

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, December 10, 2019

3:00 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Present: **Tim Gallagher**, Chair; **Sue Doe**, Vice Chair; **Stephanie Clemons**, BOG Faculty Representative; **Rita Knoll**, Executive Assistant; **Jason Bruemmer**, Agricultural Sciences; **Dawn DeTienne** substituting for Kathleen Kelly, Business; **Susan James**, Engineering; **Carole Makela** substituting for Thomas Chermack, Health and Human Sciences; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts; **Linda Meyer**, Libraries; **Monique Rocca** substituting for David Koons, Natural Resources; **Jennifer Nyborg** substituting for Melinda Smith, Natural Sciences; **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair, UCC

Absent: **Kathleen Kelly**, Business (excused); **David Koons**, Natural Resources (excused); **Melinda Smith**, Natural Sciences (excused); **Jennifer Peel**, CVMBS (excused); **Thomas Chermack**, Health and Human Sciences (excused)

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

FEBRUARY 4, 2020 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – February 4, 2020 – Clark Building – Room A103 - 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – March 3, 2020 – Clark Building – Room A103 – 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

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 – Stephanie Clemons

G. DISCUSSION

- 1.

DECEMBER 10, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. November 19, 2019

Gallagher: Are there any corrections or additions to these minutes?

There were none.

Approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on December 17, 2019 – 3:00 p.m. – Provost’s Conference Room

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting will be held on December 17, 2019.

B. *Action Items*

1. UCC Meeting Minutes – October 18, 2019 (previously approved by EC); November 15 and 22, 2019

Gallagher: EC already approved the October 18 EC meeting minutes but we did not get these minutes on the December 3 FC meeting agenda. . Gallagher explains that approval and timeliness call for EC approval of the minutes, and this is generally approached very judiciously. Brad Goetz needs the October 18 UCC minutes approved by EC on behalf of Faculty Council because there are two items that need immediate approval at the February Board meeting

Clemons moved (Doe 2nd) for Executive Committee to approve the October 18 EC meeting minutes on behalf of Faculty Council.

Clemons’ motion was approved.

Goetz, Chair, UCC spoke regarding the minutes. On page 10, there are two certificates that need to be on the Board meeting agenda for approval at the February 6, 2020 meeting.

Gallagher: Any questions of Brad? There were none.

Gallagher: All in favor?

EC unanimously approved.

Gallagher: Now on to the November 15 and 22, 2019 UCC meeting minutes.

Gallagher: May I have a motion to place these UCC minutes on the February 4, 2020 FC meeting agenda?

Bruemmer moved (Clemons 2nd) to place the November 15 and 22, 2019 EC meeting minutes on the February FC meeting agenda.

Gallagher: Any discussion?

Gallagher: Hearing none, all in favor of placing these minutes on the February FC meeting agenda?

Executive Committee unanimously approved.

2. Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – Graduate Study, Master’s Degrees – CoSRGE

Gallagher: When Melinda Smith contacted me, she also said that she would try to get someone from CoSRGE here regarding the two following CoSRGE motions. We can go ahead and discuss them, but if there are any issues for inquiry, Melinda will be here next week and we will have enough time to discuss before the February Faculty Council meeting.

Pedros-Gascon asks about whether this language has any effect on requirements for additional items by one degree-granting program when it’s a dual-degree program.

James: You have to meet the requirements of the program.

Nyborg: Concerned about what happens if the dual-degree program doesn’t work out. Is successful matriculation in the other program possible?

Rocca: Regarding the Rationale--if you are dismissed? You are sort of qualified to come back? It seems odd.

Makela: Is a one-time MOU sufficient, or does it become out of date after eight years due to changes to programs?

Gallagher: Would you like to postpone this discussion until next week's EC meeting?

EC unanimously agreed.

3. Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – Integrated Degree Program and Integrated Degree Program Plus Admissions, the Advisory System, Graduate Assistantship – Terms and Conditions of Appointment, and Definition of “In-State Residency” for Tuition Purposes – CoSRGE

Gallagher: Is this problematic or is it straightforward?

James: It looks straightforward.

Meyer moved (Pedros-Gascon 2nd) to place the proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – Integrated Degree Program and Integrated Degree Program Plus Admissions, the Advisory System, Graduate Assistantship – Terms and Conditions of Appointment, and Definition of “In-State Residency” for Tuition Purposes on the February 4, 2020 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Meyer's motion was approved.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Last week, all *Manual* changes were approved at the Board of Governors meeting. There was a nice presentation about online programs at Global and CSU Online. Dean Pritchett and Alan Rudolph made presentations that went well.

Pedros-Gascon: Regarding our possible partnership with Qingdao and concern about impact on human rights.

Miranda sent a proposal in the first half of October regarding funding. However, we need to understand issues in the coming year, such as academic freedom, intellectual property, etc., but there is plenty of opportunity if they bite on this. Not sure what their response will be. We are in a holding pattern right now.

Pedros-Gascon: The human rights situation will be addressed by the administration?

Miranda: I am not sure how the president will incorporate that into her conversations.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

This morning, Gallagher attended a listening session hosted by the Office of VP for Diversity. It was very well done. Re: bias incident on campus and suggestions for what we could do that we haven't been done yet, and what we are not able to do because of the First Amendment.

Gallagher also met with Mary Ontiveros, Vice President for Diversity, last Friday. Positive impression of that conversation. What are the things that we can do? There are many sort of bias issues on this campus that go over the line from protected speech to unprotected speech. Gallagher suggested the idea of bringing the full force of law and policy on those who engage in harassment, which is an illegal behavior.

James agreed with what Gallagher said. Would Faculty Council take an action, or is this not our purview?

Gallagher: It is not in Faculty Council purview. There was a recent harassment issue on the LSC plaza. Let's ask the CSU PD to get the footage of this on their cameras. Gallagher feels we have thrown up our hands too many times saying there is nothing we can do. We can do something when the conduct is harassment.

Doe mentions the outcomes from her listening group table: what to do or how to intervene when intentions don't match reality, host a major event, bystander training (whole campus), faculty reward structures that support diversity.

Clemons asked about the subcommittee that we were going to create out of Executive Committee.

James stated that she would be willing to work on such a committee, especially looking at the Humboldt University Tenure and Promotion standards. (Sue Doe would be happy to join in a review of these documents.)

Clemons suggested that in January, Executive Committee have a full discussion of what we want to do, especially forming a subcommittee coming up with actionable items. Clemons wonders if another incident happens, such as at the level of last fall, would we be any further along in our thinking about where Faculty Council stands. Clemons suggested that a statement is an action. Do we need to put this out there?

Bruemmer points out that we made a statement about instructional spending, so a statement here would be equally or more important.

Gallagher: RBEI is doing the job of what we proposed to do. Blanche Hughes' group is taking over the main responsibility for the initiative.

Gallagher: We can follow up and put this on the agenda for a January EC meeting. Bruemmer agreed.

Gallagher mentions the statement by John Elder at the FC meeting. Notes that he realized there was something wrong with the moment but it took a little bit for him to figure it out. John's proposed amendment was going far beyond the subject of the main motion. Our Parliamentarian, Lola, was able to clarify that this was "outside the scope of notice", which means that the entire discussion and proposed amendment was out of order. Agenda items go out ahead of the FC meeting so that constituencies can comment on the substance, so items outside the scope are not properly made.

Gallagher will speak to what happened at the FC meeting to clarify that he wasn't "killing John Elder's" idea but rather calling on proper procedure. Amendments must be "germane to the question." The chair would be required to rule such a moment as "out of order." Motions to amend are constrained in these ways.

James: So what was the proper steps John should have made?

Gallagher: Going back to CoRSAF for these amendments for approval first.

Pedros-Gascon thinks it is important that faculty know how to proceed with amendments, such as going through CoRSAF.

Clemons points out that professional development training on procedures should be made available and encouraged periodically, but especially for those faculty who are new. There were a lot of new faculty members this year.

Gallagher speaks to new faculty and does training for new Faculty Council members at the beginning of each year and stated that he can certainly do more.

Pedros-Gascon: There should be some kind of minimal understanding of the rules for any committee and suggests that training should be made available as it was back in 2012, a two-day workshop.

DeTienne: Faculty don't have the time to attend a 2-day in-service. There needs to be a way to convey information in small bits. I'm a first generation scholar but I had no idea what to expect.

Gallagher: I distributed a 30+ page document that explains the basics, but then used the orientation to touch on top level items. That packet has all the necessary information and is supposed to be used as a reference. However, I do support the idea of additional and periodic updates.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Stephanie Clemons

Clemons will present the full Board report from December to the faculty at our February FC meeting.

D. Discussion Items

1. UGO evaluation

Gallagher: Have you connected with Margarita Lenk regarding the survey?

Meyer stated that she and Lenk have not physically met yet. Lenk will explain how to access the survey. EC will decide if there are things to change on the survey and then Meyer will input the changes with Lenk's assistance. The questions in the packet were created last year.

Gallagher met with Richard Eykholt last week. Eykholt brought up an interesting point—the survey doesn't address things that do not get to the level of a grievance, so a great deal of the

UGO's work is not represented here. We may need to capture these kinds of activities by the UGO, in addition to grievances, and therefore need to get some of that in the survey document.

Gallagher asked that EC members review pages 25-30 in today's agenda packet and come back with possible recommendations for changes.

Gallagher: Perhaps when we convene again in January, we can discuss this again.

Pedros-Gascon: Asks about question #29. Elicit thoughts, repercussions, any type of explanation.

Doe: Question 30 is a follow-up for 29.

James asks about what kinds of things the UGO does that do not get to a grievance. Looking at the *Manual*, she describes what she sees in Section K, in addition to grievances and it's rather slight.

Gallagher points out that not everything the UGO does is related to grievances. The UGO does a lot of informal dispute resolution work.

DeTienne asks how a new faculty member knows about such things.

Gallagher mentions that he points to items when he participates in the new faculty orientation.

Makela thinks that the organization should be reconsidered: Keep the inquiry section separate from the grievance section.

EC adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

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