

**Agenda for 13 September 2010
Faculty Senate Meeting**

Meeting Time 3:02 pm

Location: Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

Senators present: Paula Adams, Becky Becker, Greg Blalock, Tammy Condrey, Pat Duttera, Josh Eyler, Pat Hogan, Rita Jones, Teresa Lang, Ellen Martin, Brenda May-Ito, Tom McCormack, Mike McFalls, Jacqueline Radebaugh, Dan Ross, Kimberly Shaw, Melody Shumaker, Glenn Stokes, John Studstill, Dan VanKley, Troy Vidal, Jeff Zuiderveen

Guests present include: Provost Inessa Levi, Sri , Shawn Cruzen, Brian Schwartz, Dean Linda Hadley, Kyle Christensen, Kimberly Gill, David Mitchell, Roberta Ford, Carey Scott Wilkerson, Iris Saltiel, Dean David Lanoue, Assistant Provost Tom Hackett, Clay Nicks, Assistant Provost Tina Butcher, Tim Howard, President Tim Mescon

1. Report from the President or Provost

The President and some of his Cabinet members met today with our legislative delegates to ask for support of CSU and current developments here. We have asked for support for several issues, in particular, support for funding for a new building (classrooms and offices). Over several years, we have asked for design money for a new building, and this money was removed in budget reductions several times. Several departments have needs and concerns regarding space. Legislators have been asked to support this request.

On a different note, CSU has been extremely successful for getting funds for endowed chair positions. As of spring, we have 16 endowed faculty, including the most recent one in military history (the Hallock Distinguished University Chair, which will be filled on a temporary basis until the endowment becomes active). Some time ago, there was a program on the state level of matching funds for endowed positions, and we as CSU are asking for that support. While we are fortunate to have that many endowed positions, we are looking for support for the salaries that come with that.

Question: The schedule for next semester has been put up as a rolling schedule from last spring. What's the advantage for putting this up, when for some departments so much of this schedule is so wrong? If a student looks at that, this may cause them many problems.

Response: If it is mostly wrong, then we don't want it up. The conversation we had in spring was 'will it make it easier to do this rather, than keying in a new schedule every spring, then adjust it before publishing?' It was supposed to be effort saving.

Question: However, file adjustments won't be made until October but the schedule is already up.

Response from Dr. Butcher This was brought to my attention yesterday. We can roll it so that it is viewable or hidden. It is currently viewable, but Nicole DeVries should ask department chairs if it should be hidden, taken down, or viewable? Some advising centers will begin advising students soon. Schedules are supposed to be final October 25, but there was a tentative date that has already passed. Is it hidden from students but not faculty? No, hidden means from all people but the programmers.

2. Announcements from the Senate Executive Officer

none

3. Old Business

DRAFT MINUTES - Corrected

- a. Institutional Research report – data mining on retention/progression rates on readmitted students

Distributed a paper report, and displayed a powerpoint. **Will attach as appendix.** The study examined cohorts from 2001-05, tracking 219 students on second or higher exclusion. Only 7 of 46 students tracked in this study graduated (15% probability).

Question: The way I'm looking at this, this is over a 7 year period.

Response: Yes.

Question: I find it interesting that in 2009-2010, our numbers here dropped even though our enrollment has increased. I can look into that.

Comment: One thing that we did collect data on, is the number of students that have left CSU and gone to two year colleges or technical schools has increased a lot.

Comment: I thought we were told by the admissions appeals committee that there were 13 students on list for potential reenrollment last month, and these numbers don't support what the admissions appeal committee told us.

Response: Maybe those students were excluded some other year. Looking at the first student, excluded in 2003, came back in 2008. Other students could be from further back. My recollection is that many are readmitted and then unable to get financial aid in order to reenroll after being readmitted.

Comment: By the time you are at your second exclusion, you must wait at least a year. It's probably the case that most of those from last month's report are from prior years?

Question: Are we putting a lot of effort into a very small number of students? The cost-benefit may not be worth our continuing to do this. Who's on this committee now?

Comment: With the kind of scrutiny that for-profit universities have currently, it will come our way. Let's tighten up our policies where needed now. We should be asking the committee to look at this now.

Comment: I think we should continue to spend resources on this, because it shows our intent with RPG. RPG is important, and the effort here is important as well.

- b. Committee on Committees report

He distributed two handouts from the committee. If anyone wants a copy and did not get one, email John Studstill for electronic copy. A word of thanks before everyone starts thumbing through to last year's committee: Stephanie Lewis, Elizabeth Wurtz, and John Studstill and then this year's committee (Paula Adams, Josh Eyler and John Studstill). The committee sent out a notice in spring, and another recently to committee chairs, to confirm committee listings. Still some problems, changes coming in even in last day or two. The committee will simply continue to update. Senator Studstill is still unclear how to update listing online, but will coordinate the final updates. One or two committees are still missing a chair, and that can be sent. Carl Wallman will still update website. One more note to make – if your committee is supposed to have students, you need to contact SGA to solicit student members of these committees. Please send this information to committee chairs. Hardly any of the committees have listed student names of committee members. *Committee listings will be updated online by Carl Wallman, and are not included here.*

- c. Faculty Performance and Engagement Task Force policy (discussion and vote – 20 minutes)

<https://sites.google.com/a/colstate.edu/faculty-performance-and-engagement-task-force/?AuthEventSource=SSO>

The policy was presented back in April, made available for discussion and discussed at the last Senate meeting in spring 2010. No action was taken then, or at the first meeting of Fall

DRAFT MINUTES - Corrected

2010. There will be a final vote of the faculty as a whole, so this is not where it ends. I have received several emails with input, and will make sure that these topics come up during today's discussion. For the sake of parliamentary procedure, if someone will make a motion to adopt the policy, then we can discuss it. It was moved by Senator Duttera, seconded by Senator Jones, that we adopt the policy. Recognize that several guests present were on task force that developed the policy, and encourage them to speak as needed.

Comment: On page 5, in the middle of the page, 5 bullets down, a faculty member is limited to a vote at only one level if both on department and college level committees. We don't understand why you should have to choose to vote at one level or the other. I'd like to just strike that part. Can we have some committee feedback? Was that the intent?

Dr. Hadley: to be perfectly honest I cannot recall that we spent a great deal of time on that. A few committee members wanted to be sure that someone would not be able to get into the college committee in order to send someone back down. I don't feel this was critical to the document.

Comment: Make a motion to amend the policy to strike this (JZ). Amendment accepted.

Comment: On page 8, about non-tenure track faculty appointments. The committee was asked whether this section refers to librarians and nurses. Faculty were told that there would be a separate committee to address this issue for non-tenure track faculty, so that non-tenured faculty may still go up for promotion.

Response: The committee recommended a separate process for non-tenure track faculty, with different titles.

Comment: So if this policy was approved, the current non-tenure track faculty would be converted to other titles.

Response: We assumed that current faculty would be grandfathered. We were simply making the recommendation that there be a different process, and were told that there would be a separate committee. It was beyond the scope of what committee was asked to do. Some other policy would still need to be developed for those in place.

Comment: But with the lack of such a document, are we going to be able to vote this through? Without this in place, nurses and librarians will automatically be dropped to lecturer, etc. I recommend that we form that committee now.

Question: Are you going to be able to vote for approval of this today?

Comment: Put forward motion that we change the language.

Comment: But even if you change language, it is not final word, just Senate's final word.

Comment: I would not agree unless it could be stated at title that it excludes library and nursing faculty. Non-tenured faculty are still held to much of these qualifications, so to say otherwise is egregious and erroneous.

Dr. Hadley: The task force was only tenured faculty. We did not feel it was our place to develop policy for non-tenured faculty, and the Provost agreed that this policy could be limited in scope to those faculty.

Question: If it is not addressed in this way, who will address it and when? It still appears to address other faculty such as nursing, library faculty. Motion to delete that section in order. Senator Adams moved that we exclude that section (original movers agreed).

Comment: Perhaps the title of the policy should be modified to be more clear.

Question: If there will be another task force, would they bring recommendations to Senate? I would assume so. I would assume that this would come out of the Provost's office.

DRAFT MINUTES - Corrected

Comment: Statement in the document – associate professor should have terminal degree from a fully accredited university. But this is primarily an American phenomenon, so we limit ourselves with this (page 3).

Comment: Concern also about page 15 – faculty development. He also notes no mention of study abroad teaching. We have failed here for a long time to acknowledge this as important to the institution. Recommend that we add this here. I didn't assume that the list was all-inclusive. Does wording limit what can be considered? Wording is vague.

