

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
Tuesday, April 7, 2020
4:00 p.m. – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

APRIL 7, 2020 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

4. **Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – April 7, 2020 – Microsoft Teams - 4:00**

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Tim explains the processes associated with working within Teams.
2. Next Faculty Council Meeting – May 5, 2020 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 PM
3. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website – <https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/>
Recently approved Executive Committee meeting minutes will be uploaded to the Faculty Council website when ready.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – March 3, 2020 (pp. 3-18)
These minutes were unanimously approved after a change was made that was requested by John Elder.

Approved by unanimous consent

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

UCC meeting minutes – February 14, 21, 28, and March 6, 2020
(pp. 19-40)

Brad Goetz makes the motion to approve the consent agenda. This motion was unanimously approved.

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approve UCC meeting minutes – March 13 (pp. 41-46)

Tim refers members to page 41 of the agenda packet.

Sue Doe moves to divide the question, separating out the miscellaneous request from the rest of the minutes.
748+Jason Bruemmer seconds

All other parts of the UCC minutes of March 13 besides the miscellaneous request are unanimously approved.

Tim explains that this item was pulled as result of interest from the EC. It seemed appropriate to move the miscellaneous request out of the larger minutes so that the rest of the minutes and action associated with them are not delayed.

Sue requests that there be a discussion of the process and substance of this request. Sue asks that Brad Goetz speak to the intentions of the request and that Rick speak to the larger context of the request after Brad.

Brad Goetz speaks to the UCC request. Reports that the UCC was first asked to consider this action in September. Would allow previously approved courses to be delivered in any method as desired. No other curriculum review process would be affected. More and more courses are offered online. We need to acknowledge that. ¼ of courses are currently offered online. This proposal would allow units on campus to be responsive to change. Confusion: it is not to REQUIRE every course to be delivered online. This is not intended to be that kind of proposal. Rough numbers: of about 7000 courses at CSU, 1900 approved to be delivered online.

Rick Miranda requests to speak and has slides to share. Seeks faculty to ratify the movement of courses to online and to approve any approved course to be delivered in whatever modality as desire by the unit. Short term need is imperative. Needed for accreditation. States that this is broader authority than we need for the semester and the summer. The reasons why he asked for this change. We want quality in our course offerings. There are better ways than the pre-approval mechanism that we've been relying on. We need to be more nimble than we have been. We will not move courses online wholesale. This will move at its own pace going forward. Shared governance demands that we work together to create more online options. One possibility for addressing the quality question is through use of Quality Matters (QM), which is a national certifier of online instruction. The approach would be to not just to give a faculty member a laptop but would require faculty working with a course designer. First would establish minimal standards and then follow up to see if working. CoTL and CSU Online could co-develop rubrics to establish expectations for online course delivery. Departments and colleges would offer course after working with instructional designers to reach established QM standards without prior approval by central committees. After taught once, then course would be reviewed and if standards were not achieved then the course would be pulled until shortcomings remedied. This would involve an annual report and professional training. CoTL/TILT/CSU-Online would collaborate on designing training and professional development for faculty teaching online that would be mandatory at the initial stages to support the achievement of high standards. States: He supports the proposal and hopes the FC will also support it.

Karen Barrett: I want to speak in favor of the motion due to it being important to be nimble. Most faculty have at least online resources associated with all courses, so this makes it less nit-picky as to when or how a faculty member chooses to deliver the course. Today it's a rather complex question as to what kind of course any course is any longer This permits as many different possibilities as people might want to offer.

Doug Cloud: I am speaking against the motion. While the argument Rick presented helps me a great deal, the motion seems overly broad and a sweeping change proposed in the middle of a pandemic. Would have no problem

recommending a short-term change, but rather than have a full-scale proposal approved would recommend caution with regard to such a sweeping change. Wonders: Is this even legal? Can a responsibility of a standing committee simply be removed? This seems like the abdication of a major responsibility through their minutes?

Moti: Speaking against the motion. I think we need to be careful about mixing two concerns. For the next year at least, I don't see any need to rush the proposal as it stands. Would this make it easier for someone to say we want X% of courses to become online. Rick's suggestions are very sensible, but we need to see these in writing. I recommend a narrower version for the next academic year and recommend that we deliberate further for the more open-ended plan.

Sue James: I generally support the proposal but I also hear the concerns. Who is in charge of the accountability piece? This is why it might make sense to pass this as an emergency matter and then address the broader question down the road.

Rick: As I understand it, the online people know about the external vendors such as Quality Matters which are strong monitors of quality.

Sue J: Won't this require resources?

Rick: Yes it will, if we're going to do it well.

Moira Velasquez: Speaks against the motion. Agrees with points made earlier. The sweeping nature of the proposal is concerning. Monitoring quality is a difficult thing to do centrally. Coming from language teaching and having worked with course designers at both TILT and CSU-Online, she doubts very much very that there will be a time when online will be equivalent to f2f.

Kelly Long: Sits with the UCC every week and wishes to offer insights. What the UCC does is take course and program proposals to make sure they have all the component parts. There seems to be a sense that the UCC has some basis for oversight and quality control but it does not. The authority resides within departments and in faculty culture. Suggests that what is asked by the UCC is procedural so that a course doesn't come through the CIM process twice, once f2f and once for online. We have provided lots of guide sheets to address the learning outcomes coming from the gtPathways. This would not shift regardless of modality of delivery.

Antonio: Speaks against the proposal. It's a too broad and too much of blanket request. Is concerned about the impact of faculty surrendering control of the curriculum through UCC and not having a UCC providing oversight. We cannot be sure that it will not have a big impact down the line. States that it is the mandate of the committee to run that process. Wonders if we are also going to start considering that committees decide what they do and do not want to do. From his perspective, he approves a transitory approval for any form of delivery but not one that extends into the future indefinitely.

Gwen Gorzelsky: States her wish to convey a message from Matt Hickey and the CoTL which would be happy to work with CSU Online and TILT which would look at quality measures once a course is offered while also providing for certain efficiencies. States that Moira is right about instructional designer expertise. Chris LaBelle from CSU-Online would assert that course designers depend on the faculty member's expertise while the course designer's works has to do with the organization of the course and providing engagement approaches so that students can become as successful in online environments as face to face when properly supported.

Jason Bruemmer: UCC was asked to streamline and the process will take up to a year. The pandemic accelerated the process. Jason would offer an amendment "if and only if requested by the instructor" after the first sentence.

Melinda Smith seconds the amendment.

Tim invites comments on the amendment.

Moti: Repeats her understanding of the amendment: The course could be taught in any instructional modality if the instructor requested it.

Tim invites comments on the amendment.

Doug speak against the amendment. I'm not sure I can speak to the implications of the amendment but I want to speak against the amendment because it doesn't speak to the central concern. The amendment doesn't seem to address the concerns about a long and permanent change and the disruption to the deliberative processes that the proposal represents.

Sue J: I also don't support the amendment because it's off point although I support the broader effort to make online approval easier. Instructor request doesn't seem to be the central issue. Even if courses are approved online, that doesn't mean that they must be.

Tim calls the vote and the motion on the amendment is defeated.

Rick speaks to concerns that we would be giving up some quality control already held by the UCC. They are not given nor do they possess the expertise to evaluate quality control.

Blake Naughton: I don't think that flexibility of delivery abdicates responsibility for quality. We have many modalities of delivery. Where is the line drawn in terms of how faculty and departments are able to deliver courses? We have a conflation of issues here. Quality and quality control is generally managed better in online spaces than in face to face ones. States his appreciation for CoTL's role. We must design courses better through something more robust than through a course approval process managed by the UCC.

Sue Doe: Thanks to everyone for this conversation. Speaking to Blakes points: I appreciate what CSU-Online and TILT and an outside vendor like Quality Matters bring to the table in terms of the quality oversight question. But there must be a faculty role here. Shared governance and faculty participation is essential. Faculty must be involved and have a voice. This is why it is heartening to hear of CoTL's interest in serving in that role since it appears that UCC will not and perhaps has not served in a quality control role though many of us thought they did.

Joseph DiVerdi: We are in the 21st century and need to think differently. The change has been articulated by the Provost who has explained why we need this change. But notes that while he speaks in favor of the proposal he also speaks to the importance of approaching this matter deliberately. Joseph proposes an amendment for the proposal to apply only to summer and fall 2020 and then be revisited as a question at a later time when we are not in the middle of a crisis.

Motion is seconded by Steve Reisling.

Brad Conner: Likes this idea but wonders about the timeline given how early course proposals must go forward for spring.

Tim: We can do an amendment to an amendment if you wish to change the timeline.

Brad states his wish to hear discussion before making an amendment to the amendment.

Tim: Invites discussion on the amendment and only the amendment.

Antonio: Speaks in support of the amendment. This approach addresses the urgent need but also allows for the possibility to revise in a timely manner.

Brad Conner formalizes his amendment and moves to amend the amendment to have the provisional period be extended one semester beyond what was proposed. Proposal would be effective Spring 2020-Spring 2021.

Melinda Smith seconds.

Joseph DiVerdi: States his supports for the amendment.

Sue James requests that the entire proposal be posted to the screen. States that some in the chat box are asking for this.

Tim explains the limitations of the technology of Teams. But reads the amendment to the amendment.

Votes are cast and the amendment to the amendment is approved.

Wes Kinney: I've heard mention that the course delivery is under the purview of the instructor and also I've heard in this discussion that it's under the department. I could see a time in the future at the UCA when there is no option to teach a course. There is no existing online platform that can support the kind of teaching that we sometimes do. This is a situation where we feel that we are being forced to teach a class in a manner that is not possible.

Tim: Departments determine if a course is offered a certain semester.

Wes: It seems we could be forced to teach a class in a format that is not possible.

Tim: Rick, what are your thoughts on this?

Rick: The circumstances of this semester are a first. If a department chair can't convince a faculty member to teach a course a certain way, then I guess it can't be offered. It's always a negotiation between chair and faculty members. It's at the unit level.

Tim: The original proposal is in the March 13 minutes. The essence of the proposal is to accept the language of the proposal with the amended language.

Melinda: If we do this time limit, that could mean that if someone developed a course, then in spring of 2021 they may have to go through UCC for approval subsequent to 2021?

Brad: My guess of some version of what Melinda said would be correct in that there would be only agreement to the temporary delivery of courses online.

Tim: In the interest of time, given the many other things on the agenda, are you ready to vote on the amended proposal that's on the floor? We take the original proposal and conclude it with "from UCC from Spring 2020-Spring 2021."

[Entire proposal now reads: "The UCC supports approving the addition of all instructional formats (Face-to-Face, Mixed Face-to-Face, Online/Distance) for all courses previously approved in any format. This would apply to all forthcoming course proposals from Spring 2020 to Spring 2021."]

Tim: invites comments on the proposal as a whole. Hearing no further discussion, Tim invites voting on the proposal as a whole

Amended motion is approved by majority vote.

2. Election - Faculty Council Standing Committees – CoFG (pp. 47-48)

Steve Reising speaks to the ballot.

Tim invites nominations from the floor.

No objections to the nominations so approved by unanimous consent.

3. New Degree: Major in Dance (BFA) to be established **effective Fall 2020** in the School of Music, Theatre, and Dance – UCC (pp. 49-50)

Brad Goetz makes the motion.

The floor is open for discussion of the new program in dance.

Vote is taken.

Motion approved.

4. New Degree: Major in Agricultural Biology, to be established **effective Fall 2020** in the Department of Agricultural Biology (formerly Department of Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management) - UCC (pp. 51-52)

Brad makes the motion.

Tim invites discussion.

Vote called.

Motion is approved.

5. New CIOSU: Center for Human-Carnivore Coexistence – CUP (pp. 53-58)

Ellen Fisher invited to speak. Not present. Mo also not present. Sue makes the motion on behalf of the CUP committee for the approval of a new CIOSU—Human and Carnivores.

Antonio notes the errors (2) in the proposal

Tim assures that he will fix these.

The CIOSU is approved.

F. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Rick thanks the group for a several-semester approval for online. Assures that he will return to the Faculty Council with a proposal

Virus situation will have a budgetary impact in some way though it's unclear how the state budget will be impacted. We may get a negative picture from state appropriations. Enrollment is also down and since both the state budget and enrollment are in question, the situation is not a rosy picture.

Notes that faculty are working hard to do the best they can, given the situation. Student withdrawals are actually down from last year. Academic advisors report that they are reaching out to students who need extra support. Rick is proud of how we've responded. Now we must start thinking about wrapping up this semester and what finishing well online will mean in this context. Summer session is slated online for both 4-week and 8-week sessions. Field experience courses impacted. Events on campus during second half of summer, such as summer camps, may be possible but we are not optimistic at this time.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

The nominations for the Harry Rosenberg are due by April 10 so if you have intention to nominate someone get them in by then. The Executive Committee will evaluate nominations.

I think we had an energetic set of discussions at this meeting. Given the difficulties that we are going through, I have high confidence that the faculty will have a prominent place at the table with regard to dealing with the challenges moving forward.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Stephanie Clemons

Stephanie reports that the next BoG meeting is May 6-8.

4. Report on Faculty and AP Retirement Plans Changes
-Teri Suhr, Chief Total Rewards Officer of Human Resources
-Robyn Fergus, Executive Director of Human Resources

Faculty retirement plans the topic. Presentation is pulled up.

Robyn Fergus addresses the body. Joined by Teri Suhr. They provide slides (available at the end of the minutes and Carol Makela requests in chat that they be posted somewhere very clear) to explain the history of the Optional Retirement Plan in lieu of Colorado PERA.

They have developed a website to show their current project. Go to hrs.colostate.edu to get to the explanation of the project they're undertaking in a three-phase plan. After 1) introductory work that includes a survey of constituents. They will then 2) seek vendors. Then in Phase 3) they will involve conversion coordination and investment selection. They will engage in actively managed investment line-up with vendor selection and consolidated fund options. This will be a 54 week process.

They are looking forward to moving forward on planned benefits and education that is benchmarked with our peers, offer high caliber choices.

Steve R asks about CU's project. Did they select just one vendor?

Teri: Yes, CU has had a defined contribution plan much longer than CSU. The premise of their decision was made on fees. For our project we are not necessarily seeking a single vendor?

Sue Doe asks if the existing problem is essentially one of having too many options?

Teri: Yes, there are way too many fund options. But it's also just time for a review to get the best plans for employees. Employees need to feel good about the decisions they've made.

Antonio: How do the members of your committee get elected and when was the last time there was an election?

Robyn: Members come from chair roles from major, relevant committees. Essentially determined by expertise and existing established roles in the university on committees. The process was to ask for representation from the committees that add value for this complicated topic.

Antonio: Would like to have faculty more involved in the process.

Robyn: I will defer to Tim but the nomination for roles on existing committees has already been done.

Tim: I had no input into how individuals were chosen.

John Elder: Serves on the university benefits committee. Discusses that plan organizations have changed. This is a very big project. One of his concerns is the selection of the committee. Appointments are made. Currently there's need for a representative from the CLA as well as someone from the NTTF ranks. John recommends a member of the NTTF who is among the most knowledgeable people on this issue. States skepticism about how the committee is constructed. Thanks them though for this huge undertaking.

Tim: Suggests that John bring item before the Faculty Council.

Moti: Asks whether they (INOVEST) have a fiduciary duty that will guide the work with the university.

Teri: Yes, there is fiduciary duty for all who are making recommendations. As decisions are made there will need to be another committee for ongoing investment fund management.

Karen Barrett: couldn't get microphone to unmute. [wished to speak]

Steven Hayne: States that expense ratio on fees is one of the main things we need to pay attention to. Reports that what we pay is 4-5 times what Vanguard's is. Hopes that the committee will address this.

Teri: My sentiments are with you. The price point is also important to us. That investment fund lineup needs to be best of breed. Vanguard might be among those considered.

Cynthia Brown: Better advice from advisors is crucial.

Robin and Teri: Yes, we have to make sure that the education piece is available.

Antonio: Pointing out the benefit of being in front of the computer, refers to the section of the Manual stating that CoFG has responsibility for nominating members of the University Benefits Committee. Asks: Why haven't we been replacing the committee members when there are openings? Why are committee members appointed?

Robyn: The open positions need to be identified by Faculty Council.

Tim: The open seat would need to be elected through Faculty Council and specifically would need to come through the CoFG.

John Elder speaks to the size of the task in front of this group. The committee resisted for 1.5 years in moving forward. Reiterates that we don't have someone from the CLA on the committee. Reiterates that one of the most qualified people on this topic is NTTF.

Tim: States that he will ask the EC to look into these issues.

Robyn Fergus: repeats that the CoNTTF will identify a representative from the NTTF ranks for position.

The meeting is adjourned at 6:18 p.m.