

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, February 25, 2020
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**, CoB; **Susan James**, Engineering; **Carole Makela**, Health and Human Sciences; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts; **Linda Meyer**, Libraries; **William Sanford**, Natural Resources; **Jennifer Nyborg** substituting for Melinda Smith, Natural Sciences; **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair, UCC; **Matt Hickey**, Chair, CoTL

Absent: **Jennifer Peel**, CVMBS (excused); **Melinda Smith**, Natural Sciences (excused)

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

MARCH 3, 2020 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – March 3, 2020 – Clark Building – Room A103 - 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – April 7, 2020 – Clark Building – **Room A201** – 4:00 PM (*Note room change*)
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website – <https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu> January 21, 2020 (amended); January 28, 2020
3. Election of faculty to Faculty Council Standing Committees and University Disciplinary Panel – Committee on Faculty Governance – April 7, 2020
4. Upcoming Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award (*presented at May 5, 2020 Faculty Council meeting*). Nomination materials will be emailed early March.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – February 4, 2020

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Elections – Student Representatives (Graduate) – Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance
2. 2019 University Grievance Officer Report

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC meeting minutes – January 24 and 31, 2020; February 7, 2020

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Election: Faculty Council Chair - Committee on Faculty Governance
2. Election: Faculty Council Vice Chair – Committee on Faculty Governance
3. Election: Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Committee on Faculty Governance
4. New CIOSU: Center for Environmental Justice – CUP
5. New SAU: Cell and Molecular Biology – CoFG
6. New SAU: School of Advanced Materials Discovery - CoFG
7. Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin: The Advisor System – Non-Academic Members - CoSRGE*
8. Proposed revisions to Section 1.4 Student Appeals of Interdisciplinary Decisions Made by University Hearing Officers of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – CoRSAF*
9. Proposed revisions to Section I.5 Academic Integrity Policy and Academic Misconduct Procedures of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual - CoRSAF*

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
4. Report on CSU-FC Research
-Alan Rudolph, Vice President of Research

G. DISCUSSION

FEBRUARY 25, 2020 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. February 11, 2020

Gallagher: Are there any proposed changes to these minutes?

Pedros-Gascon has a minor edit that he will email to Knoll.

Clemons moved (Bruemmer 2nd) to place the February 11, 2020 EC meeting minutes on the April 7, 2020 FC meeting agenda.

Clemons' motion was approved.

Executive Committee approved by unanimous consent.

Pedros-Gascon brought up another topic re: the cost of living in Fort Collins. This comment was made at the last Executive Committee meeting. Many of our Tenure Track lines do not have disposable monies to buy a house. Could our institution provide some monies toward a down payment? Any kind of financial assistance would help faculty commit to the institution and contribute to retention and other positive outcomes.

Gallagher: Rick, how would be make such a proposal?

Miranda: I could present a brief to Lynn Johnson and the President. We are currently looking at some housing projects that CSU has some control over and partnering with developers for more affordable housing so our staff and faculty would have first dibs. We haven't considered mortgage or down payment assistance but maybe we could.

Gallagher: Would you be willing to put this down on paper for this committee to float?

James: There is a system in place at the University of California. Arrangements that help with zero down.

Pedros-Gascon: Other institutions own properties and rent to faculty. Another variation on the theme.

Doe: Mortgage lenders for people through the Universities.

Clemons: There are some models out there already, so we might want to figure this out and start there before creating special language.

Pedros-Gascon: It's hard for those coming out of graduate school to make a big payment. This could have a positive impact and help with retention of faculty.

Miranda: Concerned about house buying in general as faculty are being pushed farther and farther away from campus. Proximity, or lack thereof, becomes a reason not to participate fully in the life of the campus.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on March 10, 2020 – 3:00 p.m. – Provost's Conference Room

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting will be on March 10, 2020.

B. *Action Items*

C. *Reports*

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda has no report.

Nyborg: I have a question for Rick. I was wondering what the university is doing re: planning for the potential of the Coronavirus?

Miranda talked with Ken Quintana, the public safety specialist, earlier today. Looking at the plan that was installed 10 years ago with the H1N1 virus. Miranda has consulted with the health network and protocols. Everyone all over the country is starting to look at the plans. CSU would not be able to protect ourselves from being overwhelmed. We would need local and state resources.

3. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

There will be a Parliamentarian's meeting next Monday. Preparation for the next meeting is well underway.

Gallagher reached out to Lynn Johnson regarding the upcoming presentation. Gallagher reminded EC about the history of their presentation. Specifically, that they were invited to present at the December FC meeting, but they had to cancel. Gallagher asked Johnson what the intentions of the presentation are and explained that the entire business processes of the university are part of Johnson's presentation. Is her hope that EC would want to put this on the agenda for the entire Faculty Council for April or May? However, the April and May agendas will be full. Gallagher reported that he couldn't guarantee an hour of presentation time. He is attempting to navigate this matter.

Clemons suggested the presentation be held at the September FC meeting possibly.

Teri Suhr and Robin Fergus wanted to talk about our retirement plans. Heard about it at the UBC meeting. It's an important message for Faculty Council to hear. The changes are in regard to the Defined Contribution Plans. It sounds like they are going to two plans instead of the current three.

Gallagher asked them to attend the April 7 FC meeting. They will need 20-30 minutes. Gallagher will request 20 minutes with additional time for questions.

Any objections?

There were no objections by EC.

Gallagher's report was received.

4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Stephanie Clemons

Clemons reported on the following:

Reports that our STARS report may be something that the FC wants to hear about--either in a written report or through a short presentation (possibly 15 minutes). Institutional Learning Outcomes were a factor in our high rating for academic/instructional impact. 92% of units offer a sustainability course. 50% of faculty are doing sustainability research. The decisions that faculty are making are having an effect.

The following BOG report will also be on the March 3, 2020 FC meeting agenda:

Board of Governors – Faculty Council Representative Report – CSU-Fort Collins

Respectfully submitted by Stephanie Clemons, Ph.D. at Faculty Council Meeting March 3, 2020

Board of Governors (BOG) Meeting – February 5-7, 2020 Location: CSU Pueblo
 Executive Summary

BOG meeting began with status report across institutions in the CSU System regarding student enrollments, graduation rates, student debt and return on investment. See following. Issues discussed: tuition compression, increased borrowing, decreasing demographics, community colleges offering bachelor’s degrees, and level of student preparedness transferring from high school to college. Biggest perceived issue is retention. National avg: 37% of students transfer to different institution during education.

Report on Overall CSU System (CSUS) Enrollments

Enrollment	F’ 2010	F’ 2019		F’ 2010	F’ 2019		F’2010	F’2019
Fort Collins			Pueblo			Global		
<i>Overall</i>	28,547	34,166	<i>Overall</i>	5,152	3,847*	<i>Overall</i>	2,741	19,083
% diverse	14%	24%	% Diverse	38%	47%	% Diverse	13%	29%
% women	51%	52%	% Women	53%	55%	% Women	52%	60%
% 1 st gen	21%	21%	% 1 st gen	10%	43%	% 1 st gen	0%	37.5%
% Non-Resident	20%	32%	% Non-Resident	11%	15%	% Non-Resident	27%	61%

*typical of regional comprehensive universities across the country **Total Overall CSUS Enrollment: 57,096**

Report on CSU System Graduation Rates

Graduation	F’ 2010	Today		F’ 2010	Today		F’2010	Today
Fort Collins			Pueblo			Global		
4-year	36%	45%		18.1%	21%		N/A	49%**
6-year	64.8%	69%*		30.7%	36%		N/A	52%

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

February 25, 2020

Page 8

1 st year retention rate	N/A	82%		N/A	63%		N/A	83%
12% who leave CSU will graduate elsewhere; 79% of those who graduate do so in 4.5 years or less. Graduation rates count if students start and finish at same institution			As an HSI, focus is opportunity and success of students from underrepresented groups. Narrowing gap in student success rates remains a key focus.					

*national average is 66%

**national average is 39%

2018 NCES data for not-first-time students

Ft. Collins 4-year grad rates for 1st gen, Pell Grant recipients, racially minoritized students are at record high rates.

Report on CSU System Student Debt

CSU Fort Collins		CSU Pueblo		CSU Global	
% of students graduate with zero student loan debt	47%	% of students graduate with zero student loan debt	10.4%	% of students graduate with zero student loan debt	38%
Average debt for resident students	\$24,478*	Average debt for resident students	\$21,131	Average debt for resident students	\$13,288

*state average is \$25,000; national average is \$29,000

2018 NCES data for not-first-time students

ROI: CSU System

CSU Fort Collins		CSU Pueblo		CSU Global	
% of graduates secured first-destination plans (jobs or continuing education) by Dec. following graduation	84%	% of graduates secured first-destination plans (jobs or continuing education) by Dec. following graduation	83%		N/A
Average starting salary	\$49,262*	Average starting salary	\$39,200	Average starting salary	N/A

*in line with national average of \$50,000.

Note: one in 25 Colorado workers has a CSU degree

CSU-Fort Collins highlight.

President McConnell highlighted major faculty honors and awards including twelve researchers and scholars from our campus who were recognized for their extraordinary work (see BOG website). Our campus' third STARS platinum rating was announced; only institution in the world to achieve this recognition. Student activities were mentioned including *Student Veterans of*

America Chapter of the Year Award, and graduate students who presented research at United Nations climate talks. Innovation and Research topics were discussed including establishment of Sustainable Livestock Systems Collaborative. Clemons highlighted faculty activities as well as College of Natural Sciences.

Consent Agenda Items - all approved.

CSU-Pueblo highlights

CSU-Pueblo is retaining more students than previous year; reversing enrollment trend. They increased football game fan attendance by 33% over prior year with 42,663 fans attending. CSU-P Foundation and CSU-P have cultivated \$18.1 million dollars for 2019. Student/Faculty presentation made to BOG: CBASE Panel presentation; Colorado STEM. CSU President/Faculty report: focus on involving more faculty/staff in revitalizing culture. Consultant is also re-packaging Vision 2028; increase understanding.

CSU-Global highlights

Fall 2019 CSU-Global held its first sponsored experiential learning activity for students (think: study abroad). Seven-day trip to London focused on business/management. CSU-G was selected to establish a chapter of the National Society of Leadership and Success (largest leadership honor society) and a Federal Academic Alliance, which provides discounted tuition rates; four million federal gov employees.

System Highlights

State budget status and process were discussed. Salary survey: 2% and 3% models under review. Goal: avoid raising tuition more than 3%. National Western Center is anchor tenant to City of Denver. Buildings serve as "platform" that will be responsive to future needs. SPUR spending \$1 million on public art; 435 artists responded to RFPs. College of Ag, College of Business and Extension all connected to SPUR; 30 CSU-FC faculty research proposals/partnerships underway. **Standing Committee Reports** received from Academic and Student Affairs Committee, Audit and Finance, Real Estate/Facilities Committee and Evaluation Committee.

Next BOG Meeting: May 7-8, 2020 at CSU-FC. Units to be highlighted: Warner College of Natural Resources and College of Health & Human Sciences.

Clemons report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. UGO Survey Results

Gallagher made a few explanatory statements about the UGO evaluation letter that results from the broader process of the evaluation.

Meyer then distributed a confidential set of data to the EC members. EC members read the narrative responses and discussed the survey findings. EC determined several problems with the survey, including that respondents did not seem to know who they were referring to as the UGO. Were they talking about others at times? It seemed so. The EC felt that several changes were

needed. It was agreed that the UGO should be identified by name and have respondents indicate who they spoke to.

James: The campus seems confused about the process on the campus.

DeTienne: Design the survey differently on Qualtrics possibly? Add the UGO's specific name in the survey, not only in the email.

Gallagher: I am hearing from EC members that this year's survey needs to be strongly reviewed before sending it out next year.

Bruemmer: You are writing this to the Provost. Maybe the UGO's position should have an assistant to log who contacts him throughout the year.

James: On the PCC, we hear a lot of comments regarding grievance processes/complaints.

Pedros-Gascon: Make the UGO responsibilities versus HR responsibilities more clearly defined. There are systemic issues that need to be addressed (as noted from comments in the survey).

Gallagher: Last summer, Gallagher and Eykholt created a document with all the formal resolutions available on campus-- UGO, HR, Ombuds, OEO. It was uploaded to the website of each entity. This is not sufficient enough to navigate where to go for particular grievances.

Doe: How about putting this on the FC website?

Pedros-Gascon: Instead of 4 different tiers? HR and OEO on one side, and the Ombuds or UGO on the other side? We could simplify this to make it easier to understand.

Gallagher will bring in the chart that he and Eykholt worked on.

Dawn DeTienne: Which of the following did you contact (this would be good to put on the survey).

Doe felt that she would go to the FC website to find this information.

Makela: These comments would be easier by person than by questions.

Gallagher will get together with Linda Meyer and review the comments, etc., for a first draft.

2. New course survey
-Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL

Hickey: Does the new survey give information helpful to faculty in accomplishments in the area of teaching?

Doe: Is there a button (or do you activate something) through CSU Online?

Hickey: They haven't merged with this system yet. All RI courses now.

Doe: Now that explains why people online were asking about the survey.

Hickey: Thank you for the invite. I have provided a document to give you some updates on our radar screen, i.e., response rates is one of them. The response rate was not good. We anticipated that there would be a drop. We have been having some headaches with Qualtrics. We happened to be able to do a pilot on some summer courses last fall. The response rates were better.

The pilot encouraged us to use Smart Evals instead, which is cost effective and responsive. There are bells and whistles that are helpful, such as real time response rate can be leveraged. Incentivized response rates seem to work. The dashboard is handy in terms of the ability to mine your own data. The system also automatically generates emails to the students. We need to move the responses up from 30%.

Lessons learned: timing was short and we switched to a new tool in the fall. It's in a digital platform so it is editable. We aren't stuck with certain questions this way. It is something that we can be more fluid with.

Has this survey handled the bias issues? I cannot say that it has done that. Have had conversations with Laura Jensen about this. Convinced we can come back to you with another report. Vetted through IRB approval process with invitation to offer their surveys. Better served being transparent.

Growing set of resources that TILT is providing. Hickey encouraged EC members to go back periodically and take a

look at the tools in the toolbox, including templates about how to do annual evaluations. The toolkit for annual evaluations is getting better.

An online teaching portfolio tool now exists for external evaluation that the CVMBS is trying out. A faculty member secured tenure in the CVMBS with this tool. Peer observation tools are available too and being collected by TILT.

Phase II. The original charge was 2016. CoTL was asked to approach in a two step process. Phase II was supposed to be optional modules that are expressly linked to every slice of the pie of teaching effectiveness. This would result in a set of questions specific to the area of interest to the faculty member. This year I want to work on inclusivity. The options range in areas of development. Want to keep less questions than more.

Hickey urged CoTL that not too much is dropped out too fast. Has heard a variety of feedback. Not strategically wise, and suggests that if it given to faculty this spring, or early fall, may be adoptable next December. A little IT work to go yet. Would need to pilot first to correct bugs, etc.

Questions:

Bruemmer: Overwhelming questions from some of our faculty have to do with the core questions themselves, which faculty didn't feel that the questions were helpful. They felt this new instrument was of no value to themselves or students.

Hickey asked for Bruemmer to send an email to help CoTL address this.

Clemons: Faculty want to ask custom questions.

Hickey: Yes. We can add a cell where people can design their own questions. The current questions are not written in stone and CoTL is interested in the feedback.

DeTienne: It has something to do with the questions themselves. My students are stuck in a room waiting for contest results and DeTienne encourages them to do the surveys at that time. Why don't students want to take this? Is it too lengthy? I didn't have this problem before the new survey.

Makela: What is the range of small incentives that were used?

Hickey: 1-5 points on the student's projects. Giving students time in class-- 20-30 minutes to complete.

Clemons: I want to thank you, first, for all of your hard work. Regarding the second phase. A couple concerns: If there was a 001 lecture at the same time that there was an L01 lecture, would students get the survey twice?

Hickey: I think we got this figured out. Courses where we do not ask survey questions (such as thesis advising). Working on IR-- being more deliberate. One thing that would help me-- send an email to me with what you would like to see happen differently. Your request will be looked at by CoTL.

Clemons: Heard everyone can see our surveys?

Hickey: The cover page, or summary page, can be seen by anyone but the comments are under the control of the faculty member. The Smart Evals report gets emailed directly to faculty member. Hickey recommends that we should share it with T&P but the decision is up to us. The reports go to the instructors on record and they recommend that these reports be shared but it's up to the faculty member. Should vs. must language in the Manual puts faculty in the position of decision-maker. The first question about % of class that's lecture is meant to be seen by the student but currently isn't. We need to be attentive to the student voice though. Hickey encourages faculty to send questions to him.

Clemons: Do you hear departments putting in their department code, the teaching effectiveness indicators?

Hickey: As soon as units are willing to share, they will post the language to the TILT site. Some units are using quality descriptors that they then translate to numbers—like the NIH evaluation system. Hickey does not like reducing teaching to a number though.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

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