Question: On page 15 as well, one of my colleagues raised a concern with online evaluations and low response rates. Where did the number 6 students come from, when we are shooting for 15 student minimum in undergraduate courses?

Response: We were talking about an open records request that came from an online source, that wanted online evaluations by professor by course, and the Attorney General's office recommended that courses with 5 or fewer students need not be included, because at that level anonymity for the students is suspect.

Comment: So that's a court ruling?

Response: As I recall, that's exactly right. The task force didn't feel that a given percentage was correct, but that there should be a threshold for response rates and for the number of students. Sometimes student evaluations are the only methods for evaluating teaching effectiveness. But we were saying you could exclude those at this point.

Comment: A grammar point. The wording seems to imply that with response rates less than 30% and less than 6 students (do you interpret this as 6 total students in course, or 6 responding).

Response: Meant to be 6 in course. There needs to be an editorial change. Put courses with word fewer.

Question: Who makes the decision about exclusion? Must submit them all, but may exclude under these conditions.

Comment: With the justification of the number 6, policy still doesn't protect anonymity, it is only saying I can opt not to use these evaluations.

Response: Once again, this was beyond purview of task force. But the number seems more curious now. Sample size was also a concern. Policy doesn't stop any of the stated concerns.

Comment: Someone else can jump in, but rationale was that confidentiality where suspect the evaluations may not be as reliable. That would be where the evaluator makes exclusion.

Dr. Hadley We didn't necessarily feel that 6 was magic number, but rather that this was a concern. There are music professors that only have 2 students in a class by necessity, so they didn't want to include those.

Comment: No recommendation stated at this point, so moving on.

Question: Who is eventually going to correct things like this? What we are voting on is the document, with the edits included in our motion today. We could take a simple approach and say yes or no. But since the Senate agreed that approved policy would be applied next year, we need to vote.

Statement of concern: People who start under a set of criteria ought to be evaluated under those criteria, out of fairness (not ones created after that time). I don't see any timeline for phase-in in this policy. Post-tenure review policy would limit greatly academic freedoms. Certainly for faculty if they are rated unsatisfactory, so that they will now be on probation. It will be like not having tenure anymore. Really even people who haven't been evaluated

DRAFT MINUTES - Corrected

would also in effect be on probation out of fear of a bad evaluation. Especially with the clause “after 3 years subject to dismissal for cause. Position to prove themselves over again. AAUP recommends against post tenure review having these outcomes, using other mechanisms for dismissal.

Implementation documentation from last year, not until AY 2011-12. Those applying before then should be evaluated based on what is in place at their last pre-tenure review before this point.

Comment: I’m not sure whether Provost’s office agreed to this or not.

Dr. Hadley – The point that you bring up about dismissal for cause was mentioned in all focus groups. The wording has been lifted from BOR handbook, implemented January 2010. We must conform to existing BOR policy. The Task Force thought it was important to inform faculty, and give a reasonable process to lead up to that for CSU. This was put in procedures to make this better.

Comment: I think this is time for Senate to vote in contradiction of BOR. BOR has already taken steps so that most recent school added to the USG doesn’t even have tenure. You can be dismissed for a number of reasons in systems that have tenure. But suddenly if you get an unsatisfactory review from Dean and a Chair, you can be removed. There is no longer a peer-review process.

Comment: Each evaluation should include review by college committee. From our college’s standpoint, we did a thorough evaluation of each portfolio, which gave each person an opportunity to make their case.

Comment: If you look at page 12, a faculty member is supposed to be satisfactory in each. If you have a split recommendation, the Dean makes the decision so the Dean and the Chair can make the decision in the absence of the Committee.

Comment: What about the appeal process?

Comment: This places a heavy burden on that faculty member.

Question: How you get off of probation is not spelled out, who evaluates annually to make the decision. It only states the penalty if you don’t get out.

Comment: Looking from business manager point-of-view, this continues to make faculty accountable for their productivity and their actions, and guards against inactivity.

Comment: But system already does this. You don’t need to use post-tenure review to do this.

Comment: There’s a national body of AAUP which has studied this carefully and put forward guidelines. Why can’t we try to forge a policy better than the BOR policy. When are we going to stand up and say you can’t just stuff this down our throats? We all know tenure is a very contested area. I think AAUP has addressed this for years, and I don’t think BOR is as competent to make these decisions.

Comment: It’s not often that I agree with my fellow senator, but this seems to be very close to the tenure process, committee reviews this and approves it. The only thing not the same is that at the top when it goes to the president’s office, I’m not exactly sure what happens. When you achieve tenure, it’s not egregious to ask for review.

Response: No one is protesting that. We are protesting the post-tenure review *process* in this document specifically.

Comment: Process is the same as what is in College of Business.

Comment: The important thing here is that to remove a tenured faculty member, it has to be done by peers. That protection is lacking here. Now I have to prove I’ve done a good job

DRAFT MINUTES - Corrected

and defend against possible charges for dismissal. When going up for tenure, burden of proof on candidate. In post tenure review, burden should be different. Post-tenure review to be sure they are still working, make remediation plans.

Question: Why should the burden be different? It's a periodic review.

Comment: But then it isn't tenure.

Dr. Hadley: When the task force was charged, it had to come up with recommendations that met system requirements. We could make more stringent recommendations, but none that didn't honor BOR rules. Post-tenure process is now changing to mirror what is in the tenure process, to be certain that post-tenure process stops at college level. As for specifics of how to get to review, we did not feel strongly that process was necessarily the best, but felt that stopping it at college level was most important (doesn't have to be reviewed by provost or president). Appeal process in place at last paragraph.

Comment: that it's the same not the point.. They put wording in to call attention to faculty that BOR policy has changed.

Comment: Do we protest at this level, or the upper level?

Comment: Bear in mind we will come to a faculty vote.

Comment: If you vote to approve the document, you are approving this whole concept.

Comment: What the task force was concerned about, was that BOR policy could be used against a faculty member without their awareness that the policy existed.

Question: Is that committee on page 13 a new committee, or already in existence?

Response: I am sure there is something similar now, but we were saying something needs to exist and needs to have this kind of membership.

Question: Do they exist already?

Response: No, it's new.

Comment: In the interest of a recommendation, we could add some language about the policy to warn faculty that this is current BOR policy but that we are not endorsing this policy.

Comment: I have a feeling that we are on front line of this, and most other USG institutions don't realize this has changed. I think if we vote to endorse, we are hurting colleagues. I think there needs to be dialog across the system.

Comment: That's certainly an option, not to approve the policy.

Comment: BOR policy on post-tenure review says independent processes for dismissal for cause must apply, so -

Response: I didn't see that in our policy.

Comment: BOR policy says "after 3 years, faculty member has not been successful, may be subject for dismissal to cause. (Regular independent processes will apply.)" It can't be based just on post-tenure review.

Question: Why isn't that language here?

Comment: I don't recall anyone saying that they wanted that language in or out.

Comment: But voting it down is sending a message. Either we take what they dish out, or we say that we need to be part of the dialog. Face it, tenure is under attack so we should stand up and make a little noise.

Call the question (moved by Senator Hogan, seconded by Senator Ross). Motion to call the question passed.

DRAFT MINUTES - Corrected

Comment: In summary, the motion is such that passing it would accept the document with amendments made, striking sections on page 5 and 8. Document goes forward either way, with or without the attachment.

Vote on the motion to adopt the policy proceeded, and paper ballots were used.

Results: 6 vote in favor of the motion, 16 vote against the motion. The Senate does not recommend the policy in its current form. We will pass on results to the administration.

d. Salary study committee - membership selection

Senators Zuiderveen and Shaw volunteered to participate on this committee. Nominations approved by acclamation.

e. Evaluation of Administrators committee – report

Paper report attached, thumb drive with data passed on. The committee set up an account with survey monkey, shared password and account information with Senator Van Kley.

Paper copies entered by both senators into survey monkey together. Recommend that there are always 2 who can access it. To protect privacy, 2 from separate colleges should have equal access. Cost \$20 per month, requires accurate email addresses. Email problems were a difficulty. Faculty should be discouraged from using hard copies, which are more susceptible to fraud. Faculty on some paper copies changed questions, which invalidated their responses.

All surveys electronically handed to secretary for inclusion in records. Results in report listed below.

Some colleges had near zero participation, some had near 100% participation. Those chosen are neither exceptionally bad nor exceptionally good. Some were very high, some very low.

Why is only COBCS reported here?

100% participation all hand entered – from library. These were picked because they were typical. The lower the number of participants, the less reliable the result.

The charge from Senate was to report last year's results and on process, in order to charge next committee.

Question: Are we prepared to nominate representatives, or do so next meeting?

Question: I don't know at this point whether these results mean anything or not?

Question: Do we want to have the data posted?

Comment: At very least, President and Provost would get it, and each Dean would receive appropriate files. Data has been delivered to senate secretary.

Question: Is this about process or data? Both.

Comment: My understanding is that this meant all administration would be evaluated regularly. Idea was that this would be continuing process. Is survey that was used a common one for the campus?

Response: Last year was the first year for it.

Comment: Maybe the committee should tell us more.

Comment: Discussion was that as faculty we are evaluated, shouldn't we have evaluation for administrators? The whole university should have the option to see this, otherwise why are we doing this?

Response: As with the idea of student evaluations, I'm reluctant to put much up, particularly for those with low response rates. Don't want to see so much responses for each dean, for each chair, but want to see data on response rates. Are we looking at valid substance here?

DRAFT MINUTES - Corrected

Response: Turner College had 14 (of 35), Ed had 7, COLS had 50 (of 108), COA had 5, Library had 7, evaluating interim dean and CIO. Response rates varied wildly.

Response: Suggest poor turnout may have been due to timing. After working through all this, it was very late in semester, and that may have had something to do with this. I am wondering if we might need to reevaluate the instrument to see if modifications are needed.

Comment: Recommend that we reconstitute the committee, take all of this information and make recommendations on how to deliver in spring by November meeting. With lack of consistency in results, table discussion for today. Senator Zuiderveen moved that the evaluation of administrators committee be reconstituted and that they review the results from this past year's questions/responses, and in November meeting that they bring recommendations for spring. Senator Hogan seconds.

Current committee – Senators Van Kley, Lewis, Becker, Adams, and Theis.

New committee – nominate Senator Hogan for DATCOBCS; nominee from COEHP, Senator Blalock. Nominations closed. Nominees accepted by acclamation. Senator VanKley will call meeting, and the committee will elect a chair at that meeting.

4. New Business

a. Library Committee report
postponed

b. Enterprise Services report

First item - He works with food, vending, others on campus auxiliary services. Wanted an auxiliary committee – which we have. Talked to the person who was chair, but they hadn't met in long time. Want to revive committee, ask for suggestions. Follett and Aramark find that faculty/student committees help them a great deal to test ideas, get feedback.

Suggested that he get in touch with new committee chair, work with them. Want to add students to current committee makeup.

Second – intellectual property. **Distributed a handout.** We haven't had a policy committee for this in some time, but have had several opportunities recently with commercial value.

What we have done is develop in foundation a limited liability corporation (nonprofit) to put profits from these efforts, as a short term measure. Some other Universities have research foundations. This allows flexibility with funds. He asked to start this committee.

Current policy is word for word BOR policy. We need to be able to take advantage of opportunities, and need standing committee, to formulate/revise current policy and then deal with current issues.

Comment: Most of those listed here are Chairs – not typical of senate committees.

Response: A number of those here are early stakeholders.

Question: Was it inappropriate to have a librarian?

Response: It's (having a librarian is) a possibility.

Question: What types of things are we specifically talking about?

Response: This change will allow us to take advantage of anything from selling our own lab manuals (for \$10, cost \$6 – funds field trips for students in departments). Larger idea – CCSSC completed animation video for planetarium, may be commercially viable, but not sure on pricing. That could be bringing in \$ for university. Mobile apps for students are viable to sell to other universities, as we are in forefront.

Question: Can faculty/staff get anything out of this?

Response: The current policy needs revision to clarify that, but at this point, no. This is one reason for developing the LLC. Our sister schools take this into account, for faculty and

DRAFT MINUTES - Corrected

others already developing intellectual property. We are just beginning to deal with these questions.

Recommend that he work with Committee on Committees, make recommendations on structure at the next Senate meeting.

- c. UITS report on administrative privileges and access to software manuals - postponed
- d. Center for Quality Teaching and Learning – Director Iris Saltiel introduced herself.
- e. Teaching Evaluations group – membership selection - postponed