

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, August 22, 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**, Agricultural Sciences; **Stephen Hayne**, Business; **Russ Schumacher** substituting for Steve 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: **Steven Reising**, Engineering (excused)

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Tim Gallagher, Chair

September 5, 2017 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – September 5, 2017 – Clark A201–4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – October 3, 2017 – A201 Clark – 4:00 p.m.
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – August 25, 2017
(<http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/>)
3. Faculty Council – Location of Issues – Tracking
4. Schedule of 2016-17 Faculty Council Meeting Dates
5. Faculty Council Membership List 2017-18
6. Faculty Council Standing Committees Membership List 2017-18
7. University Committees Membership List
8. Parliamentary Motions – Quick Reference
9. Parliamentary Motions – What They Mean
10. UCC Minutes – April 28, 2017 and May 5, 2017 minutes were approved by Executive Committee (on May 9, 2017 meeting) on behalf of Faculty Council (Appendix 1 – pp.).

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes –

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Elections – Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance
2. University Committee Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance

D. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda
2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher
3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk
4. Faculty Council Standing Committee 2016-17 Annual Reports
 - a. Faculty Council Report to the Board of Governors
 - b. Committee on Faculty Governance - Pending
 - c. Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
 - d. Committee on Libraries
 - e. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty
 - f. Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Pending
 - g. Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education
 - h. Committee on Scholastic Standards
 - i. Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning
 - j. Committee on Teaching and Learning
 - k. Committee on University Programs
 - l. University Curriculum Committee
5. University Benefits Committee

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Confirmation of Faculty Council Secretary – Rita Knoll – Executive Assistant to Faculty Council

2. Confirmation of Faculty Council Parliamentarian – Lola Fehr –
Professional Registered Parliamentarian

F. ACTION ITEMS

- 1.

G. DISCUSSION

- 1.

August 22, 2017 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes*

1. May 9, 2017

The May 9, 2017 Executive Committee meeting minutes were unanimously approved and will be placed on the FC website.

B. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

1. May 2, 2017

The May 2, 2017 Faculty Council meeting minutes were unanimously approved and will be placed on the September 5, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. Next Executive Committee Meeting: August 29, 2017– 3:00 p.m. – Room 106 - Administration

Gallagher announced that the next Executive Committee meeting would be held on September 12, 2017,

Executive Committee will not meet on August 29, 2017. Executive Committee can approve the UCC minutes electronically. Makela is fine with this. Makela explained that the UCC minutes would be reproduced in a shorter form. They want to concentrate on having things correct in the CIM system, so this becomes the official record instead of duplication of reports in multiple locations. Courses will be listed with links.

Gallagher raises another issue re: Discussion topic for September 5, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda. We don't currently have a discussion item for FC. If there were time for a discussion, it would be more problematic to have in the same month as the student course survey as it will be a lengthy discussion topic.

Barisas: I think we all need time to get in gear for the fall semester.

Gallagher: For future consideration, any topics in your academic units, or regards to campus-related issues for us to think about?

B. Action Items

1. New Degree: Ph.D. in Watershed Science - UCC

Makela explained that this is the last element of the reorganization of the Warner College of Natural Resources.

Sanford moved (Hunter 2nd) to place the New Degree: Ph.D. in Watershed Science on the September 5, 2017 Faculty Council meeting agenda.

Sanford's motion was unanimously approved.

C. Reports

1. Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported the following:

Last week had a successful intake of students. Ram Welcome went well.

Part of the process as we head into the semester is making sure we have enough courses. The Course Capacity Committee addresses this. Kelly Long is our representative to that committee and drives the recommendations. The report thus far is that things are going pretty well.

Last week opened Health and Education Outreach Center with a groundbreaking ceremony. Anatomy building on the east side; adding a wing to create the new anatomy labs. The anatomy labs are completely maxed out. Having trouble expanding majors and also just addressing the needs of pre-med majors from across the curriculum. Funding is coming from the National Western Center disbursements. Because of its location and the opening of the new chemistry and bio buildings, there's a kind of quad that has formed there. The look will be homogeneous.

There will be upcoming concerts on Friday, tailgating and football game on Saturday, and parking. Everything is converging. Trying to make everything go smoothly this weekend. Will learn a lot after this weekend's events.

Shulman: I heard there was an enrollment decline.

Miranda: Enrollment is up actually. Up about 100 students--very heterogeneous setup in freshmen; a little flat in upper classmen. Mixed story, depending on populations you look at.

Hunter: When is census?

Miranda: In a week, around the September 10th, but it can take longer. Final numbers are about one week after the census.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported the following:

In Cabinet, revised anti-bullying policy was approved. Gallagher thinks everyone listened closely to the concerns. An ad hoc committee looked at policy from 2015 and found some deficiencies. Gallagher applauds the effort in necessary changes. CoRSAF was also deeply involved with revisions. The policy reflects all of those suggestions that various stakeholders had.

Gallagher has been pushing for the policy to be put into the *Manual*. President Frank has agreed to put in the *Manual* as an Appendix if that is what Faculty Council recommends.

Summary of why Gallagher wants it in the *Manual*? We have all kinds of policies that are in various catalogs—the HR Manual, etc. However, of all the policies that have been approved, only the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* have been approved by the BOG. It's the only document viewed in court as a legally bonding document.

Will be recommended to EC to place it on the agenda for a vote from FC upon receipt of such a recommendation from CoRSAF and, if the BOG approves it, it will be in the *Manual*.

Gallagher has been keeping in touch with Richard Eykholt, who is the Grievance Officer, and also a member of the Ad Hoc Committee and CoRSAF. Eykholt pointed out that when we've made proposals to put items into the Appendix, we've managed it differently than things appearing in other locations in the *Manual*. Items in the Appendix of the *Manual* have traditionally not been amended on the floor of Faculty Council.

Lenk: It sets up the possibility that FC will not support it. Are we supposed to check with the colleges beforehand? There are so many outcomes that could put us in a very uncomfortable place.

Gallagher: My understanding is that there are so many outcomes. If FC wants it voted down, there may be some uncomfortable feelings between faculty and administration.

Lenk: We need to ask ourselves if it's something that we want.

Gallagher: Rick, my assumption is that if Faculty Council would vote it down, we would still have the policy and it would be enforced. Would you agree with that interpretation?

Miranda: Yes. All policies that are published, and, if you violate them—you're in trouble legally.

Hunter: FC should hear this.

Gallagher: If anyone wants to know the source of the information that the *Manual* has contract status can go to the National AAUP site.

Miranda suggested having Jason Johnson, OGC, address the legal status of the *Manual*. If bullying is found to have occurred, then the disciplinary processes appropriate to the group (APs or faculty) activate.

Shulman: I am still not clear what the value added is of having this in the *Manual*?

Gallagher: I am looking for the clearest guidelines for what should be done. If accusations of widespread abuses of the bullying policy and this goes to an E.15 hearing, then he would still feel better if the due process elements were followed. There's not a disagreement about whether this could go into the *Manual*—Tony is okay with it—then putting it in the *Manual* removes concern about due process.

Miranda said the one downside is that putting it in the *Manual* might constrain administrative flexibility--by which he explained that the policy would be harder to amend if in the *Manual*.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported the following:

Lenk highlighted points regarding the August BOG meeting and their sense of priorities: speed of degree, quality of degree, student experience.

- Customization of programs. Global believes the individual degree plans and customization is the key to the future. Faculty need to have current knowledge of industry and there needs to be good connections to industry.
- Portfolio of options in the future. Big market in refreshing the knowledge of alums.
- CSU Global interested in putting together a network of sharing best ideas back and forth between CSU-FC and CSU Global.
- CSU gets more sponsored research than peers.
- Student success indicators. Ranked third in Mountain West with three firsts in the Mountain West.
- Lynn Johnson spoke re: fiscal health of the university. Colorado is expected to grow by 6%.
- Amy Parsons reported that stadium construction is on time.

- Opening of new alumni hall: Michael Smith Alumni Hall at new stadium

Lenk's report was received.

D. Discussion Items

1. Continue discussion on Proctoring Policy for Online Courses
 - Proctoring Task Force Report (*email attachment*)
 - Matt Hickey

Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL was present for the Proctoring Policy for Online Courses. Steve Shulman shared his summary from last week's EC meeting and offered that he doesn't think that classroom decisions on this should be laissez-faire. He said that having run an online program in Economics that some kind of proctoring is needed but he's not making an argument for what it should be. He sees proctoring as a good thing to have.

Lenk: Some faculty believe that there are significant differences across disciplines about how to proctor or how to maintain academic integrity. Some people want an administrative policy and others don't.

Gallagher looked at *Manual* and noted there were things that looked vague, nothing on point. Found a couple references re: good order in classroom, and reasonable level that exams were given in an appropriate way without cheating.

Matt Hickey said he had a meeting with Gwen Gorzelsky and Mike Palmquist. He talked about how Mike encouraged the task force to look at this with great vigor last year and, at the end of the year, sent an email about the choice of ProctorU. ProctorU was vetted by Mike's team, is offered at a reasonable price and with cost savings--the option of an AI based metric vs. a real person in the room. The AI seems to have some potential, according to Scott Woods. Some faculty who are in the trenches did not see Mike's memo and there's no intention to take existing tools away but only that ProctorU will be sponsored by the University. Otherwise, there's a cost for other options. If we wish to charge CoTL to look into this further, that's okay, but their approach has been to come up with a tool that could be made available to everyone. If it's an on-campus class, you pay for ProctorU. All courses at CSU delivered online are paid for. If one wants to pay, resident

instruction is available for a cost as is Proctor Track, which is another option (also costs money). Both ProctorU and Proctor Track have AI and live proctoring available. The pricing of ProctorU was so superior that it was the obvious default selection.

Gallagher's understanding was that Mike Palmquist spoke to EC last year and that the Proctoring Task Force Report was delivered at that time. Gallagher reports his sense of that meeting and asked what EC did in regard to the presentation and the receipt of the report? Previous members searched their memories, notes, and minutes. They recalled that they supported the principle but nothing specific in terms of vendor or other specifics.

Questions:

Avery: How typical is it that RI classes are NOT proctored?

Gallagher: There is no way to know this for the RI (resident instruction) classes.

Gallagher: This is one of those areas where we (EC) have not often entered the conversation as Faculty Council. Our role may be to move the needle—to stir faculty to consider the issues of academic integrity more fully. If we want to do *Manual* changes, then CoTL might be tasked to develop a proposal or investigate the question further.

Hickey: In the spirit of messaging, we are crafting a message to go out to all faculty. When we think about proctoring in regards to academic integrity, if you could. We hope to have this message ready by the end of this week. Paula Rodriguez plans to hold an open house at the University Testing Center. This proctoring piece will be a part of it.

Hayne: I like the idea of messaging to start with. It will take some time to come to a consensus. I like the idea of mentioning ProctorU and members can take advantage online. I think many of my colleagues, are most concerned about the online space.

Gallagher: Part of Mike's group may have addressed this.

Lenk asked if there would be value in surveying alums or current online students to see what their experience has been at CSU.

Avery pointed out that a lot of data collection across the country has been done so it's doubtful that a local survey would show additional information.

Lenk then pointed out that the movement toward critical thinking may suggest that there are shifts in understanding of the importance or proctoring.

Shulman: Do we know what peer institutions are doing?

Makela: Office of Academic Integrity has collected this kind of data and has a good handle on this.

Hickey noted that the proctoring of ProctorU goes well beyond plagiarism detection into many behaviors. He said that faculty have an opportunity to dial up or back the intensity of the AI if it starts to give false positive indications.

Nissen: There's the possibility for a misreading of academic integrity and this could have grave implications.

Hickey: Current cost \$20 per student per year, which is far below what it was.

Gallagher suggested closing the conversation for now, but further discussions will continue.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

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