MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, November 17, 2015
3:30 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration

Present: Stephanie Clemons, Vice Chair; Paul Doherty, Jr., BOG Faculty Representative; Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant; Bradley Goetz, Agricultural Sciences; Margarita Lenk, Business; Jose Chavez, Engineering; Scott Glick, Health and Human Sciences; Adrian Howkins, Liberal Arts; Nancy Hunter, Libraries; George Barisas, Natural Sciences; David Gilkey, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

Absent: Monique Rocca, Natural Resources (excused); Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President (excused); Mary Stromberger, Chair (excused)

Guests: Carole Makela, Chair, UCC

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Vice Chair, Stephanie Clemons.

December 1, 2015 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

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

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – February 2, 2016 – A202 Clark Building – 4 p.m. (Please note room change for spring semester)

2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the 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. Provost/Executive Vice President– Rick Miranda

2. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Paul Doherty, Jr.
E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – October 23, 2015

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. New CIOSU – Global Diversity Center, housed within the School of Global Environmental Sustainability – CUP

2. Proposed revision to Sections C.2.1.4 Electorate for Faculty Council and Election Procedures and C.2.4.2.1.m Department Codes of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – CoFG
   - Don Estep, Chair, CoFG
   - Jen Aberle, Chair, CoNTTF

G. DISCUSSION

1. FY17 budget
   - Rick Miranda
November 17, 2015 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

II. Minutes to be Approved

A. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

1. November 3, 2015

By unanimous consent, Executive Committee approved the November 3, 2015 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes.

The minutes will be placed on December 1, 2015 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

III. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: December 8, 2015 – 3:30 p.m. – Room 106 Administration

Clemons announced that the next Executive Committee meeting will be held on December 8, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in room 106 Administration as no meeting will be held on November 24, the week of Thanksgiving.

B. Reports

1. Rick Miranda – Provost/Executive Vice President

No report as Miranda was out of town.

2. Faculty Council Vice Chair – Stephanie Clemons

Clemons summarized a meeting regarding campus parking she attended on behalf of Stromberger last Friday. Dave Bradford facilitated the meeting. Faculty, State Classified, Admin Pros, ASCSU, Steve Hultin, Facilities, Pam Jackson, Public Relations, and Martine Carcasson, Director, Center for Public Deliberation from Lynn’s office were present.

Clemons points:

1. Discussions to disband the current parking committee because it is too large (~18 people). A smaller, but better representative committee may be formed.
2. Parking is no longer just one issue anymore; looking systemically at transportation and alternative transportation. There are many transportation committees (e.g., biking, alternative transportation, electric) and maybe these committees should be put together, or at least talking to each other;

3. Additional discussions concerning pricing for parking and whether everyone is paying their fair share. For example, parking at the foothills campus is free, but a bus and infrastructure is being invested for the foothills campus. How the stadium will contribute to paying for parking infrastructure and services is also an outstanding question.

Students (ASCSU) are considering a proposal to institute an Alternative Transportation Advisory Board (ATAB). The board would initiate a fee as well. This idea is percolating for now. Students are paying about $800k for Transfort services. CSU pays an additional ~$550k for Transfort buses on campus. With this advisory board, the students would negotiate with Transfort.

Gilkey noted that students have approached him about unaffordable parking and difficulties finding parking spots. Some students are parking at Moby and walking to the CVMBS. Gilkey wanted to know if anyone else had heard similar comments.

Barisas shared a concern that, with a large transportation committee, parking would end up low on a priority list because of a political process having many, sometimes unrelated, groups involved. Maybe administration should be in charge of balancing needs from different committees?

Lenk added that different areas of campus have different parking needs, and people from the different areas may not understand each other’s needs – and maybe this is why the current committee is so large.

Hunter thought a central coordinating committee, with the different chairs of the different committees (e.g., biking, parking) might be a useful idea to pursue.

Howkins noted that he had a visiting lecturer that was late to class because he could not find parking; parking is a current problem. Keep committees separate as they have to work at separate time tables.

Barisas thought a smaller coordinating committee would be more effective than a larger committee.
Hunter thought that making sure everyone knows the constraints (e.g., enterprise status) of transportation on campus could make a committee more likely to find workable solutions.

Clemons added that someone in the parking committee mentioned that the buses have an effect of breaking down streets, resulting in more frequent road repair costs. Glick didn’t think that buses are heavy enough to ruin roads, heavy construction and trash trucks are more likely to be a problem.

Gilkey wanted to know how representatives would be chosen for a smaller committee.

Glick asked how many interest groups have an issue with parking? And how would all of these groups be represented with a smaller representative group? Clemons agreed with Lenk’s suggestion that different areas of the campus would need representation. Barisas thought groups from the foothills campus need to be represented.

Lenk noted that the student cost (~$4/month/student) for Transfort does not cover all the costs. Any kind of city bus will probably cost more than $4/month for students.

Hunter noted that students are subsidizing Transfort, but Transfort and MAX don’t run on Sundays. Hunter and Lenk thought timing of buses and use patterns is a challenging research topic.

Gilkey suggested that transportation problems impact productivity and this impact has not been considered. Barisas added that faculty he is familiar with make multiple trips to/from campus each day, and whether mass transport is cost effective or not is still a question to be answered.

Chavez asked if the topic will be coming to Faculty Council as a discussion topic. Clemons answered there is not a parking proposal to bring to Faculty Council yet.

Makela explained the current parking committee membership.

Clemons’ report was received.

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

No report was given as BOG has not met since last report.

C. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – October 30, 2015
Makela noted a number courses from SPCM because they will be proposing a new PhD program soon.

Lenk moved, (Goetz 2nd) to place the October 30, 2015 UCC meeting minutes on the consent agenda for the December 1, 2015 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Lenk’s motion was adopted.

2. Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin – SCHOLASTIC STANDARDS - CoSRGE*

Lenk moved (Hunter 2nd) to place the Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin – SCHOLASTIC STANDARDS* on the December 1, 2015 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Hunter asked if the sentence before the deleted course numbers could be struck as well. Makela agreed.

Lenk (Goetz 2nd) moved to accept the motion, but with striking the sentence and having Stromberger check with CoSRGE to make sure they are ok with that edit.

The motion passed unanimously.

**D. Discussion Items**

1. Principles of Community Statement.

Clemons introduced the topic of how Faculty Council should handle the Principles of Community statement being developed by Mary Ontiveros. Does it belong in the Catalog and does Faculty Council need to vote on it?

Gilkey asked if a final draft was essentially completed. Doherty replied that he thought input/presentation was still ongoing and we do not have a final draft.

Hunter asked if all the current values section of the Catalog would all be replaced (e.g., support excellence in teaching and research). Hunter thought an additional section “Principles of Community statement” might be better than replacing all the current Values.

Lenk thought a substitution for the “Guiding Principles” section might be appropriate.
Doherty noted the parts of the Catalog are approved by Faculty Council, but the preamble apparently has not been approved.

Barisas thought the topic could take up Faculty Council time and whether that was needed or not is questionable.

Lenk thought some of the current values needed review. Lenk added that a clear proposal explaining the substitution of Guiding Principles (or parts thereof) with the Principles of Community is needed. Such a proposal could come to Faculty Council.

Howkins thought a clear substitution proposal needs to go to Faculty Council and some wordsmithing should be expected. Ontiveros should be present to answer questions.

Barisas questioned whether Faculty Council really needs to approve the changes to this part of the catalog. Makela spoke to the parts of the catalog that Faculty Council does approve. Barisas suggested that Faculty Council discuss the topic, but not vote on it. Hunter and Lenk thought a vote on endorsing the change, rather than voting on the explicit language might be appropriate. Clemons added that we need to know who approves changes to the front matter of the Catalog.

Gilkey thought the “Commitment to Diversity” might be the appropriate place for a substitution.

Clemons suggested that we first figure out who approves which sections of the Catalog, that the entire front matter needs some attention/re-writing. Such changes could then come to Faculty Council for a vote or approval.

Chavez shared a concern that the group making the new principles may not be open to further changes. Clemons thought the group is currently gathering further input. Chavez thought a February discussion topic would be appropriate to gather input from Faculty Council.

Goetz thought a February timeline is fine, but asked if the original goal of making the statement/changes will be truly achieved. Will people’s practices/behavior actually change?

Chavez asked if the Principles of Community statement was ready to be shared with department colleagues. Doherty replied that an electronic copy of the Principles has not been supplied and the group developing the Principles is probably not ready for broad sharing yet.
Hunter moved (Chavez 2nd) to have a discussion topic at the February Faculty Council meeting concerning the Principles of Community statement. The motion passed. (6-0-2).

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

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