Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
January 26, 2016

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, January 26, 2016
3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration

Present: Mary Stromberger, Chair; Stephanie Clemons, Vice Chair; Paul Doherty, Jr., BOG Faculty Representative; Bradley Goetz, Agricultural Sciences; Margarita Lenk, Business; Jose Chavez, Engineering; Scott Glick, Health and Human Sciences; Adrian Howkins, Liberal Arts; Nancy Hunter, Libraries; Monique Rocca, Natural Resources; George Barisas, Natural Sciences; C.W. Miller, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences; Rick Miranda, Provost/Executive Vice President

Absent: Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant (excused); Carole Makela, Chair, UCC (excused)

Guests: Eric Prince, Chair, CUP; Mike Rush, University Architect and Lindsay Brown, Facilities Management; James Folkestad, School of Education

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Mary Stromberger.

February 2, 2016 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – February 2, 2016 – A202 Clark Building – 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – March 1, 2016 – A202 Clark Building – 4 p.m.

2. Elections for Faculty Council Chair, Vice Chair, and Board of Governors Faculty Representative – March 1, 2016 – Committee on Faculty Governance. Nominations close February 15, 2016.

3. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website – November 10 and 17, 2015; December 8, 2015 (http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

4. Revision to the 2014-2016 Academic Calendar – Acting for Faculty Council – Adopted by Executive Committee December 15, 2015

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – December 1, 2015
C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Faculty Council Standing Committee Graduate Student Election

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.
4. UGO Annual Report

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – November 6 and 13, 2015; December 4 and 11, 2015
2. Approval of Degree Candidates – Spring and Summer Semesters

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Proposed revisions to Section E.2.1.5 Temporary Appointments –
   *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual - CoNTTF*

G. DISCUSSION

1. Principles of Community statement
January 26, 2016 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

Introductions of Executive Committee members.

II. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

1. December 15, 2015

By unanimous consent, Executive Committee approved the December 15, 2015 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. The minutes will be posted on the FC web site.

III. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. Announcements

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: February 9, 2016 – 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 Administration

Stromberger announced the next Faculty Council meeting on February 2, 2016.

The next Executive Committee meeting with be February 9, 2016 at 3:00 p.m. in room 106 Administration. President Frank will attend.

Kim Kita will come to the February 16, 2016 EC meeting to report on Todos Santos.

2. Faculty Open Forum with President Frank: January 29, 2016 – 3:00-4:00 p.m. – Cherokee Park Ballroom, Lory Student Center.

Stromberger announced the Faculty Open Forum with President Frank on January 29, 2016.

B. Action Items

Goetz moved, (Glick 2nd) to place the revised December 4, 2015 and January 15, 2016 UCC meeting minutes on the consent agenda for the February 2, 2016 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Goetz’s motion was adopted.

2. Biennial Reviews for Discontinuance of Centers, Institutes and Other Special Units (CIOSUs) for the academic year 2015 (Reporting Period FY14 and FY15) – CUP

Eric Prince, Chair of CUP, presented the recommendations for renewal or discontinuation of CIOSU’s that were reviewed this year. The recommendations also included the approval of a new CIOSU, the Center for Analytics of Learning and Teaching (C-ALT). James Folkestad, School of Education, will be the director. Folkestad provided information on the new center.

Stromberger asked for additional detail on CIOSUs that were being discontinued. Prince explained that there was no discord. A couple of centers had memberships within a single department, and therefore did not meet the interdisciplinary criterion to be an official CIOSU. They are still “centers” but are not recognized as an official CIOSU on the Provost Office’s website.

Lenk asked how members were chosen for C-ALT. Folkestad answered that membership was voluntary and anyone interested in learning analytics is welcome. Lenk asked if there was a rotation plan for members? Folkestad stated that, thus far, all were welcome, but in the future the Center would have to think about that. The Center is focused on projects that would benefit the University, not just individuals.

Lenk asked who made up the steering committee for the new Center of Learning Analytics? Mike Palmquist, Alan Lamborn, Dave Johnson, and Gwen Gorzelsky are part of the Steering Committee. Lenk asked if the steering committee would have influence on which projects were pursued by the new Center? Folkestad answered affirmatively and explained an early project. For example, we are working with Math 150 self-regulated learning theory using analytics to understand this theory that would then be applied across disciplines. Lenk asked if CUP had membership in the new Center. Prince answered no and explained the relationship of CUP to CIOSUs

Lenk wanted to know where the faculty governance has oversight over the new center.
Stromberger explained that the steering committee is broader than Folkestad’s Center. Lenk noted that Learning Analytics is a huge area and thought the requested budget is relatively small and was wondering how decisions about allocating those dollars would be made.

Miranda noted that the Center is not a decision-making body, but focused on research. Miranda explained the different units, and people around campus that are involved in learning analytics in general. Folkestad added that the Chair of Faculty Council is on the steering committee as well.

Clemons asked if a general email invitation would go out to faculty about the Center? Folkestad thought that would be a good idea.

Glick moved (Barisas 2nd) to add the CUP report and motion for a new center to the Faculty Council agenda for next week. The motion passed.

2. Hospital Provider Fee Letter (carry-in)

Stromberger passed out a draft letter to support the Hospital Provider Fee that could be presented to Faculty Council for endorsement. Stromberger explained some feedback on wording. Barisas thought the letter was fine.

Glick asked if any background information would be included with the letter to Faculty Council so the members would have context.

Stromberger would include other such support letters from the Admin Pro Council and State Classified Council, and maybe a news article.

Glick noted a risk of some rider getting included in a final bill that then would be supported by Faculty Council.

Stromberger explained that the letter is focused on the fee, not a particular bill.

Howkins asked about a previous discussion about whether such a bill will be constitutional.

Miranda and Stromberger responded that different opinions have been stated by the State Attorney General and another lawyer. A final decision is needed.

Stromberger suggested including a clarification about our letter being conditional on the bill being constitutional.
Miranda suggested some wording, but didn’t think it was necessary.

On the second paragraph, Stromberger will add “…we must do everything possible” to “we must do everything within our constitutional scope to…”

Hunter moved (Miller 2nd) putting the motion on the faculty council agenda.

Hunter’s motion passed.

C. Reports

1. Rick Miranda – Provost/Executive Vice President

Miranda reported the following:

Promotion and Tenure review of 55 cases occurred. Miranda explained the process and how controversial or illustrative cases are identified and taken to the Council of Deans. Patterns of interest are also identified to be noted to the deans. Hunter asked for an example. Miranda explained that interdisciplinary work or technology transfer is valued by some colleges/faculty, but not others.

Miller asked if we would know the outcome about the 55 candidates. Miranda explained the process and that the candidates would be notified as soon as President Frank completes the review.

Miranda noted that budget hearings occur tomorrow. Miranda explained how the budget process changed this year and how budget area review committees would be presenting and not deans and VPs. This is a work in progress, and the process will be reviewed and modified to continually improve it.

Miranda noted that tracking of legislative matters is occurring and decisions about which bills to support or not support occur. Other higher education units (e.g., CU) also do similar things and communication occurs between CU, CSU and others.

Howkins asked about the probability of the cut to higher education and timeline for knowing.

Miranda said the cut is probably dependent on the hospital provider fee and knowledge about that could occur late in the budget process.
Miranda’s report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger

Stromberger reported the following:

Last Thursday, Stromberger met with the Housing Task Force, chaired by Cori Wong. The committee meets monthly. As the meeting, there was a discussion about different pieces of land that CSU owns around campus. The Committee is collecting possibilities; what large pieces of land are owned by CSU and might be used for development. Another group is coming up with a list of rental potentials to rent to CSU employees at a reduced rate. For example, the developer of “The Slab”, located at Prospect south of Lake Street, will be building an apartment building soon and is interested in a master lease with CSU. There was also discussed an “intranet” (similar to Craigs List) that would be specific to the CSU community; a way for employees to communicate with each other re: housing and other things employees want to advertise.

Hunter: Would new hires be left out?

Stromberger: Yes. Good point. We would have to develop a different resource for new employees if they can’t get on to the intranet site to look for housing before they move here.

Rocca asked if new hires get an ID quickly?

Lenk replied that ID acquisition could be variable.

Miller asked what the motivation for a realtor wanting to hire CSU employees at a lower rate?

Stromberger noted that CSU employees go through background checks and have a stable job and those are advantages to realtors.

Stromberger gave an update on the 6 recommendations about diversity from students. President Frank has submitted a reply to the recommendations. Two of those recommendations concerned faculty.

One recommendation was to increase the number of diverse faculty. In President Frank’s response, he explained to students that a group of faculty will study the issue and will develop recommendations. Dan Bush, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, is in charge of this effort.
Another recommendation was that all students should take 6 credits of diversity courses, specifically Introduction to Ethnic Studies and Introduction to Women’s Studies. President Frank’s response was that UCC will discuss the recommendation and will review the University curriculum for courses that focus on diversity. Makela explained that many diversity courses could be considered for AUCC category 3E.

Stromberger noted a recent Strategic and Financial Planning Committee meeting. The committee reviewed two proposals, each written by a faculty member. One proposal recommended the termination of the football program, on the basis that it is too dangerous and that CSU can’t afford it. CoSFP passed this proposal on to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics for review. The second proposal was to recommend that academic units be spared from the 2% reallocation exercise, and the $3.8 million budget cut be placed on the Athletic Department. CoSFP will continue discussion on the budget proposal. Stromberger noted that the proposals have been widely circulated among department heads. Lenk added that we should be aware if the proposals came forward from the floor. Stromberger explained that a stronger process was to involve our standing committees and that is what is happening now.

Stromberger’s report was received.

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

Doherty reported the following:

Doherty noted the upcoming BOG meeting February 4-5, 2016 and he will report on the agenda, which will be coming in the next couple of days, at the Faculty Council meeting. Doherty will also report on the last BOG meeting in December.

Doherty’s report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. Mike Rush, University Architect and Lindsay Brown, Facilities Management

Rush gave a presentation on a proposal to deconstruct the bridge connecting the Lory Student Center and the Engineering Building. Due to deterioration of the structure, the bridge needs to be repaired or taken down. Rush is visiting with a number of stakeholders to get feedback.
Lenk asked about a parking garage on the master plan for the Engineering parking lot. Rush noted what such a parking garage might look like and how it could connect to main level of campus.

Clemons asked why this repair/removal is being prioritized? Rush thinks this is an aesthetic/recruitment issue and there is some left over money from the LSC remodel and associated dollars. Rush would like to move on this project before the money is used up on other projects.

Rush explained problems with the bridge and associated roof. Rush is in favor of deconstruction and explained how the grading and drainage of the area would also be improved as part of the deconstruction project. A future parking garage could also more easily be connected to the plaza. Lenk noted concerns with traffic and aesthetics a walk-way connecting to a future parking garage.

Stromberger asked about costs. Rush said $400k for repair, $300k for deconstruction and revitalization of the area.

Doherty asked about the purpose of the covered area that is not the bridge.

Rush answered it was aesthetic at the time to show connection among buildings.

Barisas asked about what repairs would be needed. New glass would be needed at a minimum and probably an entire replacement/rebuild would be needed. The slope of the floor within the walkway would need to be addressed, as it is too steep and does not meet Federal ADA regulations.

Chavez (rep from Engineering) requested feedback from his college. He had two sets of comments, some who like the cover to transition between buildings and others who thought the structure had to go. Stromberger will email the Engineering dean to connect the dean with Lindsay, so that a meeting can be scheduled.

Glick noted that a bridge connecting his building (Guggenheim and Construction) was taken down and now no one knows there was bridge at one time.

Chavez asked about ice, snow, and wind effects, and also thought meeting with his college (Engineering) would be good.

Stromberger asked for a pdf copy of the presentation to pass along to interested people.
Stromberger asked for a pdf copy of the presentation to pass along to interested people.

Chavez asked if some sort of transparent canopy could be considered to provide cover, but also keep the view shed. Rush will look into this and draw up some schematics.

2. Annual Evaluation for Mary Stromberger, FC Chair

   Glick moved (Hunter 2nd) to go into Executive Session.

   Glick’s motion was adopted.

   Lenk moved (Goetz 2nd) to exit executive session.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Mary Stromberger, Chair
Stephanie Clemons, Vice Chair
Paul Doherty, BOG Faculty Representative