

**MINUTES**  
Executive Committee  
**Tuesday, November 15, 2016**  
**3:15 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration**

**Present:** Mary Stromberger, Chair; Stephanie Clemons, Vice Chair; Paul Doherty, Jr., BOG Faculty Representative; Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant; Jason Ahola, Agricultural Sciences; Troy Mumford, Business; TBD, Engineering; Scott Glick, Health and Human Sciences; Angela Christian, Liberal Arts; Nancy Hunter, Libraries; Maria Fernandez-Gimenez, Natural Resources; George Barisas, Natural Sciences; J Lucas Argueso, CVMBS; Rick Miranda, Provost, and Dan Bush, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Guests: Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL; Dan Turk, Chair, CoRSAF

The meeting was called to order at 3:16 p.m. by Mary Stromberger.

**December 6, 2016 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – December 6, 2016 – A201 Clark– 4:00 p.m.**

**A. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – February 7, 2017 – A101 Behavioral Sciences – 4:00 p.m.
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website –

[\(http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/\)](http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

**B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes –

**C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**D. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED**

1. President – Tony Frank
2. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda
3. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger
4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Paul Doherty, Jr.

**E. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. UCC Minutes -
2. Approval of Fall Degree Candidates

**F. ACTION ITEMS**

- 1.

**G. DISCUSSION**

**November 15, 2016 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. Minutes to be Approved**

**A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes***

1. October 18 and 25, 2016

There were no corrections to the minutes.

The minutes were unanimously approved and will be placed on the Faculty Council website.

**II. Items Pending/Discussion Items**

**A. *Announcements***

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: November 29, 2016 – 3:15 p.m.  
– Room 106 - Administration

Stromberger announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on November 29, 2016.

Stephanie Clemons, Vice Chair, will give a report on student success. She attended a meeting for The Reinvention Center and will report on national initiatives coming out.

**B. *Action Items***

1. UCC Minutes – October 21 and 28, 2016

Mumford moved (Argueso 2<sup>nd</sup>) to place the UCC meeting minutes from October 21 and 28, 2016 on the December 6, 2016 FC meeting consent agenda.

Mumford's motion was unanimously approved.

2. Proposed revisions to Section E.12.1 Teaching and Advising of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL

Hunter moved (Ahola 2<sup>nd</sup>) to place the proposed revisions to Section E.12.1 Teaching and Advising of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* on the December 6, 2016 FC meeting agenda.

Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL explained the proposed changes arose from two different groups to revisit the notion of how to deliver course evaluations. One was a group formed by TILT and UDTS on how to evaluate teaching effectiveness. CoTL is the second group. Harder part is nature of questions. Primary aim is to push conversations that student course surveys have a use to inform faculty on teaching performance.

Questions:

Hunter noted a grammatical error in one of the paragraphs. The edit was noted on the draft.

Hunter's motion was approved.

Ahola: What are the next steps? What does that look like over the next few months?

Hickey: CoTL and Zinta Byrne looked at an example of an on-line student course survey that is currently used by University Wisconsin. This survey can be delivered through Canvas. Byrne is in an "idling stage" on how to move forward with platform of questions. Whatever online tool is used, we want a central core of questions and flexibility on bank of questions given for certain faculty. Byrne is concerned about the form field for feedback and not give faculty too much leeway to their draft own questions. Her concern is that questions need to be standardized. Survey questions and the platform are the two main questions.

TILT task force is working on building tool box (i.e., rubrics; narratives, etc). Miranda has agreed to support creative ways to expand the toolbox. Whole philosophy has been about mentoring. We should arrive at something tangible.

3. Proposed revisions to Section I.8 Student Course Survey of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL

Hickey explained the rationale for the proposed revisions and explained that many faculty have a desire to do more than one survey.

Glick: Who administers the survey? Instructors or the department head? This has happened in our department, where staff administered the survey and faculty's scores went down. The language here says course instructors.

Glick: Survey cannot be used as primary source of contract. Nonsigned comments have been used as a way to evaluate faculty...signed or not signed both acceptable? So how do we address that?

Hickey: A lot of students like to write comments and some don't sign them.

Stromberger: I don't know if we can address that because the issue of whether a department head can access surveys, including student comments, is determined in department codes.

Doherty: I get the summary. Access to different survey forms. Only to course instructors and cut out the dept. code. Does your task force want to use the individual forms?

Glick: Can use anything signed or unsigned?

Stromberger: If your faculty don't like that, your department can change it.

Glick: I have no recourse.

Stromberger: If it's in your department code, faculty should change it.

Glick: Dan Bush and Miranda came over at one time and said nothing could be used that is not signed.

Clemons: Is there someone that is looking at department codes?

Bush: I look at code language. Anonymous comments from a student are not going to decide someone's P and T.

Stromberger: Does it make sense to post the middle of semester surveys? They are helpful for instructors to make adjustments, or should the students see just the final survey?

Hickey: Really only reflects the last two weeks anyway.

Mumford: I would suggest posting just the final one.

Hickey: We could revise this to say that only the final or end-of-semester survey is posted online.

Ahola: It's a little frustrating that fall course surveys were slow in getting back. There were two or three legitimate reasons. We had no data for half

of the year. I am wondering if there is some value to add some kind of time frame for the surveys to come back?

Hickey: Point well taken. Not sure.

Clemons: Related to the student course survey...first paragraph. Does the proposed language relate to the current course survey or was it written with the new course survey in mind. Is this putting the cart before the horse? Some faculty won't use the course survey anymore.

Hickey: There are two looming elephants. One is that no matter who creates the questions, can we circumvent those questions that are more important. Second elephant: can we build a better survey? Should we release it now or wait?

Clemons: If it's not a primary source of evaluation, do we need the survey?

Hickey: ASCSU would like a survey.

Clemons: Understanding the issues of the first one, there will be departments that rely heavily on them.

Glick motioned to return Section I.8 back to CoTL and Barisas seconded, with specific instructions. What is the course survey used for and not used for? This needs to be addressed this academic year.

Stromberger suggested that Hickey talk to Clemons, Makela and Miranda.

Clemons suggested having intent statements for each section (i.e. this is the *intent* of this section, specifically).

Barisas: The questions is: How is this information currently used properly? Examples of right way to receive information and use it.

After further discussion, Doherty moved (Ahola 2<sup>nd</sup>) to refer the proposed revisions to Section I.8 Student Course Survey back to CoTL for further review.

Doherty's motion was unanimously approved.

Glick moved that we revisit the proposed revisions to E.12.1, and that the proposed revisions to E.12.1 be pulled from December 6 Faculty Council meeting agenda. Glick's motion was seconded.

Executive Committee discussed the need for both these proposals to move forward together. Glick asked CoTL to consider revising language related to unsigned student comments, so that anonymous comments cannot be used in evaluations period.

EC discussed that clear language is needed that describes the purpose of the course survey. Student voice in instructor evaluations? Professional development? Information for course instructors only? Makela suggested that CoTL consider examples of how the course survey is used in each of these scenarios.

EC also discussed that the proposed revisions between E.12.1 and I.8 are redundant, and that perhaps revision to I.8 should focus on what I.8 was intended for – describing the responsibilities of ASCSU to partially fund the course survey.

Glick's motion to pull the proposed revisions to E.12.1 from the FC meeting agenda was approved.

Glick moved to refer the proposed revisions to E.12.1 back to CoTL for further review. Glick's motion was seconded.

Glick's motion was approved. The proposed revisions to E.12.1 will be reconsidered by CoTL.

4. Proposed recommendations regarding Student Course Survey Redesign – CoTL

Stromberger: What does CoTL see as the intent? Would you like us to bring this to Faculty Council, or can I just report this?

Hickey: Do as a report.

Stromberger accepted CoTL's recommendations on the Student Course Survey. She will report on the recommendations at the December 6 Faculty Council meeting.

5. Proposed revisions to Section E.9 Faculty Productivity of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual - CoRSAF*

Dan Turk, Chair of CoRSAF, presented the rationale for the proposed revisions to E.9. One sentence was added, basically saying that negative behavior can be taken into consideration in decisions regarding merit salary increases, but that the behavior has to be documented following the

E.15 process. Without having validation of the process, it would not be appropriate for the evaluation process.

Stromberger: This proposal came up last May in FC. Talked about negative behavior and positive behavior. Faculty Council referred it back to CoRSAF because there was concern about rewarding positive behavior (not defined; not documented). CoRSAF reviewed and removed language with positive behavior.

Barisas: Could we tell the difference?

Stromberger: Negative behavior has to go through an E.15 process. A chair just couldn't say "I don't like your behavior, so I'm docking your pay". That could not be done.

Glick: Barisas' question seems about perception. And this has to go through E.15.

Mumford: Can behavior be considered in performance evaluations?

Stromberger: If it impacts teaching, service, or research.

Mumford: So for merit pay, behavior has to be non-performance?

Stromberger: Harassment, retaliation, and bullying are examples of behavior that don't affect research, teaching and service. These behaviors can't be factored into performance evaluations. But if such behavior resulted in an E.15 action (letter of reprimand), then it could be taken into consideration for merit pay.

Bush expressed concern regarding the language. It could be interpreted that behavior that impacts research, teaching, and service cannot be considered in performance evaluations. Language should be added to clarify this.

Clemons: In our department code, part of our service component is to contribute to service. You have a stronger way that chair can say something.

Glick: Reference or define those behaviors ...direct to E.15.

Barisas: These questions are reasonable. Talking about the role of personal favoritism is what we had originally discussed last year.

Stromberger: Question to Dan Turk, Chair, CoRSAF: Would you be more comfortable taking this back to CoRSAF and doing your own wordsmithing?

Turk: History of favoritism needs to be clear and be clear on what behaviors can be factored in performance evaluations, and that non-performance based behavior is addressed with merit pay decisions.

Glick moved that the proposed revisions to E.9 be referred back to CoRSAF.

Clemons seconded the motion.

Glick's motion was unanimously approved.

6. Proposed revisions to Section D.3.6 Responsibilities for Ensuring Nondiscrimination Practices; D.5.1 Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action; Appendix 1: Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Stalking, and Retaliation of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Turk and Stromberger explained these proposed revisions are needed to update and match what the Federal government requires of us. Pregnancy and discussion of pay – cannot discriminate on those. Some editorial changes.

Barisas moved (Mumford 2<sup>nd</sup>) to place the proposed revisions to Section D.3.6 Responsibilities for Ensuring Nondiscrimination Practices; D.5.1 Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action; Appendix 1: Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Stalking, and Retaliation of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* on the December 6, 2016 FC meeting consent agenda.

Barisas' motion was unanimously approved.

### ***Reports***

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

No report for today.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger

Stromberger reported the following:

Stromberger attended a Tobacco Task Force meeting to revise the smoking policy. The task force is considering a revision that would add interiors of parking garages as nonsmoking areas. Also, the new health facility, on the corner of College and Prospect, would be listed as a non-smoking area as well (inside the building and on its grounds).

There have been a couple of complaints made in the last year or two, related to chewing tobacco. Stromberger asked if Executive Committee members felt this was an issue? If a student's chewing is impacting student learning in the classroom, then it should not be allowed.

Giminez: Prefer not having in the classroom.

Stromberger: The task force discussed that if faculty find it disruptive, faculty could put in syllabus that chewing tobacco would not be allowed in the classroom, because it is disruptive. If you feel it should be banned, I can take this back to the committee.

EC discussed that while chewing tobacco and spitting is annoying and disruptive, a lot of other behaviors are also annoying, and we can't policy everything.

Stromberger's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Paul F. Doherty, Jr.

Doherty reported the following:

BOG will meet December 8-9, 2016. Any issues to be reported by Doherty to the BOG should be sent via email to Doherty.

Stromberger suggested the Graduate Student Showcase.

Doherty's report was received.

4. Update on Parking – Nancy Hunter

Hunter reported the following:

Martin Carcasson conducted the meeting. Representatives from APC, State Classified, ASCSU, and committee members were present. There were 4 proposals that were discussed: 1) Current model: 2) Current model with Changes related to parking at Moby and Ingersoll for students in

dorms; 3) Salary-Based Model, and; 4) SP + Model that was proposed by the consultant that they hired (designated parking, means you have one parking lot you can park in).

For the Salary Based model, two versions were presented – one with 5 salary bands and one with 4 salary bands. The more you make, the more you pay. The elasticity is people selecting out of parking. They do expect that permits would go down—the number they sell. 4-band model was fairly similar; more burden for annual fee on people making more than \$70,000 / year. There are 1700 potential permits from faculty and staff making 35-70,000 per year at \$582 cost. Over \$70,000 and the permit would rise, eventually to a max of over \$1,000. This was talked about a lot. Favored model, but it's not as viable option. Would not fulfill parking services need and not as viable.

The current model with revisions includes adding reduced parking at Moby, among other changes. This model seemed to be the most popular with the meeting group.

David Bradford, Parking Services Director, will make recommendations to Lynn Johnson in early December.

Stromberger: Any open forums to get feedback from faculty and others?

Hunter: No.

Stromberger has these proposals in an Excel program and will email to EC members. She will also check on open forum possibilities.

Doherty: Subsidizing the MAX, etc. Was it mentioned at all?

Hunter: Discussed a little bit. Students contributing a half million dollars already.

Clemons: Engineering and Research Blvd. Was Foothills not mentioned?

Hunter: 24/7 lots is off the table. There won't be evening permits or Saturday permits. However, game parking is under lock and key.

Barisas: How does this differ than the clicker presentation given in EC?

Stromberger: Martin assimilated information from the forums in October and incorporated feedback into these models. These are four models that were developed. I will check if there will be opportunities to hear these models and get employee feedback. Will double check my emails.

Hunter: The lot prices are not static at all. Interior lots would be more than exterior lots.

Stromberger asked EC to look over the parking models and that we will discuss these and prioritize them at the next EC meeting. May invite David Bradford with Parking Services.

Hunter's report was received.

***D. Discussion Items***

1. Review UGO/UM evaluations

Stromberger asked EC members to look at the survey questions for the UGO evaluation. When EC meets on November 29, we can have a more detailed evaluation discussion.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

Mary Stromberger, Chair  
Stephanie Clemons, Vice Chair  
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant