MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, February 23, 2016
3:00 p.m. – Room 106 – Administration

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

Absent: Jose Chavez, Engineering (excused); George Barisas, Natural Sciences (excused)

Guests: Carole Makela, University Curriculum Committee

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

MARCH 1, 2016 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – March 1, 2016 – A202 Clark Building – 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – April 5, 2016 – A202 Clark Building – 4 p.m.

2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website – November 10 and 17, 2015; December 8 and 15, 2015; January 19, 2016 (http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)


4. Adoption of the Hospital Provider Fee Letter – Acting for Faculty Council – Adopted by Executive Committee - February 9, 2016

5. Location of issues – Tracking list

6. Monday, March 21, 12:00 – 1:00 p.m. Meena Balgopal, CSU Biology, Erica Suchman, CSU MIP: “Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness”
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. President – Tony Frank
2. Provost/Executive Vice President– Rick Miranda
3. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger
4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Paul Doherty, Jr.
5. UGO Annual Report

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – November 6, 13, and 20, 2015; December 4 (revised January 15, 2016); December 11, 2015; January 15 and 29, 2016
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
2. Biennial Reviews of CIOSUs – CUP
3. Elections for Faculty Council Chair, Vice Chair, and Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Committee on Faculty Governance

G. DISCUSSION

1.
February 23, 2016 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

II. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

1. February 9, 2016

By unanimous consent, Executive Committee approved the February 9, 2016 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: March 8, 2016 – 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 Administration

Stromberger announced the next Executive Committee meeting on March 8, 2016.

There will be one major action item so far: Liba Goldstein, Committee on Scholastic Standards, will be bringing forth a Freshman Fresh Start proposal. This is a new policy that will provide first-year students a chance to drop out of CSU if they do poorly the first semester. Students can be re-admitted within one to a few semesters and start over with a clean GPA. This is a “time out” for one to two years.

B. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – January 22, 2016 and February 5, 2016

Doherty moved, (Lenk 2\textsuperscript{nd}) to place the January 22, 2016 and February 5, 2016 UCC meeting minutes on the consent agenda for the March 1, 2016 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Doherty’s motion was adopted.

C. Reports

1. Rick Miranda – Provost/Executive Vice President

Miranda reported the following:
i. Met with CSU Events folks to discuss commencement exercises. This spring we are trying a Sunday morning commencement for Warner College of Natural Resources. All other colleges will be put into other available slots. We can foresee colleges growing to the point where commencements—even those in Moby—will not fit there eventually. Colleges will need to make some changes, such as limiting the number of guests or dividing commencements by departments. Questions arose whether we should have an all university commencement; not very attractive to anyone at CSU.

ii. Council of Deans met last week. They reviewed 4 P & T cases. Miranda will be making recommendations to the President in the next week.

Hunter: You mentioned the P&T cases discussed might not all be split decision cases. Can you give an example of one?

Miranda: We look at early promotion cases, split recommendations, and the third category are cases that illustrate an interesting feature (e.g. robust interdisciplinary connections outside college).

iii. Launched our Ethics Colloquium last week. There was another one in the series this week on Learning Analytics. It was a very interesting hour.

iv. First dean candidate for CLA is in town. Three more will be interviewed before spring break.

v. Alan Rudolph commissioned a safety assessment of certain research laboratories on campus. An outside company performed the assessment. The results indicate there are areas for improvement—specifically related to safety issues and protocols.

Miller: Do we have a limit of enrollment at CSU? Are we still shooting for 35,000?

Miranda: The 20/20 exercise conducted a few years ago was instituted at a time when CSU had been cut from $130 million to $85 million (loss of 1/3 state funding). So the question is: How do we navigate this type of loss in the future? How do we grow our resident student numbers? And how to grow our non-residents even faster? We started modeling to have about 8,000 (3,000 residents; 5,000 non-residents) new students by 2020 (actually the freshman class of 2020 would be large enough so that four years later we’d have 8,000 more students). What actually happened is that the recession ended; the state started reinvesting in education again. We are now over $105 million now. We know it might go down a little next year, but the state is not looking for a big
recession in the next couple years. So, CSU took their foot off the pedal in accelerating growth. However, it is better for CSU’s health to have more students, and a slightly different resident/non-resident mix. We want to develop a cushion against the state appropriations being reduced. We have recruiters in Illinois and California to target out-of-state students. It is starting to pay off. Those in California had quite a bit of success last year. We will add recruiters in Texas soon. Are we going to 35,000 in 10 years? Probably not. But we had 500 more students last year and this next year looks very promising. Lynn Johnson and I talk about accommodations for students. We can’t add on 10% more per building; so how do we accommodate incremental needs across all of campus? We are used to the model of “building a new building.” It is a tough problem.

Miranda’s report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Mary Stromberger

Stromberger reported the following:

i. In the Source, there is an article about a proposed plan for game day parking and transportation. The article includes a link to the Stadium website, where faculty (and anyone) can upload their feedback on the parking and transportation plan. Mary will announce this at the March 1 Faculty Council meeting as well. Also, the Stadium Advisory Committee will be accepting public comments. There will also be a faculty/staff forum sometime the last week of March were feedback can be gathered.

ii. Update on CORA Bill. Tomorrow afternoon, February 24, 2016 at 1:30 p.m., is the Senate committee’s hearing on Senator Kefalas’ bill.

iii. Stromberger reported to EC that she received an email from the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, informing her and Mary Meyer that Meyer’s proposal to terminate the football program was rejected. CoIA will not forward a recommendation to Faculty Council.

iv. Last Thursday, Stromberger met with the leadership from APC and CPC. The Councils are working on a website that will be a “landing page” that discusses shared governance. This landing page would be for all three organizations with links to each organization. Also, as the number of university committees increase, we need to develop a one-stop-shopping for a list of these committees. Lenk suggested that the website should contain a tracking list for each committee, so that visitors to the website could read what the committees are working on.
Stromberger said she would forward suggestions. The Councils also discussed the bullying policy. Concerns have been heard, including concerns that the bullying policy does not have a lot of teeth. There needs to be educational training (what is bullying, with examples), as well as training on how the policy is enforced. Another concern is that the policy does not include an advocacy process. People who are being bullied might be afraid to file a complaint against their bully and would rather have an advocate take charge. Bob Schur has been approached for further discussion.

Lenk – bullying policy. If we are to move toward clarifications of the bullying policy, there needs to be a discussion related to intention vs. impact. How many incidences would there have to be for one individual before impact is felt?

Stromberger’s report was received.

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

No report given.

D. Discussion Items

1. Walk-in brought by Carole Makela, Chair, UCC

Makela explained that the February 19 UCC meeting minutes contain a major change to Chem 111, which is the addition of a prerequisite that students get an appropriate grade in ALEKS or in CHEM 105. This prerequisite aims to reduce the number of D’s, F’s, and W’s in Chem 111. The Chemistry Department wants this prerequisite to be implemented in Fall 2016. Because registration period begins soon, this should be included in the consent agenda for the March 1 Faculty Council meeting. The minutes from February 12 and February 19 contain other time-sensitive items, and UCC would like these minutes to be considered for the March 1 Faculty Council meeting.

EC discussed how to fast-track these minutes so that they could be included on the March 1 Faculty Council meeting consent agenda. UCC approved the minutes of February 12 on Friday, February 19. UCC will approve the February 19 minutes on Friday, February 26. Makela can send the minutes from both meetings to Rita Knoll once the meeting on the 26th is over, and then the EC can vote via email over the weekend to place the February 12 and 19 UCC minutes on the FC agenda. After EC approval, Stromberger will email the minutes to the FC list serve.
When the March 1 Faculty Council agenda is sent to the Faculty Council members tomorrow, Stromberger will note to the members that the February 12 and 19 minutes are forthcoming, and will be distributed over the weekend.

2. Motion to suspend the rules at the March 1 Faculty Council meeting.

Professor Shulman has written to Faculty Council with his plan to have a Faculty Council member make a motion to suspend the rules, so that his resolution can be discussed on the floor. Stromberger explained the parliamentary procedures for suspending the rules, which requires a motion and a second. The motion is not debatable, and it requires a 2/3 vote to approve. If the motion to suspend the rules is passed, then there will be a motion to approve the resolution. This is a regular motion that requires a second, and it can be discussed. Only a majority vote is needed for this motion to pass.

EC discussed when to place the motion to approve the resolution, should the motion to suspend the rules pass. Because of the snow day and cancellation of the February meeting the agenda is quite full. There is time to discuss Shulman’s resolution but we need to make sure that already-scheduled action items are addressed.

Stromberger and EC discussed the need for a long-term strategic plan for handling budget cuts over the next few years, given that TABOR is not being changed. What is the process of developing a strategy for how budget cuts are being made?

Miranda: In the past, he has made the budget decisions in consultation with the President and Lynn Johnson. What has been done in previous years re: budget cuts is to ask units to plan for several scenarios, such as a 2%, 3% and 4% budget cut. This provides some ability to decide which units will get cut more or less than others, based on the impacts of the different levels of cuts to each unit. Also, when budget cuts are being modeled, core curriculum needs are exempted from planned cuts, in order to protect the ability of the University to provide AUCC courses to students.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Mary Stromberger, Chair
Stephanie Clemons, Vice Chair
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant