

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 16, 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; **Marie Legare** substituting for Anne Avery, CVMBS; **Dan Bush**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs substituting for Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: **Bradley Goetz**, Chair, UCC; **Matt Hickey**, Chair, CoTL; **Mo Salman**, Chair, CUP

Absent: **Anne Avery**, CVMBS (excused); **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President (excused)

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 – *New Location:* Clark Building – Room A201 – 4:00 p.m.
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website: March 12 and 26, 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 – March 29, 2019

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Faculty Council Standing Committee Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance
2. Proposed revisions to Section C.2.1.9.5 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG
3. Proposed revisions to Section D.2 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG

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
4. Task Force on the Ethics of Learning Analytics (written report) – CoTL
5. Dawn DeTienne and Jennifer Welding, Sesquicentennial Committee

G. DISCUSSION

APRIL 16, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Faculty Council Meeting Minutes*

1. March 5, 2019

Gallagher: Any corrections or additions?

Chermack moved (Hayne 2nd) to place the March 5, 2019 Faculty Council Meeting Minutes on the May 7, 2019 FC meeting agenda.

Chermack's motion was approved.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on April 23, 2019.

Gallagher announced that the next meeting for Executive Committee will be on April 23, 2019.

B. *Action Items*

1. UCC meeting minutes – April 5, 2019

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

Lenk moved (Chermack 2nd) to place the April 5, 2019 UCC meeting minutes on the May 7 FC meeting consent agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

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

Mo Salman is happy that EC members review the Biennial Reviews for CIOSUs so thoroughly. CUP tries to follow what is in the code of Faculty Council and takes that approach. They received comments on three of the Centers.

1. Center for Public Deliberation. It is one academic unit, so it is against the FC *Manual* that says it must be cross-disciplinary. It was still recommended for continuation as it had a complete report of strong activities and we felt it was better to continue.
2. OSHER Institute, which is in the Department of Continuing Education, which is not an academic unit. Their recommendation was that it would fit with a better structure than a CIOSU.
3. Colorado Forest Restoration Institute. An oversight. We allowed at least two committee members to review this and Salman was the third person. It should not be recommended because it does not fit within the requirement or definition of a CIOSU.

Salman shares some observations from the last few years on CUP. Some of the committee members, including myself, did not know what fit a Center or not, and are not sure what they are evaluating. Still, some of us, really don't know what the Code is saying, and sometimes we are not paying attention to the Code, and sometimes the committee had two items for mission that were beyond dealing with CUP. The Code has to be up to date as much as possible and committee members need to be more knowledgeable of the Code as well.

We have revised the evaluation form, which will be new and reflect the qualifications for being a Center. If it does not meet the definitions, then stop here.

The VPR office is digitizing the evaluation form, and part of that I will have questions related to the qualifications to be a Center. Are these fitting with the application or not? Salman also thinks that he is still confused on what fits a Center vs way back when Tony Frank started clustering. What is the difference between a cluster, a Center, department, academic unit? Salman initiated a Center and applied for Center status back when things were more casual and approvals were a given, if endorsed by certain people. Salman is eager to make things more clear for the future. Whomever serves on this committee will have a good idea on what is needed for CIOSUs.

Lenk: You've given us good feedback.

Gallagher: Internal auditors dinged CSU for the casual approaches, once taken in the old days, in regard to Centers, etc. These Centers need to have significant academic component. We were told that we needed a more rigorous academic eye applied to these applications and renewal decisions, and this is how CUP came into existence.

Salman: The elected, or volunteered, members of CUP need to hear more history.

Lenk: The Center for Public Deliberation just got into partnership with City of Fort Collins and their work will involve multiple departments. They reach outside of their own boundaries.

Hoffman: The Colorado Forest Restoration Institute works with multiple units as well.

Gallagher: How should we move forward and put on the shelf, move forward?

Legare: What is gained by being a Center?

Gallagher: How should we move forward with the continuance or discontinuance –CUP's report?

Lenk: We had three Centers we wanted to change. Proceed with those three changes and send a revision of the procedure steps.

Salman: We submitted the report.

Gallagher: We don't have the authority to adjust the CUP report, but we do have the opportunity to ask CUP to tweak the report for the May 7 agenda.

Doe: It's harder to start up a Center than to continue and revise it. Can we consider that when we reflect on the impact of discontinuation?

Salman: Tweak means to elaborate on the comments. OSHER could be asked to get more information to us. We're not recommending that they disband, but that they do not meet the Center criteria. What other structures might these entities fit into?

Lenk: Table it, no changes until cleaned up processes for evaluation, or recommended changes to CUP.

Bush: Your committee is charged with evaluating their performance in terms of achieving their missions, but you seem to be focusing on the processes of their structural definition.

Salman: If this would not fit in the definition of a Center, such as it needs to exist beyond one academic unit. Some applications did not address whether faculty from multiple departments were involved.

Bush: Maybe they're not meeting the definition, but they have massive activities with many faculty involved so we don't want to undo the good work these units are doing.

Gallagher: Are we going to allow a new CIOSU to come into existence? And what do we do with those Centers that are doing good work but may not fit the definition? We shouldn't hold it against units that were brought in under unclear criteria.

Gallagher recommends that we don't indiscriminately eliminate a Center, but instead clean up the criteria.

Gallagher: Mo, could you touch base with your people on CUP and the modifications, if any?

Salman: OSHER will be changed to continuation with observation that some committee members had concerns. The Center for Public Deliberation will also be allowed to continue due to broad use. The Colorado Forest Restoration Institute --continuation too, despite being in only one academic unit. Salman recommends new language that demonstrates how other units are involved, and not necessarily academic units. Involvement of multiple "units" is interdisciplinary.

Gallagher: In terms of modification to the Code, may need one or two words. Other units if involved within research or not. Public engagement. If they are active, discontinuing them would be an insult and not encouraging them to continue.

Salman: You will hear from CUP by this Friday (April 19).

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

Hickey apologized as the rationale was short in the first submission. This just describes what is currently happening on the campus—there are no changes.

Lenk: What if someone leaves from the Registrar's office that has that knowledge?

Hickey: The Registrar's office works with many people in ALVS, and not just vets. Adult learners as well. Registrar's office sees this as a healthy collaboration

Lenk moved (Hayne 2nd) to place the Section I.11 revisions on the May FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

Lenk: How decentralized will the Registrar's office become?

Doe: Who is the certifying official at this point--the key person?

Hickey: I can ask.

Gallagher: All in favor of placing the Section I.11 proposal on the May FC agenda?

Unanimous by EC.

4. Proposed revisions to Section C.2.1.3.1 Colleges and Academic Departments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG.

Gallagher: This is about adding a new department: Systems Engineering.

Lenk moved (Hoffman 2nd) to place Section C.2.1.3.1 on the May FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

Gallagher: Any discussion? All in favor?

Unanimously approved

TWO CARRY-IN ITEMS

Gallagher explained that these are Code changes in the *Manual* and will need to be sent out two weeks in advance so that Faculty Council can review these items.

First item: Name change from Department of Anthropology to Department of Anthropology and Geography – CoFG

Second item: Name change from Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management to Department of Agricultural Biology – CoFG

Lenk requests that Gallagher and others keep their ears open for admin feelings (probably interest in restraint) about changes to colleges and academic departments.

Bush reports that relevant parties (Council of Deans) were consulted on these changes and approved them.

Brad Goetz, Chair, UCC, says that we have the perfect scenario at hand. UCC is the only place where it houses institutional memory. There's a process for approval of these kinds of proposals and the Agricultural Sciences proposal (item A on the checklist) has not gone through the CIM system. However, the Department of Anthropology proposal HAS gone through the CIM system.

Bush points out that the committee in charge (for Agricultural Sciences) didn't send it back to go through the UCC to be approved and filed in the CIM system.

Goetz said the Department got different advice. UCC abides by the CIM system, but this has not gotten to UCC yet.

Bush: Didn't someone on the committee catch this and say the processes haven't all been done yet? Is there any way to approve this with a pending note?

Linda Meyer: Can this be done over the summer?

Gallagher said EC can act on behalf of Faculty Council, but not for Code changes.

Legare: From my point of view, we could consider this next week if it gets through the UCC system in CIM.

Goetz: It has to go through VSPN, CoSRGE, UCC, COD, and is a special action to Faculty Council.

Reising: This is a really important change to be made and it is important to get through the process for this Fall.

Hayne would prefer that we send it back, discuss a week from today, and take up that issue in a week.

Lenk moves to table this for a week.

Gallagher: All in favor of tabling the name change from Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management to Department of Agricultural Biology.

Unanimously agreed.

Kroll will talk to the college committee in charge of this.

Lenk moved (Hayne 2nd) to place the Name change from Department of Anthropology to Department of Anthropology and Geography on the May 7 FC meeting agenda.

Lenk's motion was approved.

5. Proposed revisions to Section E.9.2 Individual Faculty Workload of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Legare: E.9.2 is consistent with the next proposal.

Lenk moved (Linda Meyer 2nd) to place Section E.9.2 on the May FC meeting agenda.

Gallagher: Any discussion?

No discussion.

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

Unanimously approved.

6. Proposed revisions to Section E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary

*Increases of the Academic Faculty and Administrative
Professional Manual – CoRSAF*

Legare explained the rationale.

Hayne moved (Linda Meyer 2nd) to place Section E.12 on the May FC meeting agenda.

Gallagher: Discussion?

Lenk: CoRSAF did a good job on inviting input to clean this up.

Legare and Eykholt indicate that they know this is controversial.

Legare: Teaching, advising and mentoring has expanded. Having things better defined and recognized at the department level.

Lenk: E.12.1 restating the rank and space and time need to be demonstrated.

Eykholt: The first sentence refers to tenure and promotion; the second sentence is annual evaluations.

Bush: Why salary?

Legare: Decided to see how faculty talked about this. If you have been here 20 years vs 2 years, you should be performing at a higher level. Expectations should be based at the department level.

Bush: All about years of rank.

Legare: Can talk about two assistant professors and expect more out of a professor that is here longer.

Hayne: Market dictates salary, not workload.

Eykholt: First, we knew this would be controversial and wanted feedback from EC. The rationale side is that some received raises and been here awhile but have been nonproductive. Going back to the first point, we know this is controversial.

Lenk: In my department, not everyone gets the same percentage. I agree with the people who are opposing this on the salary side.

Gallagher: Is this ready to sustain debate on the floor of FC? I would defer to the two CoRSAF members. Would you like to change this or let FC battle this out?

Eykholt: Would like to get the sense of EC, as it will be most likely the feel of Faculty Council. We don't want to take it out if there is a small amount of objections.

Legare: I feel the discussion is healthy, but it can always be proposed as an amendment on the floor.

Lenk: Base salary arguments can really upset faculty.

Hayne: I don't like inflammatory topics to cause a stir—it's not appropriate.

Legare: We didn't think it was inflammatory but Socratic. I can get a general sense from CoRSAF without the salary part.

Mary Meyer: So, these annual reviews, are we thinking of them to set merit raises? Performance expectations shouldn't depend on base salary.

Reising: I agree with Mary but agree to remove the working "base salary." There's nothing in here about merit raises.

Eykholt: The decision can be based on how EC feels. I am picking up on the sense that this may open a lot of discussion in Faculty Council.

Legare proposes to remove "and base salary" from that sentence.

Mary Meyer: Can you consider current salary when determining merit pay raises?

Eykholt: There's nothing to prevent this.

Gallagher: All in favor of removing "and base salary" on page 53.

Unanimously approved.

7. Proposed revisions to Section E.12.3 Service of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Legare: The Provost's Office of Engagement recommended this change.

Linda Meyer moved (Reising 2nd) to place on Section E.12.3 on the May FC meeting agenda.

Gallagher: Discussion?

No discussion.

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

Unanimously approved.

8. Proposed revisions to Section E.17 Renewal of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Legare said it was initially presented to EC by Richard Eykholt, but the Office of General Counsel needed to review and the proposal had some issues.

Eykholt: If you remember, we needed to create some due process per OGC. There is the need for creation of language around non-renewal of untenured faculty. This gives the department chair an opportunity to pull the plug a year before the tenure and promotion decision. The current language creates an appeals process that is parallel to other locations and OGC has given its blessing.

Lenk: In favor as an improvement, but wonders how many appeal processes does a chair go through before the administration sees this. Where is the checks and balances on the Chair's side?

Eykholt: Without this non-renewal, it is Grievable. If it goes through a grievance process, then the department has no say in this. The risk of a lot of appeals is no greater than the risk of a lot of grievances.

Bush: These are based on performance, or lack thereof. This is not casual or typical. It comes as the result of a unified voice from T&P and the Chair.

Eykholt: Grievable when a T&P decision is overturned by Chair, It's far more probable that non-renewal would occur due to the failure to make progress.

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

Unanimously approved.

Reising suggested to minor word amendments on page 59.

If the Tenure and Promotion Committee within the Department recommendeds the renewal of a tenure-track faculty appointment, but the Department Head decideds not to renew.....

C. Reports

1. Dan Bush, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Bush had no report.

2. Faculty Council Chair- Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Lynn Johnson cannot attend the May 7 FC meeting.

Gallagher would like everyone to mark their calendars for the May 14 EC meeting. UCC will be bringing some time-sensitive materials that cannot be ready for FC in May 7. EC will be asked to act on behalf of FC for certain curricular proposals.

We have the subgroup continuing work on the Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Award.

Speaks to Lenk's email message regarding ASCSU request for class notes proposal.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported on the following:

Stephanie Clemons is gearing up for the role as the incoming BOG Faculty Representative. Clemons' term starts on July 1.

Lenk hasn't had much time with the new Board member. He is a realtor from Pueblo area and may be important to figuring out how to stimulate strategies for CSU-Pueblo.

Lenk's report was received.

4. Request from Lynn Johnson for a written Report (PowerPoint presentation) to FC on the Business Operations Task Force (*separate attachment emailed with EC agenda*)

Gallagher asks if we want to put Johnson's report on the May 7 Faculty Council meeting agenda as a written report, not an oral presentation.

Lenk is opposed to placing on the May FC agenda.

Legare opposes without the oral part of the presentation as well.

Executive Committee unanimously agreed that the written report will not be placed on the May FC agenda.

D. Discussion Items

1. President's annual evaluation

Gallagher asks about the status of responses from faculty constituents to EC member inquiries.

Legare and Lenk suggest that the relative silence is not unexpected for an outgoing president.

2. Notes bank recommended by ASCUS.

Original thought was putting any notes on the site. Second idea: Within CSU EID site: wanted a website where any student could go for notes.

Lenk talked to the group about identifying the real problem. They reported that the number of excused academic excuses is growing, so more students are missing classes for excused reasons, then seek help from faculty and/or from peers. Students get a lot of mixed responses from faculty. Puts students in awkward positions. Lenk suggested--why not ask Faculty Council for an endorsement for a CANVAS shared notes function, which would be restricted to the

class? Lenk then explains how this might have pedagogical and learning opportunities.

Gallagher: We're not being asked if we think the Notes Bank is a good idea, but whether this is something we would allow them to make a presentation and pitch it to Faculty Council about.

Reising: If they are successful in convincing the Faculty Council that this is a good thing, what is the next step then?

Lenk: I forgot to mention the branding of this Notes Bank as a function of ASCSU. It would help educate students about the presence of student government.

Gallagher: As I understand it, ASCSU can do this with or without Faculty Council approval.

Reising: If supported by faculty, then it won't be ignored and therefore might be more effective.

Legare: If a student takes an excused absence, it's their onus to get the information.

Lenk: We are saying, as a university "we value this absence but we're limiting student access to information they need when absent due to sanctioned absence." The veterinary school posts all notes. Some people don't post anything.

Bush: I used to post everything, but then I learned that taking notes is solid pedagogy. Part of active learning is taking notes.

Doe: How would this work with a flipped classroom?

Reising: I compliment Margarita for shepherding those students regarding this proposal. I think we show respect to those students.

Shulman: I don't see why it should be brought to FC I think it should go to CoTL first and, if this is significant, then brought to EC. There are other sources for notes.

Lenk: I see this as leveraging technology and we need to find a way to help these students. Give the faculty the idea of putting up a folder for those students. Here is an idea that would help the excused absence students. It's probably likely to show the new President how we share governance with student voice.

Gallagher: Let's vote on this. Can I have a motion for this to be a Report to Faculty Council (a 5 minute Report)?

Lenk moved (Reising 2nd).

Gallagher: All in favor of giving 5 minutes for this report. Four approve; six opposed.

The motion was defeated.

Additional topic:

Chermack: Wondered if following question is appropriate for EC. Getting more and more new degrees. It seems like we are also having more professional doctorates. Is there anyone working on a CSU stance on doctorates? Where is the appropriate place to have these discussions?

Gallagher: This should probably be a discussion each time it comes up. Could be a topic on the Council of Deans as well.

Lenk: The COD could come up a set of values for a professional degree. We need a set of values to put these proposals in. We would feel better.

Chermack: This happens in the area that I work in. I want to understand these degrees more. I want to hear this discussion.

Gallagher; This is the sort of thing that we could have a discussion item for FC. The September FC meeting has a relatively light agenda. If you decided that you wanted to have something for an August EC meeting, they can review it then.

Chermack: Anyone else interested in the topic?

Mary Meyer, Stephen Hayne, and Marie Legare believe it's worthy discussion.

Bush: Multiple eyes and bodies look at these proposals and have an opportunity to comment and raise questions. So isn't there already a process where this could be discussed?

Gallagher: If there is enough interest in the discussion, we can include it in the Faculty Council agenda.

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

April 16, 2019

Page 17

Chermack: Maybe discuss whether there should be strategies for thinking about this, as opposed to rules.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Tim Gallagher, Chair

Sue Doe, Vice Chair

Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant