

**Colorado State University-Pueblo AY 2015-16**  
**Senate Meeting Agenda OUC Aspen Leaf Room**  
**October 19, 2015 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM**

Senators Present: Donna Souder, Brian Vanden Heuvel, Matt Cranswick, Jude DePalma, Sandy Hudock, Bill Brown, Steve Liebel, Ian Brennan, Justin Goss, Annette Gabaldon, Antonio Rueda Mesa, Alan Mills, Dana Ihm, Neb Jaksic, Ida Whited, Scott Gage, Michael Mincic, and Margie Massey

- I. Call to Order: Margie Massey
  - a. Margie Massey called the meeting to order at 3:32.
- II. Approval of minutes (September)
  - a. Unanimous approval of September minutes.
- III. Approval of Agenda
  - a. Margie Massey requested a motion to amend the agenda to include a first reading of catalog changes brought by APSB. Donna Souder motioned. Brian Vanden Heuvel seconded. Unanimous approval of amended agenda.
- IV. Information Items/Reports
  - A. President Di Mare
    1. President Di Mare discussed the power outages experienced on campus. She called Chris Burke on 9/25 to talk about the problem. She asked the electrical company to pull the number of outages the university had experienced in July, August, and September. She reported that the university experienced approximately 300 outages, all of which varied in duration. The electrical company sent a team to work with Facility Services on 9/25, and there have not been any outages since. By the end of 2016, the electrical company will have two dedicated lines to the university instead of one.
    2. President Di Mare reported that she convinced the BoG and the Foundation to each provide \$150,000 for non-base building money. The money will be provided at the beginning of December as a lump sum, from which fringe has been taken out so that a largely sum is rewarded. The money will be provided in early December. President Di Mare reported that the amount rewarded will be between \$750 and \$900, depending on whether PARA will require the university to contribute. Jude DePalma asked if other retirement plans will require the university to contribute. President Di Mare replied that VALIC will not

require the university to contribute. She will have to find out whether or not TIAA-CREF will require the university to contribute.

3. President Di Mare reported that Royal will be meeting with cabinet for two weeks to examine additional data for analysis. Cabinet will not be charged for flights or hotels. President Di Mare stated that Royal has done their job by increasing the number of students applying to the university; however, she also stated that there is no point in continuing to pay Royal if enrollment does not also increase. Cabinet will meet with Royal to determine what is best for the 2016-2017 academic year.

4. President Di Mare stated that last November, she appointed the Faculty Compensation Committee and representatives from Administrative/Professionals to review the equity study. The major study is almost complete, although on 10/13, HR received a five-page discussion of noted errors in the Fox Lawson final draft. President Di Mare reported that the gender and ethnicity study will not be distributed until all errors in the major study are corrected and until the gender and ethnicity study can be confirmed as correct. President Di Mare stated that we will be lucky to have the major study fixed by December. She also stated that she would like the appointed committee to recommend how to prioritize equity adjustments. Her cabinet will make the recommendations if the committee feels it cannot, but she would prefer the committee to do so.

5. President Di Mare discussed Ballot Issue 1B, the marijuana excise tax. She stated that a portion of the 3.5 million generated annually from the tax will support scholarships for residents of Pueblo County and will fund research on medicinal marijuana at the university. President Di Mare encouraged all to vote in favor of the measure.

6. President Di Mare reported an interest in bringing back the university's rodeo club, which brought in a lot of students years ago. The club could also result in donor monies. Specifically, President Di Mare stated that 8 influential community members who are considering donation to the campus as a whole would like to see the club come back. President Di Mare will move on this if it can bring money to the university.

7. President Di Mare stated that she has two primary goals. First, she wants to create more degree programs on this campus and wants to add more support to the current programs that are doing well. Second, she wants to make sure that we receive the raises and equity adjustments we deserve.

8. Bill Brown asked President Di Mare if she has identified funding with which we could make future equity adjustments. President Di Mare replied that she had hoped that money generated from online programs could be used.

B. Provost Kreminski

1. Provost Kreminski stated that he will soon issue a call for faculty development grants, which are not to be confused with the development that will become available through the MAESTRO program. He also reported that money from development grants will dry up next year; the monies came from CSU-Global and were one-time monies.

2. Provost Kreminski reported that the committees responsible for the dean searches have been created; however, their specific charges are left to be established.

3. Bill Brown asked for information about the current agreement between the university and the observatory. Provost Kreminski reported that he is conducting research regarding both usage, which could affect whether or not the university owes the observatory money, and what expenses the observatory incurs by working with the university. President Di Mare stated that legal has analyzed the observatory's claim that the university owes it \$20,000 and doubts we can be held to that amount.

C. Senate President - Margie Massey

1. Margie Massey thanked Dennis Flores for attending the meeting. She asked Bill Brown to provide background information on the work the ad hoc committee had completed on APR recommendations. Bill Brown thanked Dennis for attending and reported that the ad hoc committee had been given a mandate to change the university's APR distribution scores, which were deemed to high. He stated that the committee developed a solution but continues to have questions such as why we need to change score distribution and what the unintended consequences might be.

2. Dennis Flores stated that he was speaking for himself; he had no authority to speak on behalf of the board. He, then, stated that the APR issue has come up every year since 2011. From the BoG's perspective, the university's APR scores have no value: Board members want some value to come from APR evaluations, and by having a majority of faculty fall into the highest categories, the university may be cheating faculty by not providing sufficient feedback on performance. Dennis Flores reported that our APR scores seem strange by having no one fall

in below “exceeds expectations,” but he added that he hasn’t looked at our actual process and has an open mind toward what we do and why such disparity exists between our university, CSU-Fort Collins, and other colleges similar to ours.

3. Bill Brown stated that a problem involves the new APR standards being applied retroactively. He’s concerned about whether that could create a legal problem. He also added that he’s never seen a company forcing a certain distribution; good companies, he stated, tend to maximize people at higher level. Michael Mincic did not entirely agree with Bill on the timing issue as Faculty Senate chose to develop an ad hoc committee to develop a short-term solution. He, then, stated that a disadvantage of the timing issue involves securing votes to approve handbook changes. Dennis Flores asked if it is the wishes of Faculty Senate to leave the system the way it is.

4. Donna Souder stated that some faculty feel it is punitive to focus on APRs at this point when faculty at our university are not enjoying some of the benefits of being part of a system, including equity, COLA, and pay raises and merit pay. She added that looking at our APRs without also addressing other systemic issues and changes seems punitive. Dennis Flores disagreed because he doesn’t think the issues are connected. He added that he understands our financial frustrations, which he also feels, but he still believes that we could revise APR evaluations to better structure professional development. He’d like to understand why we feel there is a connection between APR evaluations and financial issues such as raises. Dana Ihm stated that our APRs are tied to tenure and promotion. She also stated that faculty going for tenure and promotion could be prevented from achieving both if the criteria for evaluating them changes. Dennis Flores replied that he understands that “meeting expectations” is the measurement for tenure and promotion. Since the university hardly has anyone in that category, he believes we could drop our scores a notch without impact. Brian Vanden Heuvel stated that dropping APR scores would affect tenure and promotion as faculty have to be in the top APR categories for three years to be tenure-eligible.

5. Bill Brown stated that another problem with the BoG’s directive is that comparing our university to CSU-Fort Collins is like comparing apples and oranges. He asked why the BoG would expect both schools to have the same distribution if the schools are so different. Dennis Flores replied that the BoG does not want the same distribution. President Di Mare added that the BoG does not want our distribution to look just like Ft. Collins; it

wants a normal distribution of scores from our university. Bill Brown showed a chart indicating that we can make our distribution scores look just like the distribution at CSU-Fort Collins. He added that he would have liked more communication from the BoG. Dennis Flores replied that he would be willing to present to the BoG a document expressing our thinking. He added that in his opinion, it would make more sense to compare our institution to other regional universities.

6. Ida Whited stated that she would like the BoG to think about internal incentive structures. She stated that faculty at our university have no incentives, so how can management incentivize faculty? She added that it costs taxpayers nothing for chairs to tell faculty they're doing well by way of the APRs. She would like Dennis to bring this point to the BoG. Dennis Flores acknowledged that Ida makes an excellent point: Evaluation systems should not only be used to measure productivity, but also to provide a baseline for increasing pay. Unfortunately, Flores stated, we haven't had the luxury to provide that kind of incentive. He, then, stated that if APRs are being used to congratulate faculty, then there might be an inflationary tick, which, he acknowledged, involves no financial cost. In response to President Di Mare's concerns about our university not being treated equally as a part of the CSU system, Dennis Flores stated that CSU-Pueblo has benefited from its membership within the system. Specifically, the system injected a total of \$8 million in 2013, and it allowed our university to refinance bonds.

7. Margie Massey recognized Jane Fraser, who stated that at a certain point, our administration put verbal labels on APR numbers without changing the numbers. She also asked how we can be held to certain standards without sufficient support, and she added that the current situation does not place the BoG in a good light since it's directing us to change our numbers without also addressing other issues. Dennis Flores replied that when it's been presented to the BoG, our APR evaluations are so sterile that they do not mean anything. He, then, acknowledged that while it's not fair to compare CSU-Pueblo to CSU-Fort Collins, this is an opportunity for us to re-evaluate our process. Speaking directly to Jane, Dennis Flores concluded by saying that the BoG does the best it can with information provided and that other issues such as pay need to be addressed.

8. President Di Mare stated that she would like to take a moment to say what she thinks: CSU-Pueblo needs to be infused with more money, especially since we are an HSI. Small institutions, she contended, will go under, but if they're in a system, the

system could help them; the system would want to help them. Dennis Flores responded, “Well said.” President Di Mare asked Flores if the BoG will be convinced by our arguments. He responded that it’s the chancellor who needs to be convinced. He’s encouraged that we will see changes from the chancellor, but we need to give him this year.

9. Margie Massey thanks Flores for attending the meeting. Dennis Flores stated that he pulls for Pueblo and is willing to talk with us any time and to look at solutions to the problems identified during the conversation. However, he also stated that the BoG is emphatic about seeing adjustments to our APRs evaluations that make sense. He thanked Senate for inviting him to attend the meeting.

V. Unfinished Business and New Action Items-First Readings, Second Readings, and Votes

a. 1<sup>st</sup> reading - APR Proposal – Ad-hoc Committee – Bill Brown

1. Jude DePalma stated that the proposal includes a mistake in that the scores go from 4.2 to 4.7 when they should go to 4.8. Bill Brown acknowledged that mistake. He, then, emphasized that the proposal provides a distribution that is less skewed. He also stated that the ad hoc committee’s objective was only to readjust distribution. He think that long-term solutions should be developed by FPP.

2. Brian Vanden Heuvel stated that the proposed solution would allow faculty to score 3.0 in all categories and still fall in the below category. He would like to see “meets expectations” start at 3.0. Bill Brown replied that he could redo the percentages to see what that would do.

3. Matthew Cranswick stated that he does not see the proposed solution as an actual solution to the BoG’s concerns. He, then, emphasized Dennis Flores’s comment that the BoG has our numbers but no context, which Cranswick identified as a communication problem. Bill Brown replied that the ad hoc committee was given a charge, and the thinks the committee has delivered on it. However, he also agrees with Cranswick’s concerns and will likely not vote for the solution.

4. Provost Kreminski stated that it might mean something to the BoG if we can show that we have made progress on the APR issue. Michael Mincic agreed, stating that with the committee’s proposal, we have proof that we have looked at this issue. To Provost Kreminski, Bill Brown stated that he does not buy the argument that all we have to do is abide by the BoG’s mandate.

He also disagrees that we have to do what the BoG wants even if it has negative consequence for our campus.

5. Margie Massey stated that our discussion today is a first reading and the proposal will come up for a second reading at the November meeting.

--Margie Massey asked for a motion to extend the meeting to 5:47. Bill Brown motioned. Michael Mincic seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

--Margie Massey introduced Alan Mills, who is replacing Dora Luz Cobian.

#### VI. Committees/Boards Reports

a. Academic Programs and Standards Board (APSB) – Bill Brown

1. Bill Brown reported that he will serve as APSB chair, although he's trying to find someone to serve as chair. He also reported that APSB will bring forward a motion involving minimum grade requirements for prerequisite classes.

b. Committee on Shared Governance (CSG) – Brian Vandenneuvel

1. No report.

c. Curriculum and Academic Programs Board (CAPB) – Donna Souder

1. No report.

d. Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) – Margie Massey

1. Margie Massey reported that FCC will be meeting in the next few weeks.

e. Faculty Handbook Committee (FHC) –

1. No report.

f. Faculty Procedures and Policies Committee (FPP) -

1. No report.

g. General Education Board (GEB) – Donna Souder

1. No report.

h. Graduate Studies Board – (GSB) Neb Jaksic

1. Neb Jaksic presented two motions involving 3+2 programs. The motions will come up for a second reading at the November meeting.

i. Information Technology Board (ITB) – Margie Massey

1. No report.

j. Scholarly Activities Board (SAB) – Neb Jaksic

1. Neb Jaksic reported that SAB has \$100,000 for research and scholarly and creative activities for this fiscal year. SAB would like to divide the money into two groups, one for Seed grants and one for SURP grants. SAB would like to divide the money as it has been divided before: \$80,000 for Seed grants and \$20,000 for SURP grants.

k. University Budget Board (UBB) – Margie Massey

1. Margie Massey reported that UBB has been meeting and will be dividing into subgroups.

l. University Board on Diversity and Equality (UBDE) – Mike Mincic

1. Margie Massey reported that Mike has submitted reports that she will distribute.

#### VII. Faculty Representatives

a. Board of Governors (BoG) – Mike Mincic

1. Margie Massey reported that Mike has submitted reports that she will distribute.

b. Colorado Faculty Advisory Council (CFAC) – Mike Mincic

1. Margie Massey reported that Mike has submitted reports that she will distribute.

#### VIII. New Business

No new business.

#### IX. Adjournment

Ida Whited motion to adjourn. Neb Jaksic seconded. Meeting adjourned at 5:38.