MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, September 12, 2017
3:00 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Present: Tim Gallagher, Chair; Sue Doe, Vice Chair; Margarita Lenk, BOG Faculty Representative; Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant; Mary Stromberger, Immediate Past Chair; Scott Nissen, Agriculture; Stephen Hayne, Business; Russ Schumacher for Steven Reising, Engineering; TBD, Health and Human Sciences; Steven Shulman, Liberal Arts; Nancy Hunter, Libraries; William Sanford, Natural Resources; George Barisas, Natural Sciences; Anne Avery, CVMBS; Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President

Guests: Carole Makela, Chair, UCC

Absent: Steven Reising, Engineering (excused)

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Tim Gallagher, Chair

October 3, 2017 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – October 3, 2017 – Clark A201– 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – November 7, 2017 – A201 Clark – 4:00 p.m.
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website –

(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 – Tim Gallagher

4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

E. CONSENT AGENDA

F. ACTION ITEMS

1.

G. DISCUSSION

1.
September 12, 2017 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

1. August 15, 2017 and August 22, 2017

The August 15 and 22, 2017 Executive Committee meeting minutes were unanimously approved and will be placed on the FC website.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: September 19, 2017–3:00 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on September 19, 2017.

Gallagher introduced our guest at today’s meeting: Zsuzsa Bhalog, ACE Fellow (a competitive program with 30-40 faculty selected each year; each fellow negotiates with a possible host institution. Zsuzsa is the third to visit CSU. Tom Siller was an ACE Fellow at Oregon State. Zsuzsa is a Professor of Engineering at Metro State.

We are beginning to populate the items for the October 3, 2017 FC meeting. The FC minutes should be ready by next week’s EC meeting. They will then go on the FC agenda.

B. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – August 25, 2017 and September 1, 2017 (draft) - UCC

Executive Committee unanimously approved the August 25, 2017 and September 1, 2017 UCC meeting minutes. The minutes will placed on the October 3, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.
2. Proposed revisions to Section E.9 Faculty Productivity of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Lenk moved (Sanford 2nd) to place the proposed revisions to Section E.9 Faculty Productivity of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* on the October 3, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Lenk’s motion was unanimously approved.

C. Reports

1. Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported the following:

Miranda reported on the three sessions at the Fall Leadership Forum in Estes Park, Colorado - September 7-8, 2017.

Miranda provided information about the salary equity committee’s report and plans for ongoing analysis on a yearly basis, as requested by Steve Shulman.

Miranda’s report was received.

2. Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported the following:

Gallagher reported on CoRSAF’s progress on Section K in regards to the bullying policy.

Gallagher reported on Matt Hickey’s use of the Student Course Survey report.

Gallagher also mentioned why he forwarded information from FC members – Antonio Pedros-Gascon re: President’s evaluation processes. Gallagher explained that the Board of Governors evaluates the President and the Board frequently requests assistance from Executive Committee, which in turn often asks for feedback from various constituents. We must deliver to the Board what it asks for. Both Lenk and Hunter said that the feedback received in
years past has been accurately processed but has been minuscule.

Memo from Robert Keller (Economics) to Gallagher was a carry-in item regarding Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. Shulman asked how we would typically proceed on such a memo? Gallagher said that typically EC would send such a request to the pertinent committees, or can decide to do nothing other than read it ourselves at the EC meeting. If sent to a committee, they do with it what they will. Should such an item be sent through the college rep? Gallagher said that Keller can do that but doesn’t have to. There are many paths for receiving, considering, and doing what we see fit with this. A discussion of processes around proposals such as Robert Keller’s then followed. Lenk moved (Shulman 2nd) that the proposal move forward today and discussion followed.

Questions:

Hayne: Does sending this proposal mean that we endorse it or give the appearance of endorsement from EC?

Gallagher: No, it means that we send the proposal forward to the appropriate standing committee but one member of EC indicates that he has already seen the proposal on the committee. Gallagher clarified that this is one of the multiple paths that a proposal could take. EC can redirect proposals to appropriate committees.

If there is a path for forwarding it routinely -- is there any reason for EC to forward it?

Gallagher: It is appropriate to bring things to the EC for possible routing to involved committees.

Hunter: People don’t always know where to send, or which committee to send a proposal to.

Stromberger: Sometimes a person will send a proposal to multiple locations. If a proposal came up through a standing committee to this group, that’s one thing, but if it comes from an individual and is passed through EC, that’s another.
Miranda: EC does not need to serve a gatekeeper function when the Chair could simply send these types of suggestions directly to the committees.

Gallagher: I would prefer to keep EC members informed but can just inform us of such things afterwards, if we would prefer that he do that.

Lenk: I move to amend the previous motion to say that items 1 and 5 from Keller’s proposal go to the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning and that items 2 and 4 go to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.

Diana Prieto memo request

Diana Prieto and Teri Suhr would like to give a report to FC in regards to faculty benefits and premium rates. They have already given their report to the Benefits Committee but would like to give a report to FC. Prieto would like to get this on the October meeting agenda so that the report precedes the open enrollment period.

Lenk: Is it unusual for these folks to come to FC?

Stromberger: It is not at all unusual.

Barisas: Could we get more information on what to expect at this briefing?

Gallagher: Questions and comments will be possible.

Makela suggested that we review the benefits report that was in last month’s agenda.

Miranda reported that there’s no radical change being proposed. The idea is to make sure that everyone is properly informed via the report.

Executive Committee unanimously approved putting this report on the October FC meeting agenda.

Overview of the Possible Qingdao University – CSU Collaboration Memo
Miranda reported that there have been various efforts to go to dual degree programs delivered fully in China vs 2+2 programs. Miranda said that most 2+2 programs offer this option. We haven’t taken up this option in all the years we have been collaborating with the China programs due to the programs not being attractive or aligned, or economically feasible. This proposal however is different. We have reports of other universities also working with Qingdao and we have several collaborations already started from the research end and this is the first time that we’ve been attracted by such a proposal.

Miranda is going in October and they’ve promised a dedicated building with maintenance—while we would provide curriculum and faculty. Gallagher was invited to attend but had to decline the offer. Other faculty are invited to attend. Miranda suggested waiting until after the trip to offer a recommendation or process.

Stromberger: Why not Anhui U?

Miranda: Qingdao has better resources. Programs mentioned are Construction Management and Fermentation Science.

Hunter: What about library access and EID?

Stromberger: What about HLC issues?

Miranda: Every remote location must be approved by HLC so that they know the assessment processes and such. We would develop the instruction and assign the teachers.

Hunter: Why, what are the advantages?

Miranda: Chinese students very much value Western degrees. Meanwhile, having the CSU brand in China helps us recruit other Chinese students. Miranda said that the revenue upside, including overhead, would be in the millions of dollars to finance international travel, student recruiting, and other interesting ways to leverage our academics to enhance revenue growth. This approach answers the question of students who are in situ—students who cannot come to the U.S. Eventually most 2+2
programs gravitate towards this. Miranda reported that some of the constructs are similar to Semester at Sea.

Stromberger: Would these be TTF lines?

Miranda: Probably not, Miranda initially stated, then revised to suggest possibly.

Miranda: It would be possible to create a small contingent of faculty for short assignments, or hire local Chinese faculty, or we could offer other international faculty to deliver the courses. They do not want an online program. They are building a campus.

Continued discussion promised with a call for full discussion.

Gallagher: Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF, will present EC with a specific proposal on Section K, and will also ask for a revised bullying policy. Gallagher’s is concerned about this. In conversations with the AP Council, they will be discussing this at their October meeting. The current process says that AP will review proposals first. If a standing committee stalls out a proposal, EC can put it on the agenda anyway and would let the standing committee know, but this would be the “nuclear option” over the objection of one of its standing committees.

Gallagher’s concerns: If the AP council says we don’t want the bullying proposal in the Manual, then the AP Council has more power than any of the standing committees. AP Council has an absolute veto. Items can fail to be brought to the floor of Faculty Council as result of AP Council deciding that they don’t want it there. At the very least, they have to review it first and could stall out the FC motions that would come before FC. This will come up again and again. The AP Council know that if they vote no, it’s not going anyway, while if a standing committee votes no, then EC can take it to the floor of Faculty Council anyway. Gallagher is starting to see unintended consequences to these processes as laid out in the preface. Faculty Council is the ultimate arbiter; the vote on the floor of FC is the final word. This was done to prevent FC from passing motions that would impact Administrative Professionals without their participation.
Stromberger: Since Tony supports the bullying proposal, is there any reason to think APC would not support it?

Gallagher: Diana Prieto met with APC and indicated that she does not support the bullying proposal, which could affect the APC’s support of the proposal, which in turn could affect whether it makes its way to the floor of FC. The potential for use of the veto power of APs is something to be considered quite seriously since there will be other issues that they may similarly reflect different priorities.

Stromberger: I suggest that we bring APC leadership to an EC meeting.

Gallagher: The Appendix materials apply to many groups outside of faculty and suggested that we also meet with CPC.

Hunter: Should we invite APC and CPC leadership to an upcoming meeting prior to their next meeting on October 9?

Gallagher’s report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported the following:

No BOG meeting and hence to report today.

**D. Discussion Items**

1. Central Administrative Data Governance Policy

Patrick Burns would like to appear at FC to address the data governance policy and invite participation from FC members.

Shulman: I am supportive of this.

Hunter: Not opposed but the faculty need to understand that this proposal involves data analytics.
Gallagher: May involve student data information, not just faculty data.

Stromberger: We need to invite Jim Folkestadt so that we get expertise in regards to data analytics.

Gallagher: I will check with Pat Burns first before inviting others.

Hayne: Requests that we understand what the scope of Burns’ presentation is—include student data?

Gallagher: Data sets and restricted access has not been codified so the intention of Burn’s proposal is to start putting into place access policies and making those uniform. Burns wants to hear back from the faculty about their concerns regarding data management policies and that’s why he wants to get in front of Faculty Council. So, this is an opportunity for faculty to give feedback. Discussion items often involve complex issues like this.

Hunter: Each breach gives us one more reason for considering how our data is stored.

Miranda: Most faculty are working at the user level only and Burns wants to know how it’s working. Questions about who are data stewards for various data sets. Who needs to know and why, and what are implications in terms of privacy.

Executive Committee unanimously agreed that the Central Administrative Data Governance Policy needs to be added to the Faculty Council agenda.

After the discussion, Executive Committee entered executive session.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

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