super early for the May meeting. I’m hoping that we won’t vote up or down on this today. What Gallagher is hearing is a high quality conversation that should be continued on April 9 to get the formal opinion of the EC. We might need to get additional information.

Lenk: Cable TV of alums and others is a key factor. Number of people watching is an important variable and will help to determine whether we get into a better conference.

Hoffman: The Front Range is a huge media audience.

Avery: One measure is the number of students in the stands, but there are other ways to attract students.

Shulman: I have heard a number of very good suggestions. I might take out #5 regarding the operating budget. Doesn’t trust the report of Amy Parsons in regard to bonds payoff. Shulman will
take out #5 and will also address #12. One of the real problems of spending so much on football is that the range of offerings, particularly for men, is affected. Is not convinced by the good will argument. There are large amounts of funds being spent on athletics and especially football that could be used to support our academic mission. He would be happy to discuss this at more length and will provide some rewriting and additional documentation.

Chermack: Have you looked at universities that have closed down programs? I know of two examples where closing sports and reductions had a positive impact.

Hoffman: UAB tried this and then brought football back.

Lenk recommends that Steve examine the student affairs budget – good portion is going to support 200 athletes.

Additional topic:

Lenk: What is the status of the MBA program? It might be a specialization that doesn’t require all the approvals.

Goetz: UCC will look at the curriculum as a specialization, and if it doesn’t have to go through other committees, it may be looked at for the May meeting.

Gallagher: The COB labeled it as a new program, which must go to the BOG and the CCHE, which would take us into July before being approved.

Lenk: To market the program and start it in the fall–how it’s categorized matters. Good for everyone to know is that if you present a curriculum like this really matters.

Chermack clarifies that from the committee he and Gallagher serve on (The Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning) that the program was presented as a new program without a budget, so they weren’t able to do anything since that’s what this committee looks at … and only that.

Lenk: Not sure why it was presented as a new program. I don’t know all the history.
Executive Committee adjourned at 4:35 p.m

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