

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, please call, send a memorandum, or E-mail immediately to Diane L. Maybon, ext 1-5693.

NOTE: Final revisions are noted in the following manner: additions underlined; deletions ~~over scored~~.

MINUTES
FACULTY COUNCIL
February 3, 2009

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Richard Eykholt, Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Next Faculty Council Meeting - March 3, 2009 - A104 Clark Building - 4:00 p.m.
- Eykholt announced that the next Faculty Council meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 3, 2009 in Room A104 Clark Building. The meeting will begin at 4:00 p.m.
- B. Tracking Records for Faculty Council Standing Committees
- Eykholt announced that the tracking records for the Faculty Council Standing Committees were included in the agenda materials and can be found on pages 1-2.
- C. Faculty Council Chair, Vice Chair, Representative to the Board of Governors - Elections - March 3, 2009 - Committee on Faculty Governance
- Eykholt announced that the elections for Faculty Council officers will be held at the March 3, 2009 Faculty Council meeting. He added that nominations are due by February 13, 2009 and should be sent to the attention of Diane Maybon at the Faculty Council office.
- D. Call for Nominations - University Grievance Officer - Nominations Due February 6, 2009 - Grievance Panel Subcommittee
- Eykholt announced that a second call for nominations has been sent to academic faculty and administrative professionals for the University Grievance Officer. The nominations are due February 6, 2009 and can be sent to Christine Susemihl, Chair of the Grievance Panel Subcommittee or Diane Maybon, Executive Assistant to Faculty Council.
- E. Informational Item - Op/Ed Colorado Higher Education News - Richard Eykholt (pp. 3-4)
- Eykholt announced that he wrote an op/ed piece for the Colorado Higher Education News and it is included in the agenda materials for information on pages 3-4.
- F. Executive Committee Approved Meeting Minutes - December 9, 2008
- Eykholt announced that copies of the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes for December 9, 2008 can be found on pages 5-9 of the February 3, 2009 Faculty Council agenda materials.
- G. Eykholt also announced that the Board of Governors has scheduled a meeting with the faculty to solicit input with regard to the characteristics and responsibilities of a Chancellor for the Colorado State University System. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 10, 2009 from 9:00 to 9:45 a.m. in the Lory Student Center - Grey Rock Room. Eykholt noted that meetings will be held all day in the Grey Rock Room, so if the 9:00 to 9:45 time slot does not work, faculty members could attend any of the other meetings, except for the lunch meeting from 12:00 to 1:00 p.m. He also noted that comments could be sent to the Board of Governors website: www.csusystem.edu

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

A. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes - December 2, 2008

Phil Cafaro moved to approve the Faculty Council Meeting Minutes of December 2, 2008.

Cafaro's motion was approved.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

A. Interim Provost/Executive Vice President

Rick Miranda, Interim Provost/Executive Vice President, reported on two dean searches. Miranda announced that Jan Nerger has been appointed as the Interim Dean for the College of Natural Sciences. Miranda announced that campus interviews are on-going for the finalists for the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences. The four candidates chosen to interview on campus are:

Sonny Ramaswamy, Associate Dean of Agriculture - Purdue University
Kevin Heinz, Department Head - Entomology - Texas A&M University
Ken Odde, Department Head - Animal Sciences Industry - Kansas State University
Craig Beyrouy, Department Head - Agronomy - Purdue University

Miranda encouraged faculty members to attend the Board of Governors meeting scheduled with the faculty to solicit input with regard to the characteristics and responsibilities of a Chancellor for the Colorado State University System. The meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 10, 2009 from 9:00 to 9:45 a.m. in the Lory Student Center - Grey Rock Room. He noted that there are pros and cons regarding creating a separate Chancellor position for the Colorado State University System and reiterated the importance of this meeting.

Miranda reported on the progress of the tenure/promotion process. He noted that some of the dossiers will be reviewed by the Council of Deans at its February 11, 2009 meeting. He added that after that meeting he will make recommendations regarding tenure and promotions to the President. He noted that the process is a little late this year due to the transition in the Provost's and President's offices.

Miranda reported on budget issues. Miranda stated that budget cuts are inevitable for 2009 and 2010. He noted that higher education will lose funding from the State due to budget shortfalls. In addition, there could be reduction in enrollment causing less tuition revenue. He explained that Colorado State University receives approximately \$130 million from the State and \$150 million from tuition. The revenue received from the State comes from fee for service and the college opportunity fund. Miranda reported that Colorado State University will need to cut approximately \$6.7 million from its 2008-09 budget. Miranda noted that the University has been planning for budget recisions since last Fall and all units have prepared for budget cuts. He added that the units have been asked this Spring to refresh these plans for budget reductions. He explained that budget recisions for 2009 will be one time fund reductions. However, this will cause additional base fund recisions for 2009-2010 amounting to approximately \$20-25 million. Miranda explained that the total budget for Colorado State University is approximately \$700 million and much of that budget is not flexible. The state portion of this amount is \$130 million. Approximately \$400 million could be flexible. Miranda added that \$20-\$25 million will be cut from the \$130 million State contribution. Areas that cannot be cut would be indirect costs; fringe pool; utility costs. In addition \$18 million which is self funded by the Professional Veterinary Medicine School or the \$13 million for enrollment and access for students cannot be cut. He added that \$250 to \$280 million can potentially be cut. Of this amount two-thirds is used for teaching/instruction in colleges and one-third is used for administration support activities such as facilities, parking, police, advising students regarding enrollment, etc. Miranda noted that every effort will be made to protect the academic core of the University and most cuts will be made in administrative units. However, some cuts in the academic units will have to be made. He noted that the President cut \$1.5 million in administrative costs last December. He added that he has decided not to fill the position of Senior Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs due to the budget situation. He noted that Colorado State University is diversified in its revenue streams and will be able to weather this economic downturn better than other institutions. He added that the last few years Colorado State University has enjoyed approximately \$100 million in budget increases and even with budget recisions the University is financially better than four to five years ago. Some positives are that the University's tuition is still low compared to our peers and other institutions in the country. The University should be able to raise tuition modestly and still attract students. Miranda noted that business leaders in the community and state are

on our side and will be there when the economy turns around. In addition, the University has planned for this and will be able to handle this economic downturn. Miranda noted that the President has appointed two ad hoc committees. One committee will review financial models and will be chaired by Allison Dineen, Vice President for Finance. The second committee will review alternative tuition models and will be chaired by Robin Brown, Vice President for Enrollment and Access. Miranda asked that faculty members send recommendations to these ad hoc committees.

C. W. Miller asked if unpaid leave is being considered. Miranda responded that no final decisions have been made but that this suggestion is on the table. Chris Kummerow asked if departments will be given the flexibility to deal with budget cuts in their own way. Miranda responded that parts of the plan are more global, but much of the decisions will be left to units to decide. Miranda added that cuts will not be equal across departments and colleges. He noted that \$6-7 million need to be returned to the State this year and this is the task at hand. Ramesh Akkina asked if the hiring freeze is universal. Miranda noted that some exceptions have been made, but that the freeze is going to get stricter.

Eykholt added that the administration wants input from the faculty, administrative professionals, and state classified staff and to please forward any recommendations to department heads, deans, Faculty Council, or the Provost.

MIRANDA'S REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

B. Faculty Council Chair

Eykholt reported that the creation of a weapons policy has been postponed due to a lawsuit filed against the University of Colorado challenging its weapons policy. The President, Provost, and Executive Committee members thought it would be wise to postpone discussion of this issue until the lawsuit was settled to ascertain what would be legally acceptable regarding a weapons policy. He asked that if anyone had concerns regarding this issue to contact the Faculty Council office. Eykholt noted that this will be revisited in the Fall.

Eykholt reported that the Interim President intends to be much more involved in Faculty Council meetings and plans to attend at least half of the Faculty Council meetings. This will give faculty members an opportunity to ask questions and have dialogues with the Interim President. Eykholt added that the Interim President also plans to attend Executive Committee once a month for more interaction with that committee.

EYKHOLTS' REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

C. Board of Governors Faculty Representative - December 2-3, 2008 Board of Governors Meeting Report

Tim Gallagher noted that his written report could be found on pages 22 and 23 of the February 3, 2009 Faculty Council agenda materials. Gallagher also encouraged Faculty Council members to attend the scheduled meeting with the Board of Governors to discuss the Chancellor position. He noted that the Board has already met with other constituents in Pueblo and Sterling. Gallagher noted that he continues to encourage the Board to have the Chancellor position equal to the Presidents with reporting lines to the Board. In addition, Gallagher noted, the he continues to recommend that the Board hire someone with a good understanding of academic values. He added that there will be little chance to influence the Board's decision to split out the Chancellor position, but encouraged faculty members to share their opinions, whatever that may be, with the Board.

Gallagher noted that Joseph Zimlick, Chief Executive Officer, Bohemian Companies, has been confirmed by the State Senate as a new member of the Board of Governors. He will replace Diane Evans whose term ended December 2008.

Gallagher also noted that he has conveyed to the Board the importance of selecting a Chancellor that commands the respect of the faculty. In addition, Gallagher explained that he has informed the Board that the faculty are very happy with Interim President Tony Frank.

Phil Cafaro asked if there was anything that the faculty could do to prevent someone in politics being appointed Chancellor. Gallagher responded that the Board had a half day retreat with a facilitator to discuss the pros and cons of a Chancellor and the reorganization of the position. Gallagher noted that he did not feel faculty should worry about this issue as the Board does not have anyone predetermined to be chosen as Chancellor. John Ridley asked why the Board decided to separate the Chancellor and President positions. Gallagher responded that the responsibilities of the President have grown significantly and the combined position is simply too much for one person to handle effectively. There were also some conflict of interest concerns regarding the combined

position. Alan Lamborn pointed out that in the past the Presidents reported to the Board. Gallagher noted that he was aware of this and has told the Board the Presidents need direct access to the Board. A question was asked regarding the cost for another administrative position. Gallagher responded that no cost has been determined, but the Board is hopeful that the Chancellor will generate more revenue than the Chancellor's salary.

Eykholt reiterated the importance of attending the meeting scheduled with the Board to express opinions on this issue.

GALLAGHER'S REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Changes in Curriculum to be Approved: University Curriculum Committee Minutes: December 1, and 8, 2008
- B. Approval of Degree Candidates - Spring Semester 2009

Carole Makela, Chair, University Curriculum Committee, moved that Faculty Council adopt the consent agenda.

MAKELA'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

SPECIAL ACTIONS

- A. Request for New Master of Natural Sciences Education Plan C Degree Program - University Curriculum Committee

Makela, Chair, University Curriculum Committee, moved that Faculty Council adopt the request for a new Master of Natural Sciences Education Plan C Degree Program to be effective Summer Semester 2009 as follows:

A Plan C Master's Degree Program, Master of Natural Science Education (M.N.S.E.) in the College of Natural Sciences be established, effective Summer Semester 2009.

Makela explained that this proposal came from the College of Natural Sciences. It has been reviewed and approved by the following committees: Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education on September 11, 2008; University Curriculum Committee on December 8, 2008.

Makela explained that, in Colorado, a majority of secondary science teachers must teach courses in physical and earth sciences, which are outside of their discipline (which is most often biology). In many rural schools, teachers are being asked to teach in multiple areas of the sciences or to teach both science and mathematics at various grade levels. The M.N.S.E. program will enhance teachers' science knowledge so they have a greater understanding of the methodology and protocols scientists use. Another primary objective of the program is to teach methods for incorporating exercises and demonstrations for application and enhancement of learning in secondary science classrooms.

Makela noted that middle and secondary school teachers are licensed in science with a concentration in biology education, chemistry education, geology education, or physics education (at CSU), not a specific science discipline. Thus, the M.N.S.E. degree program will provide courses in which students will learn, develop, and implement methods for teaching biology, chemistry and physics appropriate for secondary school science curricula. The program grew out of a need expressed by CSU graduates and area science teachers for a graduate degree that broadens their science knowledge and teaching competence.

She added that additional courses will be developed as the program progresses to give students the opportunity to gain science knowledge and pedagogy in those areas they are/will be teaching.

MAKELA'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

- B. Proposed Revisions to the *Manual*, New Appendix 5 - Research Misconduct - Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Steve Newman, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, moved that Faculty Council adopt the proposed addition to the *Manual* - Appendix 5: Research Misconduct, to be effective upon approval by the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System as follows:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

APPENDIX 5: RESEARCH MISCONDUCT

Universities receiving federal funds must comply with requirements promulgated by the federal agencies regarding ethical behavior in scholarship. The terminology used in this regard is "Research Misconduct," although the concern for ethical behavior encompasses virtually every discipline. The definition of Research Misconduct, as well as the procedures for reporting, investigating, and holding hearings regarding suspected cases of Research Misconduct may be found at the following website:

<http://web.research.colostate.edu/ricro/mis/policies.aspx>

Newman explained that the *Manual* should call attention to the procedures regarding research misconduct. A reference to the Appendix 5 will be made in *Manual* sections as applicable.

NEWMAN'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

- C. Proposed Revisions to the *Manual*, Section F.3.4 - Sabbatical Leave - Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Newman, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, moved that Faculty Council adopt the proposed revisions to the *Manual* Section F.3.4 - Sabbatical Leave to be effective upon approval by the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System as follows:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

F.3.4 Sabbatical Leave

The University offers tenured academic faculty members the possibility of sabbatical leaves. According to state statute, a faculty member may not take sabbatical leave more often than once every seven (7) years. According to University policy, a faculty member does not become eligible for sabbatical leave until the accumulation of six (6) years of service (~~not including any credit for prior service at another institution~~) as a regular faculty member at Colorado State University since the faculty member's initial appointment or most recent sabbatical leave. A faculty member in a tenure-track position may apply for sabbatical leave prior to being granted tenure, and such leave may be granted subject to the condition that the faculty member receive tenure prior to beginning the sabbatical leave. However, a faculty member must have tenure in order to take sabbatical leave.

Newman explained that this change clarifies the intent of this sentence.

NEWMAN'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

- D. Proposed Revisions to the *Manual*, Section K.14.5 - Temporary Special University Grievance Officer - Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Newman, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, moved that Faculty Council adopt the proposed revisions to the *Manual* Section K.14.5 - Temporary Special University Grievance Officer to be effective upon approval by the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System as follows:

Additions are underlined and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

K.14.5 Temporary Special University Grievance Officer

In the event of a conflict of interest by the UGO in a Grievance, or in the event that the UGO becomes a Grievant or requests to be recused, the Provost shall appoint, after consultation with the Grievance Panel and the President, a Special UGO for that Grievance. The Special UGO shall have all the duties herein of the UGO for the duration of the specific Grievance for which he~~r~~ or she is appointed. The Provost may extend time limits as necessary until the Special UGO has been appointed.

Newman explained that extension of time limits may be necessary, since the Grievance Process cannot proceed until the Special University Grievance Officer has been appointed.

NEWMAN'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

- E. Proposed Revisions to the *Manual*, Sections E.10.5.1, E.10.7.6, and E.14.2 - Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Newman, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, moved that Faculty Council adopt the proposed revisions to the *Manual*, Sections E.10.5.1, E.10.7.6, and E.14.2, to be effective upon approval by the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System as follows:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

E.10.5.1 Origin and Processing of Tenure Recommendations

no changes prior to the final paragraph in this section

The department head, the college dean, or the Provost may elect to postpone consideration of a faculty member for tenure, without prejudice, if the recommendation from the tenure committee for the granting or denial of tenure is made in a year earlier than the final year of the probationary period. The decision to postpone and the reasons for postponement shall be communicated immediately in writing to the faculty member and the tenure committee. However, the faculty member must either be granted tenure by the beginning of the first year after the end of the probationary period or be notified by the end of the probationary period that his or her ~~contract~~ appointment will be terminated at the end of one (1) additional year. Once a faculty member is on a regular tenure-track appointment, the use of multi-year research, special, or temporary appointments to extend the probationary period for tenure is not permitted.

E.10.7.6 Term of Continuation of Faculty Salary and Benefits Following Revocation of Tenure

changes only to the first paragraph in this section

Employment, together with salary and benefits, shall terminate upon a final decision to revoke tenure. However, tenure and employment may continue for a period not to exceed one (1) year if the President independently determines or concurs in a recommendation of the Hearing Committee that the tenure ~~contract~~ appointment be continued for that specified period to enable the Faculty Member to complete essential responsibilities.

E.14.2 Comprehensive Reviews of Tenure-Track Faculty

- c. The faculty member has not met the stated requirements for the position in one (1) or more areas of responsibility, and the Review Committee recommends against further ~~contract renewals~~ reappointment.

Newman explained that the use of the term “contract” in these contexts is inappropriate. The term “contract” suggests a particular agreement negotiated between two or more parties. Contract employees at CSU are generally not tenured or tenure-track faculty. The *Manual* sets forth the terms of employment between academic faculty members and the institution, rather than individually negotiated agreements. While, faculty members are appointed and reappointed, they do not generally negotiate individual employment contracts.

NEWMAN’S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

- F. Proposed Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* - Master’s Degrees and Credit Requirements - Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education

Tony Maciejewski, Chair, Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education, moved that Faculty Council adopt the proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* Sections Master’s Degrees and Credit Requirements regarding the Plan C option to be effective upon Faculty Council adoption as follows:

Additions - Underlined - Deletions ~~Over scored~~

MASTER’S DEGREES

. . . Plan C master’s degree options are distinguished in two ways. First, generally, only course work is required. No thesis, project, or final examination is required; however, some specific programs may require an internship, practicum, or other experience consistent with expressed goals of the program, as approved by the University Curriculum Committee. Second, Plan C options are designed for professional degrees; thus, this option is not available in the M.A. or M.S. Further, within any given department, Plan C degrees may not bear the same title as those with Plan A or Plan B options. Please note, however, that not every professional degree need offer the Plan C option.

CREDIT REQUIREMENTS

. . . In general, Plan C master’s programs have an additional requirement: no independent study, research, internship, supervised college teaching, or practicum credits may be credited toward the degree unless one or more of these are required by the program, as approved by the University Curriculum Committee.

Maciejewski explained that many professional master’s programs are being developed or reconfigured wherein a practicum, internship, or other research experience is desired or is required for accreditation by an outside body. Where no thesis (Plan A) or extensive paper (Plan B) is required, the Plan C professional degree alignment is more appropriate, yet current definitions in the *Bulletin*, developed in 1997, do not support these credit-bearing experiences. The professional master’s degree has evolved over time with pressures from employers and from accrediting agencies to require experiences that are beyond a “course work only” degree, as cited in the Council of Graduate Schools’ recent reports on the master’s degree. The proposed changes to the *Bulletin* will enable our current Plan C master’s programs to respond to changing national trends and to provide students with valuable training as part of their approved master’s degree programs. The emphasis on UCC approved experiences has been added to ensure that credit is granted only within programs and for activities where the requirement(s) has been vetted by the University Curriculum Committee and the Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education and there is not a conflict with a Plan A or Plan B degree program(s).

MACIEJEWSKI’S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

- G. Proposed Revisions to the 2008-09 *University General Catalog* - Academic Fresh Start (p. 57-58); Graduation Credit Requirements (p. 75); Minimum Cumulative Grade Point Average (p. 57) - Committee on Scholastic Standards

Dan Turk, Chair, Committee on Scholastic Standards, moved that Faculty Council adopt the proposed revisions to the 2008-09 *University General Catalog* – Academic Fresh Start (pp. 57-58); Graduation Credit Requirements (p. 75) and Minimum Cumulative Grade Point Average (p. 57); to be effective Fall 2009 as follows:

Deletions are ~~overscored~~ - Additions are underlined:

ACADEMIC FRESH START (pp. 57-58)

Former Colorado State undergraduate students may apply for an academic Fresh Start, a policy which allows students to establish a new academic record. A student may be granted a Fresh Start only once.

An academic Fresh Start may be granted only after at least five years have elapsed since the student's last term of enrollment as a regular an admitted, degree-seeking student, regardless of the number of credits taken. The time period during which courses were taken through the Division of Continuing Education or the Colorado State summer session after leaving the University will not count as part of the five-year interval. Courses taken through the Division of Continuing Education or the Colorado State University Summer Session after being dismissed or ceasing enrollment as an admitted degree-seeking student will not count against the five-year interval required for a Fresh Start.

Applications for a Fresh Start will be made through the Center for Advising and Student Achievement and should be submitted one semester prior to the academic term in which a student wishes to enroll in the University. Receipt of a Fresh Start does not guarantee admission, but may aid the student in normal admissions procedures.

A student granted a Fresh Start and enrolled will have a demarcation on the permanent academic record to delineate the previous record from the new academic record achieved under the Fresh Start policy. Credits for those courses in which a grade of at least C- or S was awarded prior to the Fresh Start may be applied toward graduation requirements under the Fresh Start policy. Only grades earned after the Fresh Start demarcation will be computed in the new GPA. A Fresh Start may have implications regarding other requirements for graduation, such as upper-division and in-residence requirements. See these sections of the General Catalog for details.

If a student receives a Fresh Start, he or she must successfully complete at least 30 upper-division credits of coursework in residence at CSU after the Fresh Start is granted in order to graduate.

Turk explained that these changes clarify and prevent students from using Fresh Start extremely late in their academic career and potentially graduating from CSU with a GPA of zero (if, for instance, they only have transferred courses after the Fresh Start). This new wording is consistent with the In-residence Requirements section of the General Catalog.

GRADUATION CREDIT REQUIREMENTS (pp. 74-75) has several sections including Minimum Credit Requirement, Minimum Grade Requirement, Graduation Average Requirement, Upper-Division Credit Requirement, "In residence" Requirement, and Senior Year Requirement). After these sections add a new section as follows.

Deletions are ~~struck-out~~, insertions are underlined:

Academic Fresh Start Requirement

If a student receives a Fresh Start, he or she must successfully complete at least 30 upper-division credits of coursework in residence at CSU after the Fresh Start is granted in order to graduate.

Turk explained that this change prevents students from using Fresh Start extremely late in their academic career and potentially graduating from CSU with a GPA of zero (if, for instance, they only have transferred courses after the Fresh Start). This new wording is consistent with the In-residence Requirements section of the Catalog.

MINIMUM CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE (p. 57)

Deletions are ~~struck-out~~, insertions are underlined:

In order to graduate, a minimum cumulative grade point average (CUM GPA) of 2.000 on a 4.000 scale must be earned at Colorado State University. ~~The CUM GPA is based on grades of A, B, C, D, and F.~~ A student is expected to maintain a CUM GPA of 2.000 or higher at all times. All gGrades earned in regular credit courses, including those taken through the Division of Continuing Education

or the Colorado State Summer Session, will count toward the CUM GPA ~~regardless of when those classes are taken~~. For students who have been granted a Fresh Start, all grades earned prior to the Fresh Start will not count toward the student's CUM GPA. Failure to maintain a CUM GPA of 2.000 or higher will result in one of the following actions.

Turk explained that this change removes the ambiguity of which grades are used in GPA calculation, since grades other than just "A", "B", "C", "D", and "F" are used. Rather than enumerating every grade that is used to calculate the GPA, including all "+" and "-" variations, we leave it unstated since all grades are used in the calculation of the GPA.

TURK'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

DISCUSSION

- A. Faculty Council Representation of Special and Temporary Faculty - Steve Shulman, Chair, Department of Economics and Chair, Task Force Committee on Special and Temporary Faculty

Eykholt explained that this discussion is to examine the need for better representation on Faculty Council of special and temporary faculty and faculty members on multi-year research appointments. Currently "adjunct" faculty members are not allowed to serve on Faculty Council or any of its standing committees. He noted several suggestions have been made to remedy this situation.

1. Allow "adjunct" faculty members as members of Faculty Council.
2. Allow "adjunct" faculty members to serve as at-large members of Faculty Council only.
3. Add an "adjunct" faculty member to each Faculty Council standing committee.
4. Create a new Faculty Council standing committee to represent "adjunct" faculty.

Eykholt noted that Executive Committee agreed with the latter recommendation. Eykholt also noted that the latter recommendation was sent to the Committee on Faculty Governance and they rejected the recommendations with the explanation that creating new committees is never a good idea and the interests of "adjunct" faculty should be represented by the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. Eykholt noted that he invited the members of the Committee on Faculty Governance to this meeting to participate in this discussion.

Steve Shulman explained that the Faculty Council Executive Committee adopted the following resolution at its meeting on April 25, 2006:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTION ON NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ADOPTED APRIL 25, 2006

It is recognized that control over academic faculty policies and curricular issues is governed by the regular appointment faculty, including control over the responsibilities and privileges of non-tenure-track faculty (NTTF) (temporary and special appointments);

Executive Committee of Faculty Council affirms that part-time NTTF members and full-time NTTF members are a valued and integral part of the academic faculty of this university;

Executive Committee of Faculty Council affirms that part-time and full-time NTTF members are professional colleagues with whom we collaborate in an effort to achieve our common academic goals;

Executive Committee of Faculty Council affirms that it values a working relationship with our colleagues in the NTTF categories;

Executive Committee of Faculty Council affirms that annual pay increases, fringe benefits, and resources for professional development should be available to NTTF as appropriate;

THEREFORE, Executive Committee of Faculty Council recommends that the Provost/Senior Vice President and the Chair of Faculty Council jointly appoint a special task-force with diverse representation from the appropriate groups to investigate issues related to temporary and special faculty appointments and report its findings and recommendations to the Provost/Senior Vice

President and the Chair of Faculty Council.

This resolution affirms that “adjunct” faculty and regular faculty are colleagues, that they share a common educational mission, and that the *Manual* covers “adjunct” faculty as well as regular faculty. Shulman noted that the Executive Committee took this step because it recognized that it had to assert its representation of “adjunct” faculty in order to maintain its control over academic matters. Shulman added that “adjunct” faculty now comprise about one quarter of the total faculty and teach about one-half of our courses. If Faculty Council does not represent and in some way include the “adjunct” faculty, then control over them passes to the administration. To that extent, control over academic matters passes to the administration as well.

Shulman explained that shortly after this resolution was issued, Tony Frank (Provost) and Bob Jones (Faculty Council Chair) formed a University Task Force to study the problems faced by “adjunct” faculty and to suggest solutions. Shulman added that this Task Force still functions with him as its Chair. The Task Force issued a set of proposals that responded to a number of problems faced by the “adjunct” faculty. The Provost and the Council of Deans accepted these proposals and put them into practice.

Up to now, Faculty Council has assumed that its members know and represent the “adjunct” faculty members in their departments. Sometimes this is true, but that is clearly not enough. Faculty Council has rarely considered the “adjunct” faculty members explicitly in its deliberations. It has rarely tried to address the concerns of the “adjunct” faculty. If Faculty Council is the body that represents the interests of the faculty, it would be hard pressed to show that it has represented the interests of the faculty members with special & temporary appointments.

Shulman added that, in any case, “adjunct” faculty face a set of issues that are not necessarily faced by regular faculty and that will not necessarily be considered by Faculty Council unless there is an explicit means created for that purpose. For example, academic freedom is an elemental faculty right and the bedrock of the academic enterprise, but it is not at all clear that it applies to “adjunct” faculty. Whether and how it should apply are questions that Faculty Council ought to consider.

Shulman noted that the increasing reliance on “adjunct” faculty is a trend throughout higher education. We cannot keep ignoring it if we are to have any hope of maintaining our control over academic matters. The academy is changing, and we have to understand and adapt to those changes if we are to remain relevant. The “adjunct” faculty members need a means of communicating their concerns to Faculty Council if Faculty Council is to adequately represent them. The Faculty Council needs to have input from the entire faculty if it is to continue playing its part in the system of shared governance.

Shulman explained that, to this end, the Task Force is proposing that a new Faculty Council committee be created on “adjunct” faculty issues. Of course, a number of details would have to be figured out before this step is taken. Our goal today is not to work through those details, but to get a sense of whether or not the members of Faculty Council want to pursue this approach. No commitment is being asked for, and Faculty Council will be able to vote on a proposal when the time comes and all the details are in place.

Shulman noted that the Task Force is working with colleges to set up committees for “adjunct” faculty at the college level. He said the committee is using as a model the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences which has already created a committee for “adjunct” faculty. He reported that the College of Liberal Arts has set up a similar committee for “adjunct” faculty. Shulman noted that a University level committee is needed.

Eykholt noted that when this Task Force was formed it was intended to be a short term Task Force. However, since Faculty Council has not addressed this issue the Task Force still exists and is acting outside of Faculty Council on “adjunct” faculty issues. Eykholt noted that this is not healthy and Faculty Council should be involved in all academic decision at the University. He feels Faculty Council is making a mistake by not having better representation for “adjunct” faculty members.

It was asked what do instructors want. Shulman responded that he could not answer that question because instructors have not been polled. He added that only informal surveys have been conducted.

Steve Mumme, Professor, Political Science, and Colorado State University American Association of University Professors (AAUP) President, commented that the AAUP strongly supports this proposal - it is both timely and addresses a compelling need. He added that Colorado State University had 69% contingent faculty (part time and graduate students) in 2006. Mumme noted that the AAUP says this is a serious, fundamental problem for

Higher Education as it undermines academic freedom and undermines pedagogy and quality of the curriculum. Mumme continued that we now have effectively institutionalized a two-tier system, a system of rights and privileges, responsibilities and practices associated with the tenure track system. He added that this system, with modest exceptions, fails to extend those rights and privileges to contingent faculty, eroding professional norms in the classroom and research and diminishing our ability to defend our professions. Mumme stated that the time has come to address a wide range of issues associated with our two-tier professoriate. Mumme noted the following benefits of a proposed Adjunct Faculty Committee:

1. Monitoring “adjunct” faculty conditions.
2. Conduit to Faculty Council for the voices and concerns of “adjunct” faculty.
3. An additional procedural platform supporting academic freedom for “adjuncts” and the faculty as whole.
4. Harmonizing “adjunct” faculty practices to improve working conditions and administrative accountability.
5. Strengthening the curriculum and teacher – student communications/mentoring.

Mumme noted the following quotes from AAUP 2006 Report:

“The problem lies in the nature of contingent work, its lack of support structures and the constraints on academic freedom for faculty in these positions.”

“That part-time faculty do not participate in governance—not even in basic discussions of curriculum—clearly represents a substantial limitation on their functioning as a faculty.”

“Contingent faculty are less likely to challenge their students because they are often reliant on student evaluations for their continued employment.”

Steve Robinson noted that he is confused by all the different numbers regarding “adjunct” faculty members. Robinson asked if graduate students were included. Shulman noted that there are no graduate students on the Task Force. Shulman added that instructors serve as faculty. Robinson disagreed stating that there is a difference between a student teaching and a professional hired to teach. Shulman added that there is a big variation regarding “adjunct” faculty. Eykholt explained that the new Faculty Council committee would represent special, temporary and multi-year research appointments only. Phil Chapman thanked the committee for its work on this issue and stated that he supported the idea to give participation in shared governance to “adjunct” faculty. Chapman added that this is a complicated issue and that more and more Universities are relying on “adjunct” faculty.

Sue Doe, Assistant Professor, English (prior “adjunct” faculty for over 20 years), explained that “adjunct” faculty represent not the old image of a transient group filling a transient need but a stable group filling a stable need. These contingent faculty are fulfilling much of the core curriculum teaching obligation, which is to say that on-going instructional needs are being met through contingent workforce solutions. Doe added that we need to find sustainable and responsible approaches to this situation. She added that a standing committee could serve as a clearinghouse and interpreter of the trend. It could more fully communicate information to and from the Faculty Council. Doe noted that practical approaches are needed and pointed out that the national trends suggest the trend is here to stay. Doe noted that her argument today is less about social justice than about practicality and reasonableness. Doe explained that we have created a multi-tiered faculty because we have needed these tiers, yet we have not integrated all tiers into the fabric of faculty governance. Doe pointed out that Shuster & Finkelstein’s 2006 mega-analysis *The American Faculty* reports that the move toward specialized roles among faculty is nearly complete, with separate tiers for research and for teaching. The report states: “The pattern is striking and unequivocal: among new hires ...the majority are being appointed to non-tenure-eligible positions” and “term-limited full-time positions have become the modal type of full-time appointment for new entrants to academic careers.” Does added that some may lament the creation of this tiered faculty but no one can deny it. She added that she hopes that Faculty Council will see the wisdom of creating a standing committee to address contingent faculty issues since its presence would signal recognition of the new reality and provide mechanisms for representing an increasingly significant subset of the faculty. Doe pointed out that local trends also suggest the trend is here to stay. Nationally, contingent faculty represent half the faculty or more. And locally we can’t really take comfort in numbers that may be somewhat lower than the national average. It is not even enough to say that there has been a 123% rise in “adjunct” faculty over the past decade on this campus. Nor is it enough to point out that women represent 60% of these lowest ranking faculty here at CSU. Rather, we must ask about the instructional influence of adjunct faculty. In one department during this semester, 70% of the undergraduate students as a whole and 100% of the lower-division core curriculum students are taught by “adjunct” faculty and graduate teaching assistants. In a different college

that boasts one of the lowest levels of dependence on “adjunct” faculty, “adjunct” faculty are responsible this semester for instructing just 28% of the instruction, but nearly half of that instruction is accomplished by administrative professionals, who should have joint faculty appointment, but these type of appointments are loosely administered. This is a strategy of convenience that leaves some untenured instruction undocumented and incompletely understood. Doe explained that these two examples may represent the range of situations on this campus. At the very least, we must understand that in those locations where “adjunct” faculty have the greatest impact, the very best teaching may be going on. She added, can we speak proudly of low instructional impact if low percentages mean that a few tenure-line faculty are teaching mega-sections and therefore making their departments and colleges appear to be fully utilizing tenure-line faculty for instruction? Or would we be better to seek powerful teaching and good student impacts, accomplished by a valued “adjunct” faculty and reasonable enrollment caps? That has been the strategy in departments that have the larger portion of the teaching mission accomplished by “adjunct” faculty. Doe added that we need to stabilize and professionalize this group, not marginalize and punish them or their departments for doing good work. At the very least, this is the sort of thing a Faculty Council committee could debate. Doe noted that Interim President Frank, who has made it clear in recent public announcements that we must restore public investment and belief in public higher education, has also recognized in many ways the role “adjunct” faculty play in this mission. She added that, as Shulman stated, then-Provost Frank created the Provost’s Task Force and endorsed its recommendations which everyone should know about but many don’t. Frank delivered a shift to baseline funding for “adjunct” faculty salaries, so that they rise at a rate commensurate with tenure-line faculty salary increases. Doe added that Frank also sent a clear signal, just over a year ago, that the length of our relationships with people matters, putting into policy that the job classification “temporary faculty” no longer can be used as a long-term strategy for hiring the same people over and over. Rather these people should be classified as “special appointment.” Doe stated that large hurdles remain here as well, because we have not yet used the classification of special appointment as it is intended or to its full potential. It could both simplify and professionalize the non-tenured faculty ranks. Doe noted that, beyond Interim President Frank, others have embraced special and temporary faculty. For instance, a large portion of the senior leadership of the AAUP and Mike Palmquist, Director of the Institute for Learning and Teaching, recently became signatories on a letter to the central administration stating the importance of clear views on “adjunct” faculty issues for any candidate seeking this university’s presidency. Doe added that Colleges such as Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences (CVMBS) and Liberal Arts have formed standing committees to address college-wide issues. The CVMBS’s strategy for shared governance provides a particularly strong model. Doe noted, for their part, “adjunct” faculty have taken a moderate and professional approach. Doe explained the “adjunct” faculty of this university have worked hard to organize their efforts and to clarify their positions over the past several years. They have done so with moderation while conducting their work with professionalism. Further they have defended tenure and have participated in governance for the sake of the future, although they have done so usually without benefit of having that service acknowledged on their annual evaluations. Doe added that it should be remembered, however, that these are people with advanced degrees. Smart people. Their professional and measured approach should not be confused with docility, their needs a matter of charity. They can articulate the issues themselves and should have opportunity to represent themselves to bodies like this one. Doe stated that by creating this committee, the faculty leadership of Colorado State University will become a fuller part of this civil discussion, acknowledging that the central teaching mission of this land-grant institution is now shared with the non-tenure-track faculty. Doe noted, as Shulman has pointed out, if Faculty Council does not represent and in some way include the “adjunct” faculty, then control passes to the administration. She added that we all know of institutions that prefer this kind of arrangement. Florida Gulf Coast University is but one example of a university that has gone over entirely to non-tenure-track faculty because they can be gotten at a lower price and can also be controlled, their actions and their ideas constrained by threat of termination. In addition, as a recent issue of the *Amherst Bulletin* put it, “In many cases, part-time faculty are tailor-made for rough economic times.” Administrative control of any sector of the faculty is a threat to all sectors. Doe added that Gary Rhoades, Professor of Education at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona, calls this sort of approach the end game of the Managed University, the natural outcome when we turn over governance authority to managers. The “adjunct” and tenure-line faculty alike are being managed. We share this, just as we share a number of other features of our experience. We ought to be sharing governance for our mutual well-being. Doe asked how shall we acknowledge and debate such issues if there is no official mechanism for deepening the understanding of “adjunct” faculty issues within the Faculty Council? As this is one of the most pressing issues in higher education today, one that will symbolize our generation, it seems reasonable for Faculty Council to be involved in the discussion. Doe added that she hopes Faculty Council will endorse the proposal for a Faculty Council committee as an early step in this process.

Chapman noted that he needed more statistics regarding “adjunct” faculty, specifically, actual proportions of the types of “adjunct” faculty and what positions there are in. Shulman noted that this information is difficult to ascertain.

David Gilkey, “adjunct” Associate Professor, commented that the CVMBS has 221 “adjunct” faculty. He noted that the CVMBS supports and welcomes participation of “adjunct” faculty. The College code was altered to allow representative of “adjunct” faculty in CVMBS. Mary Van Buren, Associate Professor, Anthropology, stated that most “adjunct” faculty are exploited and considered invisible. She added that the formation of a Faculty Council committee would give “adjunct” faculty a voice. Bill Timpson also noted that he would support and endorse a Faculty Council committee for “adjunct” faculty. Catherine Dicesare noted that there seems to be overwhelming support for the formation of this Faculty Council committee in Faculty Council today and asked what was the resistance to creating this committee. Eykholt responded that the Committee on Faculty Governance opposed the recommendation for a new committee because creating new committees is never a good idea and the interests of “adjunct” faculty should be represented by the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. Eykholt added that the addition of a Faculty Council committee would be a revision to the Code, which normally requires the approval of the Committee on Faculty Governance. He did note that the Executive Committee could act upon this if the Committee on Faculty Governance still opposed creating a new committee.

Miller noted that all comments seem to be positive and asked how Faculty Council can move forward on this issue. Eykholt noted that he would like to get a sense of what the body would like to do so he could take this information back to the Committee on Faculty Governance for action. It was the unanimous consensus of Faculty Council members to pursue the creation of a new Faculty Council committee for “adjunct” faculty.

Eykholt thanked everyone for participating in this discussion and noted that he will take this information back to the Committee on Faculty Governance for action.

The Faculty Council meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Richard Eykholt, Chair
Paul Laybourn, Vice Chair
Diane L. Maybon, Executive Assistant/Recording Secretary

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

Agricultural Sciences

Stephen Koontz	Agricultural and Resource Economics
<u>TBD</u>	<u>Animal Sciences</u>
William Jacobi	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management
H. Hughes, Excused	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture
Craig Butters	Soil and Crop Sciences
<u>Dennis Lamm</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
Louis Bjostad	College-at-Large

Applied Human Sciences

Molly Eckman	Design and Merchandising
Robert Gotshall	Health and Exercise Science
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition
Thao Le	Human Development and Family Studies
Mary Nobe	Construction Management
Matthew Malcolm	Occupational Therapy
Carole Makela	School of Education
Kim Bundy-Fazioli	School of Social Work

Business

Bill Rankin	Accounting
Daniel Turk	Computer Information Systems
Patricia Ryan	Finance and Real Estate
Jackie Hartman	Management
Joe Cannon	Marketing

Engineering

Chris Kummerow	Atmospheric Science
David Dandy	Chemical and Biological Engineering
<u>Tom Sanders</u>	<u>Civil and Environmental Engineering</u>
Steve Reising	Electrical and Computer Engineering
Hiroshi Sakurai	Mechanical Engineering
Xianghong Qian	College-at-Large
<u>TBA</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>

Liberal Arts

<u>Christopher Fisher</u>	<u>Anthropology</u>
Catherine Dicesare	Art
Kirsten Broadfoot	Communication Studies
Elissa Braunstein	Economics
<u>TBD</u>	<u>English</u>
Ernesto Sagas	Ethnic Studies
Frederique Grim	Foreign Languages and Literatures
Thaddeus Sunseri	History
Cindy Christen	Journalism and Technical Communication
Joel Bacon	Music, Theater, and Dance
Michael McCulloch	Philosophy
Bradley MacDonald	Political Science
Ken Berry	Sociology
Karrin Anderson	College-at-Large
Eric Aoki, Excused	College-at-Large
Phil Cafaro	College-at-Large

Natural Resources

<u>Barry Noon</u>	<u>Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology</u>
Mark Paschke	Forest, Rangeland, and Watershed Stewardship
John Ridley	Geosciences
Alan Bright	Human Dimensions of Natural Resources

Natural Sciences

Eric Ross	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
David Steingraeber	Biology
<u>George Barisas</u>	<u>Chemistry</u>
Bruce Draper	Computer Science
(Substitute for Dale Grit)	
<u>Ken Klopfenstein</u>	<u>Mathematics</u>
Raymond Robinson	Physics
Patricia Aloise-Young	Psychology
Philip Chapman	Statistics
Steve Stack	College-at-Large
Zinta Byrne	College-at-Large
<u>TBD</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

James Madl	Biomedical Sciences
Juliet Gionfriddo	Clinical Sciences
<u>Howard Ramsdell</u>	<u>Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences</u>
Ramesh Akkina	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology
Hana VanCampen	College-at-Large
<u>Gerry Callahan</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
C. W. Miller	College-at-Large
Julia Inamine	College-at-Large
<u>Paul Morley</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
Jeffrey Wilusz	College-at-Large

University Libraries

Dawn Bastian Paschal	Libraries
Louise Feldmann	At-Large

Officers

Richard Eykholt	Chair Faculty Council
Paul Laybourn	Vice Chair Faculty Council
Tim Gallagher	BOG Faculty Representative
Diane Maybon	Executive Assistant/Secretary
Lola Fehr	Parliamentarian

Ex Officio Voting Members (*Indicates Elected Member of Faculty Council)

<u>Don Estep, Chair</u>	<u>Committee on Faculty Governance</u>
Susan LaRue, Chair, Excused	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
<u>Oren Anderson, Chair</u>	<u>Committee on Libraries</u>
Steven Newman, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty
Tony Maciejewski, Chair	Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education
Dan Turk, Chair*	Committee on Scholastic Standards and Awards
David Dandy, Chair*	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning
Andrew Norton, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning
Frank Peairs, Acting Chair, Excused	Committee on University Programs
Carole Makela, Chair*	University Curriculum Committee

Ex-Officio Non-Elected Non-Voting Members

Anthony Frank, Excused	Interim President
Rick Miranda	Interim Provost/Executive Vice President
<u>Bill Farland</u>	<u>Senior Vice President for Research and Engagement</u>
<u>Robin Brown</u>	<u>Vice President for Enrollment and Access</u>
<u>Blanche M. Hughes</u>	<u>Vice President for Student Affairs</u>
Peter Dorhout	Vice Provost for Graduate Affairs
<u>Lou Swanson</u>	<u>Vice Provost for Outreach and Strategic Partnerships</u>
Alan Lamborn	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
<u>Lee Sommers</u>	<u>Interim Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences</u>
<u>April Mason</u>	<u>Dean, College of Applied Human Sciences</u>
<u>Ajay Menon</u>	<u>Dean, College of Business</u>
<u>Sandra Woods</u>	<u>Dean, College of Engineering</u>
<u>Ann Gill</u>	<u>Dean, College of Liberal Arts</u>
Don Mykles for Jan Nerger	Interim Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Pat Burns	Interim Dean, University Libraries
Lance Perryman	Executive Dean and Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
<u>Joseph O'Leary</u>	<u>Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources</u>
Courtney Butler	Chair, Administrative Professional Council

Guests:

Steve Shulman, Chair, Department of Economics