Minutes
Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 9, 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; Ali Pezeshki substituting for Steven Reising, Engineering; Thomas Chermack, Health and Human Sciences, Steven Shulman, Liberal Arts; Linda Meyer, Libraries; Chad Hoffman, Natural Resources; Mary Meyer, Natural Sciences; Marie Legare substituting for Anne Avery, CVMBS; Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: Bradley Goetz, Chair, UCC; Steven Reising, Engineering (excused); Anne Avery, CVMBS (excused)

Absent:

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

May 7, 2019 Faculty Council Agenda Items:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – May 7, 2019 – Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 - 4:00 p.m.

A. Announcements

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – September 3, 2019 – Clark Building – Room A201 – 4:00 p.m.

2. 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. 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
APRIL 9, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

1. March 12, 2019

   March 26, 2019

   Gallagher: Any corrections or additions?

   Kroll: On the March 12 EC meeting minutes-- page 7. The TTF line has been increasing but has gone up substantially for NTTF. The general idea is that the TTF has NOT been increasing the same as the NTTF. Add the word “not” in the sentence.

   The amended sentence should read: The TTF line has not been increasing but has gone up substantially for NTTF.

   Mary Meyer moved (Chad Hoffman 2nd) the amendment.

   Meyer’s motion was approved.

   The amended March 12, 2019 minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on April 16, 2019.

   Gallagher announced that the next meeting for Executive Committee would be on April 16, 2019.

   Gallagher has also reached out to Don Estep as there are department name changes coming up. Per the Manual, since it is a Code change, the proposed name change has to be sent to Faculty Council members 2 weeks in advance for review.
B. Action Items

1. UCC meeting minutes – March 29, 2019

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

Hayne moved (Chermack 2nd) to place the March 29, 2019 UCC meeting minutes on the May 7 FC meeting agenda.

Hayne’s motion was approved.

2. Biennial Reviews for Discontinuance and Continuance of Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (CIOSUs) for 2018 – CUP

Doe: The OSHER Learning Institute. Could it operate within a CIOSU? There seems to be at least one other center in the approval area that had a similar description; however, the Center for Public Deliberation was approved and OSHER was not. I am just curious.

Gallagher: Rick, do you know?

Miranda: OSHER is not affiliated with any college or department. Attached to CSU Online for convenience. University outreach and engagement is for the local population. Our faculty and staff were involved writing this proposal to OSHER.

Gallagher: Is there anything here that EC members see that we don’t want sent to FC in May?

Mary Meyer: Will it continue as a program? When they say it’s discontinuing, they are not discontinuing the program, correct?

Gallagher: Correct.

Gallagher: Hayne moved (Mary Meyer 2nd) to place on the May 7 FC meeting agenda.

Miranda: I want to see OSHER continued. Reason we gave to CUP is that the university was audited. The internal audit people spanked us for not having this listed. We have a good list and maintain it.
3. Proposed motion for Executive Committee approval of Faculty Council presentation and/or discussion topics – Faculty Council Executive Committee Operating Procedures

Gallagher: This is mainly an internal issue for our policy. Does anyone have any objections with what you are seeing?

Lenk: I don’t have an issue with #10. After our Presidential discussion last week in EC, I would like to amend #20. The point I was trying to make was that the representatives on our Faculty Council need to inquire from the faulty groups they represent to see if they have any input on the President.

Lenk moves to add a sentence (Doe 2\textsuperscript{nd}).

Discussion ensued.

Another version: Faculty Council Executive Committee will encourage the Faculty Council and APC members to poll their respective constituencies.

Hayne: This is written in the Executive Committee Procedures and not Faculty Council.

Gallagher: If you went to the document, the EC Operating Procedures would be present along with this. It alerts EC members of what we are supposed to do.

Lenk says there seems to be more growing evidence that FC members are not seeking input from others. Can you make sure you mention this to the new faculty members coming on board?

Gallagher: Yes.

Miranda: I would change the wording then. Rephrase to say that EC will add a comma after that sentence and say: and encourage them to seek input from those they represent.

**Final revision:** In order to provide the annual evaluation of the President, the Faculty Council Executive Committee will encourage the Faculty Council and APC members to poll their respective constituencies, and seek their feedback from those they represent.

Gallagher: May I have a motion to approve?
Lenk moved (Hayne 2nd) to approve the final revision.

Gallagher: All in favor.

Unanimously approved.

4. Proposed revisions to Section I.11 Students Called to Active Duty of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – CoTL

Gallagher: Matt Hickey is at a different meeting right now so he could not attend our meeting today. Any questions or comments on Section I.11?

Doe: Curious about designating ALVS for purposes of informing people who may be active duty about their options? Curious about why this would be their job. Why not from the Registrar’s Office.

Miranda: There is a close connection with the Registrar’s office. The stricken text all refers to ALVS. I think this is the preferred unit to seek initial information.

Doe: Many veterans do not make use of ALVS.

Gallagher: I know Sue works with many veterans on this campus.

Lenk moved (Mary Meyer 2nd)

Gallagher: More discussion?

Kroll: Text that is crossed out. We won’t have this in because it’s in the General Catalog, so we don’t need all of that information anymore?

Gallagher: In reading the Rationale, it makes things consistent in the Manual and General Catalog.

Miranda: Some of the options are more flexibly applied, so they replaced specific things with different options that may be available. Increasing multiplicity of situations are involved.

Doe: My question is programmatic. ALVS is technically advising veterans, not active duty military people?
Miranda: Not necessarily. Mark Barker does supervise ALVS and in the Registrar’s Office. He kept some duties in the Registrar’s Office, so it’s a split relationship.

Gallagher: The proposed wording says, “are encouraged.”

Doe: The challenge is that when people are called to active duty, it is a very serious official function. Granting incompletes, etc. I just didn’t realize that ALVS did this.

Kroll: It looks like ALVS was cut then added.

Miranda: ALVS was added at some point. CASA was doubling at some point in the past.

Lenk: I look at business process rules (i.e., Mark may lead, and would it solve the concerns to take out “as the primary point of contact”). This could be really helpful if there was a coordinator change.

Doe: The grade of an incomplete. It surprises me that ALVS would be similarly responsible for tracking student veterans. The lack of information above is concerning to me. I am just curious.

Gallagher: I can check to see if Matt can attend EC next week.

Doe: I would appreciate that.

Legare: The rationale makes sense.

Gallagher: All in favor to put on May agenda.

Unanimously approved.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

   Miranda reported on the following:

   Miranda is a member of CCHE. Working on the affordability document. Miranda gave EC members copies of the CCHE affordability definition and guiding principles sheet, and said he would happily discuss or send him an email.

   Miranda’s report was received.
2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Gallagher stated that Sections E.9.2, E.12 and E.17 are all things we will look at next week’s EC meeting.

We also will have items from the Committee on Faculty Governance. Code changes will be involved and will need EC action by April 16 to make the two-week deadline for letting FC members know of upcoming Code change proposals. There are two upcoming department name changes – Department of Anthropology and Department of Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management.

Gallagher’s report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

Lenk had no report as there is no BOG meeting. The new president has signed a contract.

Lenk’s report was received.

4. Request from Dawn DeTienne and Jennifer Welding, Sesquicentennial Committee for a Report to FC on year-long events. Proposed oral report

Gallagher: We have had to put off the Sesquicentennial Committee for a while, and I encourage discussion.

Mary Meyer: The kickoff is September 11. I think there are too many slides here.

Hoffman: Time needed to present?

Gallagher: We will have a hefty May meeting agenda, and you have to keep in mind all of the proposals from CoRSAF, CoFG and CoTL.

Lenk: I think this is important for cultural reasons. Possibly a one-page handout to post in a hallway, etc.?
Gallagher: Recommend a four-slide presentation of 5 minutes with a one-page report, telling us where the materials are available.

EC approved unanimously.

5. Request from Lynn Johnson for a Report to FC on the Business 4Operations Task Force (see attached PDF) Proposed oral report.

Gallagher and Tom Chermack saw this report at the CoSFP meeting and it was a very long report. When Lynn Johnson first approached Gallagher, she wanted 45 minutes, and then said maybe 30 minutes. Johnson made some important points.

A lengthy discussion ensued. What are the purposes of this report and might the report show greater awareness of audience needs and interests? What’s the point of this? Why is it important for us to hear this report?

Miranda: In Lynn’s defense, she is trying to avoid recommendations for HR issues and finance issues on this campus. I think this is an attempt to inform us that this is occurring and why.

Gallagher will recommend a 10-minute overview and will seek a written report (material) from Lynn that could be shared with EC on April 16 and then potentially with FC as well.

6. Request from Matt Hickey for a written Report to FC from the Task Force on the Ethics of Learning Analytics (pp. 39-44)

Gallagher: The report from Matt Hickey is a written report and will not require Faculty Council time.

Shulman has questions about this report. Report on ethics of data collection. Shulman doesn’t know why the word “privacy” doesn’t occur.

Pezeshki: On page 43, the word “private” is mentioned.

Gallagher asked Matt if he would be present to answer questions from Faculty Council members on May 7. Matt said he will be present.
EC unanimously approved to add to the May 7 FC meeting agenda.

D. Discussion Items

1. President’s annual evaluation

Lenk: April 16 is good for the feedback.

Chermack: Anyone getting feedback yet?

Gallagher is suggesting that we have a big EC meeting next week and suggests that we start doing what we do for the President’s annual evaluation on April 30.

Lenk suggests that we put the feedback received by April 16 into a letter, which could be reviewed on April 30. Sue Doe will help Lenk work on the letter.

2. Proposed Resolution on Athletic and Academic Spending

-Steven Shulman

Shulman sent out a third draft to EC members. Got some additional feedback from the CLA reps, so this draft has some small wording changes. Would it make more sense that this should go on the September agenda, or is this appropriate for the May FC agenda? If it makes sense to delay until September, Shulman is okay with this too.

Gallagher: Thoughts on the resolution? We could put this on the May agenda or re-visit for the September agenda.

Miranda: Would you like me to leave while you discuss this. It is addressed to the administration, and the president is the primary administrator regarding athletics. I feel uncomfortable sitting in on this since it’s regarding administration.

Lenk: About the loan costs to the athletic department. I ran into Joe, it was $4 million and went up to $8 million.

Miranda: That was the loan value.

Legare: I don’t think there is any harm putting this on the agenda, and if it has to be put off, it can be.
Miranda: We are changing presidents, so what president do you want this message delivered to? Miranda excused himself from the meeting.

Gallagher: If we do this in the fall, it gets more attention of the new president.

Shulman: One of my motivations was for the new president.

Gallagher has put in a request that the new president attend the September Faculty Council meeting.

Kroll: Do we bring it up for a discussion, then a vote?

Gallagher: EC would vote in August to put this on the September agenda, and then there would be a vote after debate. If the majority votes, faculty is on the record for supporting the resolution. Plus, the September agenda is shorter.

Shulman points out that he will not be on EC in the fall and many others won’t be either, so we might lose institutional memory.

Tom Chermack reassures Shulman that he will re-present the motion if he is approved again for Executive Committee.

Lenk: It could be unfinished business from May and then that would honor Steve’s work so that it would occur in September. Either way, we agree that it will not be forgotten. Explains the notion of the resolution as an expression of faculty values.

Additional topic:

Gallagher: The Harry Rosenberg award topic is not on today’s agenda; however, we have a little bit of a problem. We have two nominations for the Harry Rosenberg award. EC chooses the person to receive this award. One of the two nominees is on EC; the other nominee is not on EC. Gallagher wants to be fair to everyone but is not sure how to navigate this.

Hayne: This is a nomination, and do you want to reveal that nomination? What occurred to me is that you can set up a private electronic discussion list, minus one, and go that way.

Gallagher: That is one thing that was kicked around. Normally, when people are nominated for this award and are not selected,
they don’t know they had been nominated. That is the key and is how it has worked in the past.

Gallagher: If I send out an email, minus 1, the EC member nominated will know they didn’t get the email.

Shulman: Have a subcommittee make the decision.

Chermack: An alternative is to entertain that person if they are not a member of EC.

Lenk: In the award, does it say you can’t be on EC?

Gallagher: It does not say that. Gallagher had a direct conversation with Sue Pendell. It is up to EC to establish the criteria for the award.

Shulman: A quorum subcommittee.

Legare: I think people are doing an incredible service load and should not be excluded.

Lenk: The option of a subcommittee. I am more for the recusing.

Hayne: I am more to stick with the privacy side. I would like the quorum.

Gallagher: The quorum subcommittee would be 7 members, with 5 members off. The nominee’s name will not be included among those voting. The random function in Excel will be used to determine the quorum members.

Gallagher: Let’s do a straw poll. Those in favor of the random selection quorum subcommittee, raise your hands.

Executive Committee unanimously approved.

Discussion of resolutions.

Gallagher will be seeking a series of numbers--Student numbers, overall employee numbers, faculty numbers, etc. Gallagher would like to get the hard numbers that might lead to a resolution. If the numbers tell me what he thinks they will tell, then non-faculty numbers are going up to the exclusion of faculty.
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Executive Committee adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

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