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MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, May 12, 2015
3:00 p.m. – Room 322 – Lory Student Center

Present: Mary Stromberger, Chair; Paul Doherty, Jr., Vice Chair; Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant; Bradley Goetz, Agricultural Sciences; Stephen Hayne, substituting for Margarita Lenk, College of Business; Russ Schumacher, Engineering; Scott Glick, Health and Human Sciences; Eric Aoki, Liberal Arts; Stu Cottrell, College of Natural Resources; George Barisas, Natural Sciences; Nancy Hunter, University Libraries; C.W. Miller, substituting for David Gilkey, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences; Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President; Dan Bush, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

Guests: Carole Makela, Chair, University Curriculum Committee; Jerry Magloughlin, Chair, Committee on Libraries; Jennifer Bissell, Co-Chair, University Benefits Committee; Mike Palmquist, Associate Provost for Instructional Innovation; Tony Frank, President.

Excused Absences: David Gilkey, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, Margarita Lenk, College of Business

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Mary Stromberger.

September 1, 2015 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – September 1, 2015 – A201 Clark Building – 4:00 p.m.

   A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

      1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – October 6, 2015 – A201 Clark Building – 4 p.m.

      2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – (http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/files/ecminutes)

   B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

      1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

   C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

      1. Elections – Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance

   D. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED
E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC

F. ACTION ITEMS

1.

G. DISCUSSION
May 12, 2015 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

II. Minutes to be Approved

1. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes – April 28, 2015

Hunter noted a typographical error on the bottom of page 5 (should be 187 of 204).

Aoki clarified one sentence.

By unanimous consent, Executive Committee approved the amended April 28, 2015 Executive Committee Meeting minutes. The minutes will be placed on the Faculty Council website: (http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/files/ecminutes)

III. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: August 18, 2015 – 3:00 p.m.
   – Room 106 Administration

Stromberger announced that the next Executive Committee meeting will be held on August 18, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 Administration

Stromberger explained that Rita Knoll will be transitioning from ½ time to ¾ time next year.

B. Reports

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Dan Bush for Rick Miranda

Bush explained the recent salary exercise. Historically a simple regression was relied upon to identify salary inequities. Separately, last year a more sophisticated statistical model was developed for a salary inequity by gender study. Unfortunately, for the salary exercise this year, a model with gender included in the calculation was used and it shouldn’t have been. This lead to erroneous target salaries being generated by department heads. To help address the general issue of salary inequity, especially with respect to gender, a committee will be formed to address how the question/analysis/process should go forward.

Barisas thought the analysis by Mary Meyer was good and he agrees that there is a pattern of gender inequity and asked what would be done to
correct the pattern. Bush replied that especially for senior women, the equity issues need attention and a process to get the issue right is underway. Barisas further noted that some faculty in his department worry that some cherry picking would occur (i.e., only a few senior people would receive salary increases), but the overall problem would still exist. Bush did not think this will be the case. Bush said the inequity issue is not just a function of e.g., time at CSU, time since terminal degree. Much thought and review will need to be done to address the issue appropriately and we are at the early stages. A large group of people will be involved in the review committee to identify important factors. Barisas thinks the problem is an institutional problem, but is mostly a problem at the department level.

Hunter asked if the problem would generally be addressed in the annual salary exercise. Bush explained that the salary exercise is done for this year. A review will be occurring and be ongoing.

Miller asked if out-of-cycle raises had occurred. Bush replied affirmatively. Bush explained that the original focus on the issue was partially driven by the Presidential Commission on Woman and Gender Equity about a year ago. In initial analyses, some problems were identified and fixed.

Bush noted that one particular model should not have been used for the salary exercise and, when this was realized, Bush retracted the results and sent out the historic data/methods. 22 salary changes have resulted. Bush said that the administration is trying to do the right thing, but more eyes are needed to avoid mistakes in the future. The current thought is that the gender inequity is greatest at full professor rank and all of those people will be reviewed for problems.

Miller and Stromberger noted that there is confusion about whether salary inequity exists at the Assistant and Associate levels as well, or if it only is significant at the Full professor level. Stromberger has been in meetings with senior woman and administrators about the issue. Stromberger explained that time-to-promotion (and not salary) may be different at lower ranks. Bush said all of these variables need to be examined and will be the focus of a committee in the coming months.

Bush’s report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger

Stromberger recently sent out a spreadsheet to the deans with the names of people serving on Faculty Council and university committees and asked that a thank you note go out to those people.
Stromberger met with the BOG and Non-Tenure Track Faculty for breakfast on May 8 to explain the role of NTTF to the BOG.

Stromberger met with President Frank and representative senior women on May 11 to talk about the salary inequity issue. The women present at the meeting urged urgent action. All 109 senior women will be reviewed for salary inequities. In addition, internal and external people will be used to review the broader process. Bush added that the issue is complex and an internal group of stakeholders will be needed to come to agreement on the process and important metrics. Miller asked where the money will be coming from. Bush thought the problem would be taken care of with central administration budgets, but that some consultation would also occur with units.

Stromberger’s report was received.

3. Library and Unizin updates
   - Jerry Magloughlin, Chair, Committee on Libraries

Magloughlin presented a PowerPoint presentation that will be posted on the Faculty Council website. He described the current activities of CoL and thought the relationship between his committee and the Dean of Libraries was excellent.

Magloughlin explained that Unizin and faculty sub-committee (members from COL and CoTL, and Gwen Gorzelsky from TILT) has been formed to work on Unizin issues, including learning analytics and data repository aspects.

Magloughlin also explained the serials (i.e., cost of journals) crisis. CSU’s library budget is not increasing enough to deal with journal inflation rates of 4-7% per year. If trends are projected out to Fiscal Year ’24, we will need to spend an additional $7.9 million on serials, just to cover inflation. To address the problem, restructuring journal purchases to minimize overlap in bundling is being considered. The total collections annual budget is $7.4 million (> $5 million for journals). Next year a base funding increase of $335k is the minimum needed (and some ground is lost). Soon, some journals or packages may need to be cut. An experiment to cancel a bundle and only purchase highly used journals is underway. However, the actual savings are not great because interlibrary loans also cost money for articles that are requested.

An additional solution is to push open access publishing.
The Association of Research Libraries (ARL), of which CSU is a member, recently joined a Hague declaration calling for changes to intellectual property law and possibly changes will be coming.

Magloughlin also explained a trend towards open access textbooks. Savings for students can be large if open access textbooks are utilized. Hunter added that Stromberger, Miranda, and Frank recently met with the Libraries Faculty Council representatives and these issues were discussed.

Stromberger asked if The Netherlands got rid of Elsevier as a bundle. Apparently that was the case.

Barisas asked if the bundle packages were publisher specific. Hunter, Bush, and Magloughlin replied affirmatively.

Bush and Hunter further explained the implications of journal bundling. Cottrell commented that open access costs money and the open access option is often declined by authors.

Cottrell asked how open access textbooks could be written if there was no money incentive. Palmquist noted that faculty can receive royalties associated with publishing open access books.

Schumacher asked about the relative cost of hard copy books vs. electronic books. Magloughlin explained that most books were not checked out, but once an electronic book was “purchased” 4 times, the book was owned by the library. Barisas asked if printing a book on demand was a way to address the problem. Hunter noted that when books are purchased, they are purchased in perpetuity.

Hayne noted that many colleagues use google scholar-type search engines to find free copies and asked what the impact of dropping journals will be. Hayne noted that the push to open access publishing will not take in the Business College because promotion and tenure rely on publishing in traditional places. Magloughlin explained that a philosophical change will be needed by department heads and T+P committees. Hayne did not think this would happen easily. Magloughlin also noted that the impacts will likely vary across disciplines.

Magloughlin’s report was received.

C. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes (April 24, 2015; May 1, 2015)
Goetz moved (Glick 2nd) to approve the April 24, 2015 and May 1, 2015 UCC meeting minutes, on behalf of Faculty Council.

Makela explained a name change, various course, and program changes.

The motion was adopted.

2. Revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – D.2.1 – Benefits Committee – CoRSAF

Bissell, Co-Chair of the Benefits Committee, explained the structure of the Benefits Committee and how it worked. The committee wants to extend the term of members from 3 to 4 years because of the learning curve for new members. APC and FC ex-officio members are also requested to increase communication. A name change to the “University Benefits Committee” is requested because that is the way the committee is known around campus.

Hunter noted an additional name change to “University Benefits Committee” was needed in the documentation.

Cottrell asked if Bissell thought a 4-year term would create a problem in finding committee members. Bissell did not think so as most members would like to stay on for an additional year.

Schumacher noted one wording change was needed to refer to members.

Hunter moved (Barisas 2nd) that Executive Committee approve the proposed revisions to the *Manual*, Section D.2.1. Benefits Committee, on behalf of Faculty Council, pending final approval by the Board of Governors.

The motion was approved.

**D. Discussion Items**

1. OnLine Plus name change
   - Mike Palmquist, Associate Provost for Instructional Innovation

   Palmquist explained the current structure of Online Plus. Officially, the name is Division of Continuing Education (DCE) and that would not change. The suggested name change would only change from OnLine Plus to CSU Online and is for branding purposes.
Doherty asked why not change from DCE to CSU Online? Palmquist explained that DCE does more than just online courses and that would not change.

Cottrell thought the change would be good.

Makela noted confusion when RI students take online courses and if the only way to take online courses is through Online Plus (which is not the case).

Stromberger asked if there was any concern about changing the brand name. Glick asked if there was much of a cost. Palmquist said stationery would change as it is used up. A sign would need to be changed. It would be a soft rollout. Maybe a $20-30k total cost.

Cottrell moved (Miller 2nd) to endorse the brand name change from Online Plus to CSU Online.

Stromberger asked where DCE would be seen in titles. Palmquist noted that DCE would still be a line item on reports.

2. Academic space build-out in the on-campus stadium
   -President Frank

Stromberger welcomed additional guests to Executive Committee and explained this was a closed meeting and was not open to non-invitees. Members from the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning, Administrative Professional Council officers, Classified Personnel Council officers, ASCSU officers, the faculty representative to the Board of Governors, and Vice President Amy Parsons were among the guests.

Frank explained a recent memo to the Board of Governors about adding academic space to the stadium and the history of considering academic space in the stadium. Pricing and costs for the stadium has recently solidified. About 85,000 square feet are available to be finished for academic space. 18,000 sq ft of that space will be used by the alumni association. Developing the remaining 68,000 sq ft can be done more cheaply than building a similar stand-alone building. If we build it out while the stadium is being constructed, the cost would roughly be 52 cents on the dollar (i.e., building a separate building) vs. 75 cents on the dollar if developing the space later. We will need academic space in the future. CSU has plenty of bond space available. This bond increase is not connected to the stadium funding. We would be committing to $850,000 per year for 30 years for the academic space from the general fund. The general fund has usually not been used to back building bonds and this would be different. We do not have revenue funds, donor bonds, or
student fees to back these bonds and this would be a mandatory cost and debt service on our annual budget for the next 30 years (a long-term fixed cost). Alternatively, this $850,000 could be used for anything in the budget (e.g., NTTF salaries, lower tuition, faculty raises). However, this $850,000 is the most cost effective way to add academic space.

Frank explained that maybe the decision is a question of prioritization – what would go into this academic space. In rough terms, some space in CLA is needed, but more consideration will be needed. This space would also be very visible and maybe something that we want to be visible (e.g., SOGES, GDPE) should go there. Maybe potential donor dollars could be combined to help empty Aylesworth Hall and move the Department of Design and Merchandising into the new space.

Frank also explained that LEED certification is a goal of the stadium project. If the academic part of the stadium is built out, this certification could be obtained. Without having the space in use year round, we cannot get LEED certification and would need to obtain (and have obtained) a waiver from the state architect. We would have a Green Globe certification instead, until we build out the academic space.

Frank noted that part of the reason for this meeting is to address the criticism that more consultation and overall shared governance is needed. How does shared governance work when quick decisions need to be made? We are in an imperfect situation, and one that is not desirable. We need to make this decision quickly and have little time to discuss/consult. Do we have enough of an academic need to push forward with this initiative, or should we say the timing is just not right and wait?

Barisas asked what are the space needs. Miranda explained that regular faculty has offices, but not all NTTF do, so office space is needed. Miranda noted that enrollment is growing, and we will need new classrooms too. Bush explained that Aylesworth’s original design was as a dormitory, not as office or classroom space. Frank added that he will not force anyone into this space that does not need, or want, it.

Katherine Leigh asked what the equivalencies would be in terms of faculty salaries. A 1% raise for faculty is about $3 million. The cost for a new faculty member is about $125k (so about equal to 6 faculty for the $850k).

Laffey asked how much of the general fund is encumbered. A rough consensus was that about 1/3rd of the general fund is encumbered with mandatory expenses (e.g., utility bills).
Hunter calculated that the cost for the academic space would be ~$13 million if we build it now and ~ $20 million if we do it later. Hunter asked where the $20 million would come from if we built later. Frank answered it would from the general fund, students fees, or a donor.

Hayne explained that the $850,000 could be invested for about 5.5 years to offset the difference.

Glick noted increased costs due to the rising costs of construction in northern Colorado also have to be considered, and that the future price would likely be more than $20 million.

Barisas asked about the future of bond prices. Frank answered that bonds are at a near historic bottom and that is why construction has been pushed aggressively in the past few years.

Stromberger asked how much of the 65,000 sq ft would be useable. Leigh thought maybe 35,000-40,000 square feet would be usable due to ramps and structure of the stadium. Leigh added that she thought the space should be built out for her home department because of a potential donor that could contribute funds to the build out, and that completing the stadium would be aesthetically pleasing (rather than leaving one side unfinished), and that this would be cost effective.

Stromberger noted the possible political damage of using general fund dollars for academic space in the stadium. Frank realizes that people opposed to the stadium will have that criticism. Frank asked if it was reasonable that people willing to listen would understand that the athletic portion of the building was built as planned, without general fund dollars, and that the academic portion of the building was built according to a different funding plan.

Jen Aberle noted that the Campus Leadership Committee, during its review of the four stadium options last fall, strongly recommended that the academic space be built out as soon as possible, so that the on-campus stadium would be multi-functional.

Jason Sydoriak asked if the donor space would still go forward for the Department of Design and Merchandising, if the stadium academic space was used for something else. Leigh answered affirmatively. Sydoriak asked about balancing curb appeal vs. functional academic space. Frank thought this was a false dichotomy because the space would be functional and look good no matter what. Parsons thought it might look similar to the Computer Science building. Parsons noted that the original academic space designs were preliminary, and the planning people are working on designing the alumni space now. Sydoriak asked if there was a way to
assess the impact of construction on students. Frank noted that this decision would be made quick enough that we do not have time for such a survey. Sydoriak noted that the impact of construction on students can be negative. Frank explained the history of pulsed construction and growth at CSU. In 2004, CSU had not built much in a couple of decades, our facilities were old, and the state was not building buildings. Frank has been pushing construction to get CSU back on the construction cycle and because the financing environment has been beneficial. Frank believes the pace of aggressive growth/construction will be slowing in coming years. Frank agreed that the construction has affected many people’s experience on campus.

Hayne asked if there would be another opportunity to get a good financing deal. Frank did not see anything on the horizon. Hayne asked if there was a risk of cost escalation if we go forward with the project. Frank and Parsons said the price would be locked in, like the stadium. Hayne asked what the risk of departments being affected by events at the stadium would be. Frank did not know how to quantify the risk; Leigh thought it would be low.

Cottrell thought the decision was a catch 22 and wished that all of Faculty Council could be involved. Cottrell agreed with Aberle about having more academic opportunities and agreed with Hayne that the cost is likely to go up.

Jeff Sturgeon asked if there was donor interest in contributing to the academic piece of the stadium. Frank does not think there will be much donor support because early conversations with donors did not produce much interest. Maybe with more solid plans in place, there may be more opportunity, but we cannot overplay that possibility. Sturgeon asked if the alumni association would go forward no matter what. Frank replied yes, the alumni association has their funding in place and ready to go.

Bernasek noted that the Board of Governors understood the need for space, the short time frame for the decision, but did not want to back Frank into a corner about the decision. Bernasek thought getting a group together for a robust participatory process would be a good thing. Frank noted that he knows that one criticism of his administration is being participatory, but realistically a plan needs to be completed by June 17 and he does not want to mislead people about the ability to have broad participation and discussion in such a short time window.

Doherty asked about the use of the general fund. Frank said we have kept the use of general funds for building to a minimum. This project would be about $850,000 of $25 million discretionary spending in the general fund.
Toni-Lee Viney thought it makes sense to move forward. Viney expressed concern about which budget dials will be turned down to make this work (e.g., parking, salary increases).

Sam Laffey has mixed feelings, but is impressed with the large cost savings and is hesitantly supportive.

Sturgeon asked how the different councils could be involved. Frank explained that he would like to say that we decided as a group and a straw poll or vote might be useful.

Miller said he is not sure what he is voting for (more academic space, or just space for one department).

Barisas asked if a straw poll would be useful. Frank said he intends to be influenced by what we decide here.

Stromberger thought a formal vote would not be because the group is larger than Executive Committee. Stromberger thought giving feedback on the plan from Parsons would be good.

Frank suggested that a statement and straw vote about being comfortable with using general funds to build out academic space would be useful.

Leigh reiterated that the Campus Leadership Committee examined documents and wanted academic space and referred everyone back to that report. Leigh thought the time frame is too short for much other involvement.

Glick added that he sees two questions 1) should we build academic space affordably, and 2) what will the space be used for? Glick thought some committees have put a lot of thought into the decisions and we should depend on them with this short time frame.

We all agree that transparency, inclusiveness and dialog is desired, but in two weeks, and at the end of the semester, we cannot expect much and Frank does not want a bait-n-switch interpretation of this meeting and what might occur.

Frank explained that there are many options for the academic space (including classroom space) and there aren’t only 2 or 3 options being considered.

Glick explained that flex-space and modularization is common in the building enterprises and such flex space might be a useful way forward.
Stromberger asked the group if they supported a straw vote. Aberle asked if a second vote could be had on a department vs. general space.

In an informal, straw vote the group voted 23-0-1 (yes-no-abstain) to support the funding of academic space. Later, one person changed their vote from a yes to abstain (22-0-2).

The group discussed whether the space should focus on flexible classroom space or a single department/office space was desired.

Glick asked if a tenant would be needed. Frank did not think so.

Laffey asked about size of classrooms. Parsons explained this space was probably not conducive to large lecture hall space. Leigh noted that the space is oddly shaped.

An informal straw vote suggested that 13 people supported general classroom space that a large number of people could use, 0 people supported a focus on a single department or office space, and 8 people thought the space should be utilized in the best way possible.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Mary Stromberger, Chair
Paul Doherty, Vice Chair
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant