MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, September 26, 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; Scott Nissen, Agriculture; Stephen Hayne, Business; 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; Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL

Absent: Mary Stromberger, Immediate Past Chair (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 – August 15, 2017; August 22, 2017 (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

5. Medical Plan Survey Results – Diana Prieto and Teri Suhr

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – August 25, 2017 and September 1 and 8, 2017

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Proposed revisions to the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual - Section E.9 Faculty Productivity - CoRSAF (pp.)

2. Proposed revisions to the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Section K Resolution of Disputes CoRSAF (pp.)

G. DISCUSSION

1. None.
September 26, 2017 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

1. September 5, 2017

These minutes were duplicated. Executive Committee unanimously approved FC meeting minutes at the September 19, 2017 meeting.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: October 10, 2017 – 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on October 10, 2017.

2. Carry-in ballot for Academic Faculty Nominations to Faculty Council Standing Committees

Hayne moved (Barisas 2nd) to place the ballot for Academic Faculty Nominations to Faculty Council Standing Committees on the October 3, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Hayne’s motion was unanimously approved.

B. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – September 15, 2017 – UCC

Makela said there are a few new courses. A special action item will be forthcoming for the November FC agenda.

Reising moved (Hunter 2nd) to place the September 15, 2017 UCC meeting minutes on the October 3, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Reising’s motion was unanimously approved.
1. Proposed revisions to Section E.12.1 Teaching and Advising of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL

Hickey gave a brief overview. CoTL is taking a two-tier approach with course survey redesign. Last spring, the proposals were tabled at the Faculty Council meeting. Over the summer, Hickey talked with Gallagher to get these back on to the Faculty Council agenda, and Gallagher suggested making the Student Course Survey separate. Hickey is working with Zinta Byrne, who will be attending the next CoTL meeting with a draft. There were no questions from EC members.

Sanford moved (Reising 2nd) to place the proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – Section E.12.1 Teaching and Advising on the October 3, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Reising’s motion was unanimously approved.

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

Questions:

Gallagher addressed Hunter’s question regarding alternative representations of course evaluation.

Shulman pointed out that there’s no stipulation about what this would be, so there’s not necessarily any additional burden.

Avery: There’s no formal peer evaluation.

Hickey: This is where we had discussions as well. My argument is that you are going to have to figure out additional ways to evaluate someone’s teaching. Palmquist charged departments with rewriting codes (2013).

Gallagher: Interesting question. Does this mean you should put it in the department code?
Member: Yes, but what if they don’t.

Gallagher: The faculty staff manual trumps department codes. My understanding that if this wording passes and if a department does not change their department code, it would be incumbent on that department head to use more than one source anyhow.

Shulman: It should be as simple as handing in a syllabus. It doesn’t impose that much of a burden on departments.

Gallagher: That’s right.

Miranda: There is onus on both sides – faculty member and chair. The question is whether the practices that are required are being used. If not, then this would need to be corrected. If there’s not a stipulated approach that can be enforced, then there’s still recourse if things are not done fairly—for instance, if only one item from the course survey is being used.

Hayne: If you have a faculty member that is not engaging in what is stipulated, what if the department chair only uses the student survey? What is actionable on the faculty side? Is that grievable?

Miranda: Faculty can make a case and it could be grievable.

Gallagher: What I have heard over the years, there are too many department chairs who just use the results of the student course survey and use no other sources, even if provided by the faculty member. It is easier to go to the website and weight that one question on the student course survey instead.

Lenk: It would be easy for faculty to list what was given to the department chair, but faculty cannot prove that the things they turned in were actually used in the evaluation by the department chair.

Hayne: I am not trying to send this proposal back. I am just wondering what the grievances look like that stem from this.
Hickey: We are working with Dan Bush to get this in front of department heads earlier than later, that this proposal is coming through. I do want to bring your attention back to E.12.1. Some of this language occurred in 2013; bottom of page 1 and 2 should now say, “will” and now say, “shall” instead of must. We are raising the bar to take the teaching domain more seriously. I think, like all changes, and as we begin to administer, there may be some bumpy roads. But if we can get ahead of the curve and let department heads know, it may help.

Barisas: How does it make clear how they are to be used?

Hickey: The course surveys provide the student voice and provide qualitative feedback that they can reflect on. This is not the same as comparing one faculty member to another in terms of effectiveness as a claim of the course survey.

Barisas: As I remember, the faculty and staff manual said the student course survey should not be used.

Avery: Could course surveys be prohibited as a mechanism for evaluation?

Hickey: There is concern about banning it completely. If I have 100 students over the course of 5 years that are saying the same thing, then CoTL does not want to go so far as to say that there’s no validity here and there is something going on that hasn’t been attended to. Feedback is from student to faculty member, changing the tenor of the conversation. A third party can look into the information.

Gallagher: There will be some energetic discussion at FC next week, and that is fine. What we need to address as EC is whether this proposal from CoTL is sufficiently far along to sustain debate on the floor of FC.

Lenk: Transfer knowledge across contexts. Might this trip people up?

Hickey: This is current language in the scholarship of learning.
Gallagher: The question is one of stuff that might prevent the proposal from going through.

Hickey: Sequence--the order of the proposals. Which one should go first?

Barisas: Broad brushstrokes is easier to have its day and would generate less enthusiastic discussion.

Hunter: In answer to Matt’s question of whether the survey should come first, establish the principles first and then address the specifics of the survey.

Hayne: If the question were also which order, Stephen thinks that I.8 might be easier to process than E.12.1

Hickey: I am inclined to agree but CoTL spent more time on I.8 than on E.12.1

Tim: E.12.1 should probably be done first, then I.8

Hickey: Deny the sole voice. There can’t be just course surveys.

Lenk: Grievances are about course survey use alone.

Hickey: That won’t be allowable any more. Period.

Gallagher: Another path is that Dan Bush has a conversation that reveals a department is using course surveys alone and he then says, “Knock it off” so when we mandate something, we hold people to it and have multiple ways of doing this.

Miranda: You may use this as well. This is not a huge departure. It’s basically the same expectations. “You have to use something else” and now it’s “You may use this in addition to something else.” The policy is a little bit more permissive than it was before.

Hayne moved (Sanford 2nd) to place the proposed revisions to the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Section I.8 Student Course Survey on the October 3, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.
Hayne’s motion was unanimously approved.

C. Reports

1. Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported the following:

Last week Miranda attended the Semester at Sea board meeting. Lynn Johnson and Miranda are nonvoting members. Bob Kling has succeeded Alicia Cook, overseeing academic matters, along with Scott Marshall, the Associate Dean of College of Business at Portland State. Scott will be a good partner for Bob.

Council of Deans: New effort reporting system on funded research. If you get a grant, you have to put percent effort into grant.

Launching search for a new executive director for The Reinvention Collaborative. Associate Provost-type of position. Alan Lamborn is going to retire at the end of the year so this search is getting started.

Provost’s Council for Engagement. Had first meeting last Friday. Trying to move from talking about engagement to doing some things this year.

Miranda’s report was received.

2. Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported the following:

Looking for someone to go to China. Margarita Lenk has agreed to represent us…still not sure yet per Margarita. Miranda told Lenk to inform Jim Cooney.

Gallagher contacted Susan James re: sexual assault and victims’ leave. She will answer all questions as soon as possible.

Met with leadership of Admin Pro and State Classified Personnel Council about the bullying policy. Bullying policy has to be approved by APs first. Shannon as head of
APC thought that these things could consider proposals in parallel but the Manual clearly says otherwise. APC’s meeting is in mid-October and so will appear on the Faculty Council meeting in November. Subcommittee meeting of APs and the APC leadership have given pretty clear indications that they support the new bullying policy and will likely support it. Gallagher expects a favorable recommendation after their October meeting.

Hunter; Does APC have the equivalent with CoRSAF, so they can propose changes to the Manual?

Gallagher: No--they have a subcommittee called the Policies and Procedures Committee. They had been charged with discussing the bullying policy and to make a recommendation back to the full AP Council. I wanted to make my case to them. Robert Schur was there as well and was very supportive.

Gallagher’s report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Nothing to report as BOG has not met. Next meeting is October 5-6, 2017.

**D. Discussion Items**

1. None.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:19 p.m.

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