

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, March 21, 2017
3:15 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Present: **Stephanie Clemons**, Vice Chair presiding for Mary Stromberger, Chair; **Paul Doherty, Jr.**, BOG Faculty Representative; **Rita Knoll**, Executive Assistant; **Stephen Coleman, Jr.** (substituting for Jason Ahola, Agriculture); **Troy Mumford**, Business;; **Scott Glick**, Health and Human Sciences; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon** (substituting for Angela Christian), Liberal Arts); **Nancy Hunter**, Libraries; **William Sanford**, Natural Resources; **George Barisas**, Natural Sciences; **J Lucas Argueso**, CVMBS; **Rick Miranda**, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: **Carole Makela**, Chair, UCC; **Laura Jensen**, Associate Provost for Planning and Effectiveness; **Heather Novak**, Research Manager, Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness

Absent: **Mary Stromberger**, Chair (excused), **Russ Schumacher**, Engineering (excused), **Jason Ahola**, Agriculture (excused), **Angela Christian**, Liberal Arts (excused)

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Stephanie Clemons, Vice Chair.

April 4, 2017 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – April 4, 2017 – A101 BSB– 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – May 2, 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
2. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger
3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Paul Doherty, Jr.
4. Diana Prieto –Salary Equity Study

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes –

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Election – Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance
2. Election – University Grievance Panel – Committee on Faculty Governance
3. University Disciplinary Panel – Committee on Faculty Governance

G. DISCUSSION

1. TBD

Clemons explained that the priority discussion topic would be the Student Course Survey with Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL. If that topic cannot be presented, then we have three other options: 1) Jennifer Schneider to present the Campus Climate Survey; move Diana Prieto to the discussion instead of a report for Salary Equity Study, or; 3) or a detailed discussion on the FY18 budget.

Mumford thought the salary discussion would be the best option.

Arugeso asked if the budget would be ready. Miranda replied that he would be presenting the budget as part of his report and the budget is in high flux. The discussion might be focused on an unfinished product.

Pedros-Gascon suggested the campus climate survey might be best (although he wondered if Mary Ontiveros would be a better lead).

Glick asked what the chances were that the student course survey topic would not be ready. Clemons thought the group has been working on the phase 1 questions. Glick wondered if *Manual* language changes for how the course survey is used in evaluations is ready for discussion? Glick stated the big push to change the faculty *Manual* was supposed to come back to EC first.

Pedros-Gascon thinks the course survey *Manual* language should first be vetted by Executive Committee.

Glick noted that with the President's report, the FC agenda is long and maybe that should influence our choice of a discussion topic. Miranda noted that President Frank might discuss the budget as well.

March 21, 2017 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. February 21 and 28, 2017

The February 21 and 28, 2017 minutes were unanimously approved and will be placed on the FC website.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: March 28, 2017– 3:15 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Clemons announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on March 28, 2017.

B. *Action Items*

1. UCC Minutes – March 3, 2017

Makela summarized the UCC minutes and explained three additional certificates and new MS programs. Makela also noted some special UCC action items that we can expect at future Executive Committee meetings.

Pedros-Gascon moved (Hunter 2nd) to place the March 3, 2017 UCC Minutes on the April 4, 2017 FC meeting agenda.

Pedros-Gascon's motion was unanimously approved.

C. *Reports*

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported the following:

The enrollment increase (~500) is less than was projected (~650) and resulted in ~\$2 million less projected money for next fall. CSU has been projecting an additional \$3 million in

state appropriations; however, the state Joint Budget Committee may give less. To backfill such an amount with resident tuition, the tuition would have to be about 2.5% more (from 5% to 7.5% increase in tuition). CSU is starting to examine other ways to increase revenue and possibly cut expenses. The situation is fluid with many unknowns, except the budget seems to be under more stress than a couple of weeks ago.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Vice Chair – Stephanie Clemons

Clemons reported the following:

Stromberger attended the ACE-NASH meeting over spring break with other CSU, CSU-P, and CSU-System administrators. The meeting attendees are mostly system heads with most systems being larger than CSU's. Strategies to engage in students' success initiatives across our system are being explored. Miranda explained that strategies to how best leverage faculty energies in student success initiatives. Some initiatives are focused on academic affairs (e.g., residence life), but many are in the academic realm (e.g., early grade feedback). Clemons added that some strategies at CSU are ahead of other systems. Clemons noted that Paul Thayer's replacement will be important.

Clemons' report was received.

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

Doherty reported the following:

Doherty reported that the Board has not met since February and will next meet in early May on the Fort Collins campus.

Doherty's report was received.

Pedros-Gascon asked if there was any academic coordination between CSU and CSU-Pueblo. Miranda and Doherty explained ongoing initiatives. Pedros-Gascon thought his program could make some progress with CSU-Pueblo with a small investment.

D. Discussion Items

1. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) findings
-Laura Jensen and Heather Novak

Jensen and Novak explained NSSE. This survey is a national survey of students and how they spend their time and engage on campus. The survey is conducted every 3 years (more cost effective than every year). The survey is conducted for all freshmen and seniors. This past year, sophomore students were also sampled. Student engagement and learning from the student perspective is the foci. Can measure the effect of high impact practices, etc. and why the survey is conducted. Jensen added that CSU's response rate is higher than our peers and the survey is incentivized. Freshman participation rate is higher than seniors. Lots of collaboration on campus to conduct the survey and to get students to participate.

Novak added that response rates were in the 32-36% range as compared to ~15% for our peers. The response can be broken out by college and departments. Demographically, the results represent the student body well, but the respondents generally have higher GPAs than the student body as a whole. Results are compared to other universities. This was CSU's ninth survey. In general, our students are happy (9/10 would choose CSU again) and rate their experience highly. We have had a slight trend upward over the last decade. The NSSE questions are grouped into 10 engagement indicators. CSU freshman rank higher in five areas as compared to our peers. Senior student results are mixed.

Sanford asked when the survey is administered. Novak said 4 weeks into the spring semester.

NSSE asks if students have engaged in a learning community or engaged in another high impact experience. CSU compares well with other universities.

Clemons asked what practices NSSE uses. Novak noted three practices.

Jensen explained more about high impact practices, and although all students take a capstone course, not all students say they have taken a capstone.

Novak noted other results of the survey. The results and an interactive tool are available on a CSU website.

Jensen noted that departments are encouraged to use the results in the program review. Doherty asked if there was a lot of variation across departments. Jensen replied there was a lot of variability. Novak would like to take, as a next step, correlating NSSE data with graduation rates, GPA, etc.

Pedros-Gascon asked how the administration uses the data. Jensen said the intent for departments to use NSSE results as they find useful, but not to have a standard approach or prescription for all departments. Jensen noted that the results can be used for promotion. Clemons thought the results could be useful for departments to understand how they are doing and maybe diagnose issues.

Pedros-Gascon asked if graduate students are also surveyed. Jensen replied affirmatively and explained some of the questions.

Clemons thought that the data are very useful and promoting it to the departments would be useful.

Barisas asked if students with AP/IB credits are not considered in the survey as freshman. Novak said AP credits are not counted in defining stage, but transfer student credits are.

Barisas and Pedros-Gascon discussed further aspects of the survey, especially when tracking students as they change majors and progress through their college years. Jensen noted that data are tied to IDs, so many such analyses can be conducted.

2. EC procedures for evaluating the president and President's Evaluation

Doherty explained the past process. Pedros-Gascon expressed concern with the process and would rather have a numeric value associated with each criteria and to have more anonymity associated with process. Clemons will explore these suggestions with Stromberger.

Clemons asked if the Executive Committee supported sending the evaluation memo to the State Classified Council. Barisas and Hunter supported the idea. Pedros-Gascon and Coleman asked if a self-evaluation from President Frank would be useful to include.

Clemons and Hunter thought a self-evaluation might have been included in the past. Glick thought that opinions can be gathered (e.g., slide a note under a door). Doherty explained that the criteria we have is what is given by the Board and in our procedures. Glick added that the main responsibility of faculty is in the academic realm, not serving on the evaluation committee. Barisas added that the Faculty provide information to the Board (who evaluate the President), and Faculty do not have a vote on the evaluation. Pedros-Gascon added that there is no perfect democracy but that we can work to make our input more effective.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Stephanie Clemons, Vice Chair
Paul F. Doherty, Jr., BOG Faculty Representative
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant