

Location: Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

Senators and alternates present: Paula Adams (Library), Becky Becker (COA), Tammy Condrey (COEHP), Josh Eyster (COLS), Pat Hogan (COBS), Rita Jones (COBS), Ellen Martin (COEHP), Mike McFalls (COA), Jacqueline Radebaugh (Library), Neal Rogers (COBS), Kimberly Shaw (COLS), Melody Shumaker (Basic Studies), Gary Sprayberry (COLS), Glenn Stokes (COLS), John Studstill (COLS), Paul Vaillancourt (COA), Dan VanKley (COLS), Troy Vidal (COLS), Jeff Zuiderveen (COLS), Mike Baltimore (COEHP), Teresa Lang (COBS), Dan Ross (COLS)

Guests present included: President Tim Mescon, Provost Inessa Levi, Brian Schwartz, Stephanie Lewis, Tina Butcher, Sri Sitharaman, Pat McHenry, Camille Lawrence, John Lester, Dee Spivey, Ellen Roberts and others.

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 pm. Apologies were expressed by the Executive Officer. There are no snacks today due to miscommunication.

- Dr. Stokes has created “table tents” for senators. Please let Kim Shaw or Glenn Stokes know if you don’t have one already made up.
- We have a full agenda today.

1. Report from the President and Provost.

Welcome from President Mescon. Because of recent budget cuts, there have been lots of meetings of the Presidents’ Cabinet. The Cabinet now includes the Executive Officer of the Faculty Senate, and the Chair of the Chairs Assembly. In early July, there was a mandated 4% budget reduction, and a request for plans for cuts of 6% or 8%. The proposed cuts were pitched to chairs and to deans for their input as well. The Cabinet consented to allow the non-academic divisions to pick up more of the cuts through a redirection of student fee funds, and the rest of cuts were allocated. We believe the 8% is not a worst case scenario, but will become requisite in short order. The President is asking the Cabinet to look at 8% numbers again, make sure everyone is comfortable with them. The Cabinet has worked hard to ensure that there is no headcount reduction of permanently employed faculty or staff. Some of the reduction was due to repayment of stimulus funds, and a backfill of furlough days. Our new tuition increase has offset some of these cuts (tuition was increased due to change of our new standing as doctoral-granting school). We have been working with the local legislative delegation, and with the Board Of Regents.

Many faculty recently have been concerned about lack of response from the BOR regarding Regents Test exemption proposal. President Mescon called Regent Nesmith, and had a long discussion about this. Today, CSU received word that this proposal was approved. This was good news academically, good for students, and good for our budget.

Question – Did you say part of student fees were being redirected to meet cuts? Response - Yes, part of academic excellence fee, which was mandated across system, but will sunset next year. We did not get fee readjustment when we got tuition readjustment as a result of changing tiers. The lost revenue on that fee is \$1M/year, almost a 3% coverage of the cuts. We have had fairly direct conversations with BOR staff and Regents about this.

Provost Levi. We are working on plans to accommodate students enrolled in Regents Test, aiding them in adjustments and ensuring they do not fall below student credit hour minimums, etc. Despite fact that the University budget is minimal this year, CSU will

continue to support grant programs, particularly undergraduate research grants and distance learning grant programs, which had recent calls for proposals. Please direct students to apply for grants.

We have had conversations on and off about issues related to ownership and different levels of permission of usage of computers, software manuals. We now have an agreement to make the following things available. For manuals for locally owned software (one user or one department), UITS will work to make software and manuals available to users with the understanding that users must make it available to UITS when they are servicing it. Ideally, UITS will have a scanned copy of manual. If you are interested in this, you should complete an eQuest and be patient about requests for these. With larger usage software (for example, MS Office), UITS will work on placing a copy of the manual in library in the reference section so that everyone can use it, and will also work on making manuals available online. They hope to move process forward, and to complete it by the end of semester. They will start addressing things as fast as they can. There have also been questions about faculty downloading software onto their computers. UITS was responsive (thanks), and now faculty may become a “power user”. As faculty, you would need to fill out an application, signed by your department chair. With this authority, you will also have responsibility. You cannot use unlicensed software (for example). You will need to be careful about what you download. If you bring a virus in, power user status can be reconsidered. If you want to assume responsibility, you can now do so under certain conditions. If your time is limited and you are able to work with them, time frame of UITS services – do so and save yourself time and bother.

Headcount enrollment is still going up and down, but the current headcount is 8419 (raw data). We assume following previous patterns there will be some drops. 8380 is current prediction for our official fall headcount, which is an increase over last year’s 8212 (projected increase just less than 3%, but student credit hour increase for this fall is over 3%) Question – so which number is it again? Response: 8419 is number for today, but we are predicting number will go down due to no-shows, withdraws, based on historical patterns.

AASCU has launched a project during July meeting in Chicago, to do with difficult budget, and increased accountability demands. The University System is asking us to increase RPG (Retention, Progression and Graduation) rates. We have to be responsive. It is morally right and our survival depends on it. Technology plays more of a role in this.

AASCU has developed a think tank capability, which schools can sign in and share ideas, data, information. Chairs Assembly recommended that we become a member of this “red balloon” project. We want to bring this to Senate as a group.

Question: Is the \$50/student incentive for online classes still there? Response: Yes it is. That amount goes to faculty, the rest of the distance learning fee charged goes to department, college, UITS. Actually, it is a few dollars less than \$50 due to taxes. It is not going away, as it is funded by the distance learning fee.

Question: Is there a restriction on what kinds of classes/new classes to be created for this?

Response: Committee reviews all proposals, but they are particularly interested in developing complete programs online. They have a rubric for evaluating these courses/proposals. So – pretty much any course that hasn’t been done online before. Not a new (never approved before) course, just those new to online offerings but otherwise approved academically.

2. Announcements from the Senate Executive Officer

One of my goals this year is to involve the committee structure more intimately in Senate business. If we spend a lot of Senate time on basics, we will bog down. Committees can function independently. Will change process slightly from before, and invite every committee to report (5-10m) in fall and spring. Senate can give a charge, with a deadline, at that time. Executive Officer would like emailed feedback on the idea of a senate liaison on each committee. We have a huge number of committees, some of which may not be functioning efficiently. At least 2 staff have already contacted Executive Committee around establishing task forces for things that should be handled by existing committees. He has already asked the Committee on Committees to review committee membership to make sure records are accurate. We are also interested in Shared Governance, sharing the work and responsibility through this. He also proposed appointing at least one faculty senator to each Senate committee to act as a non-voting liaison to that committee. Think about what you would be interested in asking the committees. Executive Officer will outline the order in the next week or so.

Committee on Committees will report back next time.

3. Old Business

- a. Faculty Performance and Engagement Task Force policy (information – 5 minutes)
<https://sites.google.com/a/colstate.edu/faculty-performance-and-engagement-task-force/?AuthEventSource=SSO>

We will not have a long discussion today, but at the next meeting. This is the proposal delivered to the Faculty Senate last Spring semester, put together by the task force chaired by Linda Hadley. We will address this formally at next meeting. We are asking the Faculty Senate to review the proposal for next meeting, get input from your colleagues, and be prepared to take action after discussion next meeting. September meeting will be 2nd Monday. Link listed here.

- b. Special Designation Task Force – charge to task force

Task force formed last spring, chaired by Dan Ross. We want to give them a renewed charge, recommendation from task force out to senate. Need to re-staff the task force in order to ensure that representation includes each College appropriately. The task force met once at end of spring term (May 7), had a preliminary discussion. Dr. Ross wondered what Senate wants at this time, and if it was still appropriate to discuss this issue. Advice from Senate: Do not assume the issue is dead. Check on makeup of committee – Ross will send a membership list. The Library had one rep, other colleges had two when task force was formed. Task force is supposed to come back with two things: Is there a reason to do this (special designation)? If so, what are reasonable designations to choose? Costs nothing but time to discuss. Diversity issue was also raised. Double check makeup of committee to ensure that disciplines are well represented. Time frame for report? Report by October on whether we should pursue a special designation (but not necessarily which ones). So moved by Senator Zuiderveen, seconded by Senator Hogan. Motion passes.

- c. Shared Governance Task Force (5 minutes)

This needs to be bigger committee – one representative per college, rec that we have 2 per college, plus one from the library (although we don't want to unduly burden them). Currently have 3 COLS, 1 from each of others, 1 basic studies representative, no library representative. We should look at diversity within colleges as well as racial, gender diversity, as we a

dd one for each of the 4 colleges, roughly proportional to size of colleges. Deadline? Motion to increase size? Moved by Senator Zuiderveen, seconded by Senator Hogan. How do we increase the size? Originally formed by volunteers. We can ask Deans to identify people. Discussion of library faculty addition followed. Tenure is definitely an asset for members here. Does the committee include administrators? Dept chairs? Yes, committee can include chairs, but probably not higher than chair. Deadline? Skeleton of a plan due by December.

d. Evaluation of Administrators Task Force (5 minutes)

Task force set up to develop and administer evaluations, from department chairs and higher. Report requested in September. The committee ran a version of evaluations last spring. Task force was asked to report on its initial results, and its recommendations for later. Senator Hogan offered to replace Senator Theis on task force if needed. Data from last spring currently split between Senator Theis and Senator vanKley. Will request Senator Theis finish his report, then have someone else take over from there. Task force is also requested to bring a copy of previous membership while reporting out.

4. New Business

a. Status of current administrative searches (5 minutes)

Provost Levi: We have 3 dean searches ongoing – College of Education and Health Professions, the Library, and College Of the Arts. Parker Executive Search Company is assisting each, in different stages. The stage depends on how fast nominations came in. COEHP has a search committee, which has met several times, developed a job description (being posted in a number of publications including Chronicle, Diverse Issues, Women and Higher Ed, etc.) Next is the Library. Their Search Committee just met with Parker reps, and are in process of revising job description. Will post this soon. College Of the Arts just sent nominations to their Search Committee in terms of faculty, and is working on who else should be on committee, done in next week or so. Finally, there is a search for the Director of Grants and Sponsored Projects (ongoing for over a year). We are bringing in candidates for interviews as they are identified as suitable.

Question: Are we sending director comments to Paula Hecht? Response: Yes. Or to the Provost directly.

Question: There have been some discussions about this – what does consulting firm do, vs what faculty search committee do? Response: Firm makes committee job as easy as possible. It meets with committee to hear interests, and desired characteristics for the position, several sample job descriptions are brought forward, search company posts ads, creates website for committee to post applications for review, do proactive recruitment by sharing info about ongoing searches. In addition, you have probably seen email from chair of COEHP search committee to help with recruitment. Search company will help to review files, identify files that satisfy conditions of job description. Will help with scheduling of interviews, scheduling campus activities, bringing in candidates, reference checks, and assists with process.

b. Re-admissions Appeal Committee report

Stephanie Lewis reports. Met on the 10th of August. The Committee had 16 files among them. Of them, 3 were a no show. Two were denied, based on low GPA, and the committee recommended that they go elsewhere to raise their GPA and reapply. Dr. Lewis didn't recall if this is a large or small number for this. Challenges for the committee include that they make a lot of recommendations, often students have low GPA (been on exclusion 2x, must

have plan for future success) but the committee never gets feedback. Who is student's one contact? No followup data, to inform future decisions of this committee. They assume that someone in registrar's office checks on recommendations written on files – but there are ways around it. Part of the problem is – don't we have an obligation to provide support for the readmitted so that they don't fall through the cracks again? Some apply for readmit have a GPA of 0.5.... We don't want to readmit students if they don't have a realistic chance to succeed. What can we do to learn about this? Followup report? Have the same concerns been seen before? In the same study, could we find characteristics of those who succeed after readmission vs those who don't? School of Nursing has a student success program, and they have reduced attrition from 46% to 15% - much due to support, and to giving students a single point of contact. Rather than send students back to department, we can send them to advising center, or dual advising. Another thing we may need to do is have those on exclusion be present on a separate report, and allow them to be tracked the first time so that they can be aided appropriately and in a timely manner. We can then give feedback to committee next term. What can we learn and apply? For example, should we put limits on the number of courses taken by readmitted students, or type of courses? Perhaps not allow students to take large classes, or online classes? But many classes are closed by the time the process is finished. Comment: While we don't want to pretend that any students are unimportant – but this seems a very small number to be considering. A bigger number is the number of students excluded the first time. Isn't this a lot of time for 10 students? But if we can get a report with 5-7 years of results, perhaps we can make better decisions. Are we getting any success? Asked committee to follow up with Sri Sitharaman.

c. Establish a group to work with master plan and classroom building planning process. CSU is in the process of requesting a classroom building for the campus (main) and revisiting its master plan, which is more than 10 years old. Part of it will discuss physical structure of campus. Senate already has a Facilities and Safety Committee, which could be an interested party, as well as the Academic Technology committee, and the Sustainability Committee which have interests here. Obviously need to involve others besides just faculty. What should our representation be? Should the Senate identify some from those committees, to act as liaison to committees? It was suggested that there be one representative from Senate, and from each mentioned committee be asked to supply one member. Should Senate identify Chair of this committee? There is also an institutional Developments and Improvements committee. Motion (Senator Zuiderveen/seconded by Senator Hogan) that one from each of above to serve on master plan and classroom building committee. Of all those groups, is there enough to represent the academic side? The Senate representative can handle this, and all of these are faculty.... Motion passes. Anyone want to serve? – Senator Zuiderveen. Accepted by acclamation.

President Mescon states that if we ever get BOR to fund it, the committee will at that point be a primarily faculty initiative. It would also look at issues regarding big scale renovations needed in master planning. When funds for new building become available, they will be for classrooms, not for lab building. Part of issues to be considered – what spaces will be renovated for additional labs? This is a serious issue. When you look at classroom buildings we use, we deserve a new building. It is incomprehensible that it has been 10 years since we have received these funds. Must work through our legislative delegation. If you look at system allocation, the allocations go where there are Regents, and we haven't had one for

years. Question: What do we do to get a Regent? Response: That starts with new governor. How do you ignore 2nd or 3rd largest city in the state?

d. Retention, Progression and Graduation Committee report

Tina Butcher and Sri Sitharaman. **distributed paper reports, which will be attached as an appendix.** Information presented is available in factbook. Overall rates reported. More data will be available in next 2 weeks. Expected graduation rate should be around 46-48%, but is around 32%. In another study - a small percentage taking much longer, most students really are graduating in 6 years.

Question: Is there a national database that based on social security numbers to determine where a student is going to college at a given time? Many departments are trying to find out where our students go. We can often find that out.

They set out to find funding formula based on RPG that is so commonly discussed. They found some of the guidelines, from 2006 document, and distributed what was found. Over the past year, Regents have placed a great deal of emphasis on RPG, and on future plans. It has become clear it isn't just academics that plays a role – plants ops, auxiliary services, everyone. We need to “get our arms around” what we are doing for retention. There are a dizzying amount of products being sold regarding retention. What initiatives are on campus? What's working? What might need to be substituted? We should not just pile on. Need to do some work through RPG committee (which needs chair). Why do students leave? Study done... they stay for great faculty, co-curricular activities, good advising, get connected and engaged.

List of our initiatives is on the last page of report. Includes using MAP works. Retention of freshman number is very important. Three weeks into freshman year, student takes survey – finds red flags to academic advisors, to allow them to intervene. At 8 weeks, another survey and another point for potential intervention. Those you really want to get to are those who don't respond at all. Terry Irvin, Jay Kimbrough working on this initiative. We will start with Basic Studies and with undeclared students and pilot this program. Won't have to experience flaws when opened to all. Last year RPG Committee recommended a mid-term grading system, Deans made recommendations for those making grades below C. Take it back to committee, flesh it out a bit. We currently imagine working with UITS to develop an appropriate system. Contingent on funding. Important time to be doing this.

President Mescon: Southern regional educational board reported on 10 universities that have made progress on these, similar to our lists. This report mandated by BOR, and he thanked the RPG committee for their work. Some schools had to go back 3-4 times, we had only one visit. Success will be tied to resource availability.

Question: As RPG currently has no Chair, how should chairs for committees be chosen/elected? Should committees elect own chairs? VPAA used to choose them. We currently need some guidance on that. Tina Butcher will call first meeting, get them to identify a chair.

Added to the agenda the formation of a faculty/staff salary study committee.....

Dr Levi and Dr Mescon have proposed a group to look at salary at comparator institutions, by college, discipline, years of service. They will then develop policy for a plan for addressing this. Talk about representation. Question is: What recommendations are there on staffing? To provide from senate? Campus elections? Representative, for different constituent groups. (admin groups, all colleges, etc). Comments follow:

- I know it's important to have a sense of equality, but COLS has the most faculty and probably the one with the most faculty at the low end of pay scale.
- Many questions, based on discipline are enough that even if 2 per college might make some feel disenfranchised. COLS is 2nd from bottom in tier we USED to be in.
- We will assume committee will come up with how to study, how to make decisions.... This topic comes up every few years, so do we have a group that studied this recently on our campus? Response: George Stanton did this, in the early 90s.
- How have other colleges and universities approached this? We should we use a Senate representative + 1 from each college, library, basic studies. This would be enough to get started.
- I am having a hard time seeing why this (representation on the committee) is a problem. Evidence is that many of us are underpaid, by national or state averages. Trick is how to establish reasonable targets. Since we are discussing process, membership wouldn't necessarily be permanent – this would be task force. Should have something simple to get things going, rather than worry about proportional representation.
- Charge of the group is to study data of our salaries vs peers in state and out of state by discipline and rank and by any other attributes the task force may look at. Then the task force should create plan (multiyear) how to deal with possible inequities.
- Form it from senate membership, one per college plus library? Charge sounds more specific, may want others represented in order to categorize people properly.
- Alternative, put it off, find out how other institutions form these task forces.... And do it then.
- Motion by Senator Adams, seconded by Senator Studstill that we identify representatives from senate to begin study. Elect at next meeting. Motion passes.

e. Core Curriculum Task Force report

<https://sites.google.com/a/colstate.edu/core-curriculum/>

Report presented by Ellen Roberts, Tina Butcher. Currently on website at

<https://sites.google.com/a/colstate.edu/core-curriculum/Task-Force-Docs>

We could work in first year experience and second year experience into core at this point, perhaps common readings, cross-disciplinary experiences. Area B is most obvious place, but any place to make it productive is good. Perhaps there is too much concern about transferability, at cost of innovation and the needs of our students. Transfer counts against us in RPG. Not just transferability for all schools but coordinate with the ones our students work with most. Top ten schools for those that transfer in are mostly 2 year schools. Should look at these schools, talk to them about their core learning outcomes and then # hours are concerns. However, two year schools will determine this a year later than us. We must be in place, ready to go next fall.

Core will become part of CPR process, like programs will go through review.

Student entering this fall, must complete area a English and math in first 60 hours. Next fall, will complete this requirement within 45 hours. Afterward, within the first 30 hours.

Meeting ended at 5:12pm.