

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, February 10, 2015
3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration

Present: Mary Stromberger, Chair; Paul Doherty, Jr., Vice Chair; Alexandra Bernasek, BOG Faculty Representative; Timothy Gallagher, Immediate Past Chair; Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant; Bradley Goetz, Agricultural Sciences; Margarita Lenk, College of Business; Steve Reising, Engineering; Scott Glick, Health and Human Sciences; Robert Keller, substituting for Mary Van Buren, Liberal Arts; Monique Rocca substituting for Stu Cottrell, Natural Resources; Iuliana Oprea, Natural Sciences; Nancy Hunter, University Libraries; David Gilkey, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences; Dan Bush, substituting for Rick Miranda, Executive Vice President

Absent:

Guests: Carole Makela, Chair, University Curriculum Committee

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by Mary Stromberger.

March 3, 2015 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – March 3, 2015 – A203 Clark Building – 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – March 3 , 2015 – A203 Clark Building – 4 p.m.
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – (<http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/files/ecminutes>)

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes –

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda
2. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger
3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Alexandra Bernasek

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes –

F. ACTION ITEMS

- 1.

G. DISCUSSION

February 10, 2015 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

II. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes – January 20 and 27, 2015

Gallagher requested a change on Page 5 of the minutes from January 20.

Gallagher explained that a number of years ago a fourth item (commitment to diversity) was proposed to be added to faculty performance evaluations.

(Amended) Gallagher explained that a number of years ago commitment to diversity was proposed to be added to teaching, research and service in faculty performance evaluations.

By unanimous consent, Executive Committee approved the amended January 20, 2015 and January 27, 2015 Executive Committee meeting minutes. The minutes will be posted on the Faculty Council web site.

III. Items Pending/Discussion

A. *Announcements*

1. Next regularly scheduled Executive Committee Meeting: February 17, 2015 – 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 Administration

Stromberger announced that the next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on February 17, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 Administration.

Stromberger announced that the February 17 meeting will include a discussion on two proposals from the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty will present a proposed revision to the *Manual*, Section K.

Bernasek announced that Chancellor Mike Martin will be stepping down from his position on March 1, 2015.

Stromberger asked Executive Committee for permission to move the Discussion to the end of the agenda, to ensure that action items are taken care of in case the discussion goes long. Executive Committee unanimously agreed.

B. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes (January 23, 2015)

Lenk moved (Gilkey 2nd) to place the January 23, 2015 UCC Minutes on the March 3, 2015 Faculty Council meeting consent agenda.

The motion was unanimously approved.

2. Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin – B. THE GRADUATE SCHOOL – B.5 Combined Degree Programs, B.5.1 Track II Programs – CoSRGE*

Stromberger explained this revision was needed because Combined Degree Programs no longer exist (now Integrated Degrees and Sequential Degrees). Furthermore, these degrees are not programs but admission processes.

Bernasek moved (Lenk 2nd) to place the Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin – B. THE GRADUATE SCHOOL – B.5 Combined Degree Programs, B.5.1 Track II Programs* on the March 3, 2015 Faculty Council meeting agenda as an action item.

The motion was unanimously approved.

C. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda is at a mathematics conference in Italy and no report was provided.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger

Stromberger attended the President's Cabinet meeting on February 3, 2015, which included a presentation by Vice Provost for International Affairs, Jim Cooney. Stromberger reported that according to his presentation, INTO enrollment is trending upwards. Most INTO academic English program students are from China, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia. However, the majority of pathway students are from China, with few students from Saudi Arabia and none from Kuwait. The lack of diversity of INTO students in the pathway programs is concerning. Another concern is that students are being accepted into the academic English program and aren't prepared enough to matriculate into the pathway program. Thus, few students outside of China are able to enter CSU. Lenk noted that

INTO was supposed to represent a large number of countries. Bernasek explained that INTO does not believe that CSU is putting the effort needed into recruitment.

Stromberger noted that the Director of INTO, Fabiola Ehlers-Zavala, wants to give a report to Faculty Council. Vice President for Research, Alan Rudolph, has also requested to give a report. President Frank will also be giving a report at the April meeting. There are only three Faculty Council meetings left this spring, with several reports and discussions to schedule. EC will need to prioritize reports and discussions. Stromberger will ask Fabiola if she can give a report to Executive Committee. She will email Alan Rudolph and clarify what he would like to present and give him a time limit of 15-20 minutes.

Stromberger attended the Committee on Teaching and Learning meeting on February 3, and followed up and went to lunch with Stephanie Clemons, Gwen Gorzelsky, Kathleen Pickering, and Laura Jensen. Their plan is to revise the course survey and to contain two to three categories of questions (e.g., student satisfaction, teaching effectiveness). One proposal is to revise the survey. Another is to revise Section E of the *Manual* to not use course surveys for annual evaluations. A third proposal is to revise the T+P process to reflect such changes. A discussion item is needed so we don't catch people off guard. Gallagher noted that the May meeting is historically full of last minute action items and there is not much time for a discussion item. Stromberger thought that a good discussion is needed. Lenk noted that some department heads (and students) will use rate-my-professor if they don't use teaching surveys. Bernasek explained that some department heads rank all their staff as good professors regardless of variation in survey results.

Stromberger explained that we have March and April for discussion and reports (May is full; President Frank will give a report in April). We will need to prioritize items for these meetings. Bernasek and Reising asked for more information on what Rudolph would like to report on. Bush thought time limits could be suggested.

Lenk suggested that the Committee on Teaching and Learning present at the first fall Faculty Council meeting to be able to get adequate input and feedback. Reising asked if the student course surveys would be ready for March? Stromberger thought so. Doherty asked how urgent the anti-bullying policy is? Stromberger will ask Jason Johnson.

Stromberger's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Alexandra Bernasek

Bernasek attended the recent retreat. The Chair of CCHE also attended and explained future performance funding strategies. Uncertainty still exists.

Amy Parsons presented the CSU master plan (including the parking plan). Bernasek and Frank noted that the parking plan is still a work in progress. Lenk asked if the parking plan was tabled? Bernasek explained the plan is currently tabled, but is scheduled to be presented in May. Reising asked if the parking plan should be discussed at the Faculty Council meeting. Stromberger thought so. Bernasek noted that, given the master plan, the constraints on future parking plans are strong. Makela noted that the Board also has to approve parking rate increases, separate from master and parking plans. Parking concerns are prevalent from the four councils (Faculty, AP, State Classified, and Student). Gallagher explained that parking is in statute and the Board cannot act outside of statute. Stromberger and Bernasek are still waiting on additional parking plan details and possibilities.

Bernasek noted that the new health center (\$59 million) was approved as well as the stadium financing plan. The stadium plan passed 8-1. Lenk expressed concern that 1/3 of the stadium bond is at a variable rate. Keller clarified that the financing plan is for 40 years.

Stromberger asked about Bernasek's student report on student debt. The Board liked it and gave good feedback. The Board also watched the documentary "Ivory Tower".

Bernasek's report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. Faculty Council Retreat discussion

Stromberger revisited the faculty ombudsperson position, third party climate assessments, and value statements. In the recent strategic planning exercises, the idea of a code of conduct has also been raised.

Bernasek explained the idea for an ombudsperson has been discussed in the Status of Women Faculty Standing Committee. Stromberger asked what the status is of the proposal within that committee. Doherty explained that conversations are ongoing, and Bernasek replied that the proposal has been given to President Frank. Stromberger asked for additional comments. Lenk thought that a position description should not be developed with a particular person in mind, because that person will

not be present forever. Lenk asked how the ombudsperson position would align with section K. Stromberger said the position was outside section K. Gallagher did not think the ombudsperson should substitute for the idea of a third party entity helping to collect anonymous reports, but could be a valuable resource in addition to a mechanism for collecting anonymous feedback. Bush reported that avenues for anonymous reporting are being pursued by Miranda, in response to last week's discussion

Executive Committee discussed a policy of conduct from the University of Colorado, as a potential example for what could be developed at CSU. Pros and cons of a code of conduct and/or values statement were discussed. Bush noted that a code of conduct could be helpful to upper administration, in terms of providing clearer guidelines to all employees of appropriate (and inappropriate) behavior. Bush explained that few tools exist to help change behaviors and new tools could be useful. Gallagher explained that CSU has section E.15 in the *Manual* concerning disciplinary action. Would this section need to be revised and/or broadened? We want to be careful that a code could not be applied selectively. Stromberger added that faculty involvement would be necessary if a task force were to be formed to work on a code of conduct/values statement, just as faculty were included on a recent task force to develop a tobacco use policy.

Lenk, who attended the recent faculty retreat, thought a value statement being incorporated into the annual review was a topic of interest. Gilkey explained something similar was developing in his college. Gilkey noted that his college now also has value-based awards. Stromberger and Lenk discussed the difference between a value statement and a code of conduct. Bush explained that the developments in Gilkey's college are the results of ~ two years of discussions and employee buy-in by the Dean (Stetter). The value statement has not developed quickly. Lenk noted that many colleges have vision statements, but accountability is the main issue. Gallagher explained the culture of his college and expressed caution about having something equated to research, teaching, and service without careful thought. Gallagher noted that E.15 explains that harassment charges can be brought against faculty, but the CSU General Counsel does not allow such charges against administrators. Similar language should be used for all.

Stromberger will follow up with Bush and Miranda about anonymous reporting.

Stromberger and Bernasek will follow up with Frank about the ombudsperson proposal. The Executive Committee is supportive of such discussions.

On a different topic, Stromberger explained that Frank, Miranda, and Stromberger have scheduled meetings with each of the college deans and faculty representatives within a college. Those meetings will be happening through the spring.

2. *Coloradoan Opinion/Editorial*

Stromberger noted recent local paper editorials calling for Faculty Council to take action about the stadium issue, and asked for input. Gilkey thought Frank has had dialog with faculty on the issue, and our Board of Governor's representative has expressed opinions to the Board. The stadium decision has been made and now it is time to move forward. Bernasek added that the issue is decisive and consensus is unlikely, no matter what the outcome. Keller added that the stadium has been a daily conversation and expressed concern about more appropriate ways of funding (e.g., without the backing of the state and tuition) not being fully considered. Keller thought additional alternatives (e.g., siting a new stadium at Hughes) should have been examined more fully. Keller thought much dissatisfaction exists among the faculty. Keller posed a question about how should that frustration be best registered? A no-confidence vote? Should some vote be used so people can express their wishes?

Stromberger went through a time line of stadium discussions/reports that occurred within Executive Committee and Faculty Council.

- February 21, 2012: Executive Committee discussed the recently announced on-campus stadium in response to early concerns among faculty. EC noted upcoming open forum and Faculty Council meetings would provide opportunities for faculty to voice their concerns or support.
- April 3, 2012: Tony Frank and AD Jack Graham led a discussion on the vision of CSU athletics (including the on-campus stadium) at the Faculty Council meeting.
- October 9 and 16, 2012: Executive Committee discussed the possibility of a resolution in opposition of the on-campus stadium, an idea brought forward by a concerned faculty. A straw vote was considered, but EC thought this was out of order and a resolution was considered instead. However, no consensus in Executive Committee was reached. EC charged the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning (CoSFP) to examine how the stadium could impact academic programs.
- April 2, 2013: Louis Scharf led a discussion at the April Faculty Council meeting and presented his financial analysis of the on-campus stadium.

- May 7, 2013: The CoSFP presented their report on the on-campus stadium to Faculty Council. The Strategic and Financial Planning committee also presented their report. In the fall, Tony Frank attended Faculty Council to hear input to the Board of Governors Rep and to respond to questions.

Stromberger and Gallagher noted that much discussion has occurred in Executive Committee over the years and three times the topic has been discussed at Faculty Council. Bernasek thought the stadium issue is worth thinking about again because where we are now is not close to where we started. The original proposal was that the general fund would not be at risk. Now such a risk can be argued to exist. A worrisome pattern of shared governance not working (e.g., faculty input not being taken seriously) on a number of issues has also occurred.

Stromberger distinguished between opposition to the stadium vs. concerns about financial plans. Gallagher described input he has received from frustrated faculty about the switch in tactics to consider 4 stadium options, but at the same time publically discounting 2 of those options. This seemed disingenuous. Keller expressed frustration that discounting some options (e.g., the \$30 million Hughes fix) was insulting to some. Glick asked how adding/subtracting classroom space would not impact the general fund. Keller expressed that going from ½ private funding to essentially zero (with a private funding buffer) is incredulous to some.

Bernasek posed the question about whether anything can derail the stadium. Stromberger thought this was unlikely, but Bernasek, Keller and others noted that anything can happen.

Stromberger noted that formal opposition to the stadium at this point is politically risky, as the stadium has already been approved by the State Capitol Projects Committee and the Board of Governors. She emphasized that regardless of what faculty do, the new stadium will be constructed.

Gilkey asked is the problem with the decision or the process? Glick expressed if there is a problem with the process, when should that issue be raised and fought? Is a decision that has already gone through the process an appropriate topic, or with a subject (e.g., parking) that is currently going through the process?

Keller thought it was important for people to be able to voice an opinion, and that current shared governance is not working well.

Gallagher posed the question whether the issue is really about whether shared governance is working or not? (e.g., stadium, overturned grievances, overturned T+P decisions, parking).

Bernasek expressed concern over the increased debt load and possible degrading our bond rating.

Gilkey expressed that the way CSU is expected to do business now (versus the past) with little state support is different. He is hearing frustration with that situation.

Stromberger raised the question of what role Faculty Council should have in university decisions regarding projects that increase our debt. EC discussed that this is a gray area for shared governance. While there is a Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning, they may not have much input on decisions involving expensive projects.

Keller expressed that for most institutions, athletics is not a positive revenue flow. Hunter noted that other expenses for athletics will come out of the general fund, in response to the NCAA rule change allowing CSU great autonomy in how we provide benefits to athletes.

Gallagher asked whether bringing forward the state of shared governance to Faculty Council as a discussion topic would be beneficial.

Bush noted the importance of the Faculty Manual and how that document is an important indicator of shared governance. Stromberger responded yes, but sometimes it feels that administrators only pay lip service to shared governance.

Oprea remembered Frank asking the Executive Committee about faculty being against the stadium. Whether such questions indicated shared governance in action or not is a question. Oprea expressed dissatisfaction that the funding formula changed and maybe something should be said.

Bernasek asked exactly what questions do faculty have a legitimate right to have input on? Lenk suggested that we invite Frank to discuss shared governance. Bernasek suggested that the whole of faculty council will want to hear and be a part of the discussion.

The discussion will continue next week.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Mary Stromberger, Chair
Paul Doherty, Vice Chair
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant