

Colorado State University-Pueblo AY 2015-16
Senate Meeting Minutes
January 18, 2016 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM

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

- I. Call to Order: Margie Massey
 - a. Meeting called to order at 3:35.
- II. Approval of minutes (November)
 - a. Unanimous approval of November minutes.
- III. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Unanimous approval of agenda.
- IV. Information Items/Reports
 - A. President Di Mare
 1. President Di Mare reported that she went to the legislature and met with a number of senators and representatives to discuss the Institute for Cannabis Studies. The university has support from members of the legislature, but the legislative session goes on until June, so the university will be vigilant in its request for financial support to start the institute. President Di Mare expressed excitement for the institute and the accompanying journal and international board. She also stated that the money that would come forward in support of the institution would set CSU-Pueblo forward. The institute will also show that CSU-Pueblo is a different four-year regional public institution—one that can conduct a kind of scientific research that usually occurs at land grant and Research 1 universities. President Di Mare reported that approximately twenty-one faculty members have expressed interest in doing research through the institute. Provost Kreminski confirmed this number. Provost Kreminski also stated that a two-page white paper has been prepared showing an expected annual award of \$1 million for two years in support of a journal, a conference, and a national advisory board.
 2. In reference to regional coverage of the institute, President Di Mare stated that KRDO provided the worst reporting. She, then, stated the *The Chieftain* supports the initiative. She also

emphasized our identities as researchers, affirming that we create and impart knowledge; we are not taking a stand on marijuana. President Di Mare is addressing community concerns.

3. President Di Mare confirmed that the dollars we would receive would be generated through a marijuana tax on growers. The funds are not E&G. President Di Mare stated that the Joint Budget Committee (JBC) will decide who receives the funds. She also stated that CSU-Pueblo has the support of its delegation, which includes 8 or 9 legislators. She assured the Senate that it will be broadly reported on if CSU-Pueblo receives the funds and moves forward with the institute and the journal because both initiatives represent a pioneering effort. President Di Mare also believes the institute could draw students to CSU-Pueblo. She would also like to us to consider the development of curriculum regarding the study of cannabis. President Di Mare will do her best to deal with all stakeholders. The president also spoke approvingly of the proposals submitted by faculty from all colleges. She stated that the institute would not involve faculty only from CSM. Lastly, she said that the recognition CSU-Pueblo would receive from the institute would generate funding that would support the university overall.

4. Dana Ihm stated that a faculty member asked her to ask President Di Mare what she thinks about CSU-Pueblo being labeled Marijuana U. President Di Mare replied that we are researchers and teachers. She also stated that we would not be the only institution researching drugs that are scheduled. Provost Kreminski confirmed the statement. He also stated that we will want to make that what we are doing is beyond repute, which is why he wants a national advisory board and a conference that is national in scope; we will not have local growers serving on the board, for example, because of conflict of interest issues. Provost Kreminski stated that we need to be cautious about how we proceed and that we need to emphasize our caution, although we cannot ultimately control how journalists will report on the institute. He, then, affirmed the need for the kind of research that would be conducted through the institute, especially research involving the recreational marijuana. President Di Mare stated that the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA) asserts there is not enough research done on this area. She also said that we will be made fun of initially, but we should emphasize our role as researchers and the social benefit of research in this area. Jacinda Heintzelman stated that if CSU-Pueblo does not do this research, someone else will. She cited physicians in Colorado who are conducting the effects of marijuana on seizure alleviation. She, then, emphasized that we

need the results of marijuana research, especially in the healthcare setting.

5. Jacinda Heintzelman suggested that the university web site could be a space to post positive and informed messaging about the CSU-Pueblo's interest in pursuing the Cannabis Institute. President Di Mare replied that Jacinda's suggestion was a good one. She, then, added that news of the Institute hit sooner than she wanted it to, but the administration is managing it. She referenced, for example, an editorial coming out intended to clarify questions people may have. Provost Kreminski, then, described the delicate conversations ongoing with the legislature. He stated that a year ago there was nearly \$10 million available for research that the legislature was making available and that the university hopes to tap into that amount. He discussed Sue Sisley, a physician with a Schedule 1 license from the DEA to conduct research on marijuana and PTSD whom the university has hired as an adjunct for \$1 a year to serve as a consultant. Sue received between \$2 and 3 million dollars last year in coordination with John Hopkins University, the University of Pennsylvania, and CU Denver. She has in-depth knowledge of the processes involved with marijuana research. Provost Kreminski expressed concern about saying too much too soon because other universities in the state such as CU Boulder may become interested in tapping into the \$10 million he referenced. He stated that it was unfortunate for the university to go to *The Chieftain* so soon, but it had to do so. He, then, stated that the university will be waiting for the next few months to find out if it's going to receive money in support of the Institute. President Di Mare added that you don't want to sound too confident before the legislators because they could claim that no promises of support were made. She also added that the situation is delicate, especially since the current session will last for another 3-4 months.

6. President Di Mare reported that the results of the equity study are in. The committee that oversaw the study will see the results first, after which the next steps will be identified. She stated that continues to work with the BoG and that she still has concerns that she voices at every board meeting. When speaking to board members individually, she emphasizes the need for COLAs and equity monies to adjust salaries appropriately. She will continue to make those arguments.

7. President Di Mare discussed a recent \$3 million gift that went towards academics in general, specifically a clause setting aside \$230,000 to benefit the university. She believes that the best way

to benefit the university is to set the money aside and to build upon it for faculty and staff who have not received raises or COLAs. If the money cannot be used in that way, then President Di Mare stated she would like to use it for the initiatives discussed in the Strategic Plan. She has asked to use the \$230,000 for either salaries or Strategic Plan initiatives. She reiterated that the donor said to use the money in ways that would benefit the university in the broadest sense. She will provide an update.

8. Regarding the Strategic Plan, President Di Mare reported that an update would be given to the BoG during the February meeting. She stated that the Strategic Plan looks great and that the implementation committee is doing a great job.

9. President Di Mare stated that she has not yet decided if the search to fill Paul Orscheln's will be national or statewide. The university does not have money to use a firm for the search. She added, however, that candidates for VP searches often do not believe a university knows what it's doing if it does not use a firm. President Di Mare will take over Paul's role in the interim, Chrissy Holiday will take over student services, and Marie Humphrey will take over career services and first-year programs.

10. President Di Mare discussed an RFDQ that will be distributed to get a quote for remodeling a building on campus that a local restaurant could use to establish a restaurant/pub on campus. She identified a clubhouse in Walking Stick as the target location. She reported that students desperately want a place they can go, so the pub could serve as a recruitment strategy. She stated that the pub will have a liquor license and big screen TVs and that efforts will be made to ensure that students under 21 are not allowed to drink. The university will consult with CSU-Ft. Collins, which has a similar establishment on its campus. President Di Mare emphasized that we need to get more activity on campus in order to get students into the residence halls. Her hope is that the pub will lead to other things coming to campus and that the pub will make the campus more residential.

B. Provost Kreminski

1. Provost Kreminski discussed an initiative to provide financial backing for new academic programs at the university. The initiative was developed by the Chancellor in coordination with President Di Mare. The provost addressed a question he received from some faculty: Will the university be able to support a needs assessment? He answered that the university could offer some limited support such as help with mailing. He, then, asked if anyone had questions he could address in his memo about the

program. Brian Vanden Heuvel asked to confirm that “new academic program” means a new major and not a new minor or emphasis area. Provost Kreminski replied yes; the programs should be new per Chancellor Frank. He, then, stated that the needs assessment for any new program should show that it can be self-sustaining, especially since the Chancellor will only offer support for approximately two years. He also emphasized the timeline for completing the process of application, stating that programs would need to be selected within a month’s time and that CAP Board would need to perform expedited reviews for initial approval. The new programs would not be available in Fall 2016 because they will need CDHE approval and there’s not enough time to do that. Brian asked what the proposal will look like, and the provost responded that details will be available in the memo he distributes. Only three, four, or five new programs will go forward. The deadline for the first round is February 15.

2. Questions and comments regarding the proposal process: (a) Bill Brown asked how the memo would be distributed. Provost Kreminski replied that the memo would be sent to deans and chairs, who would share it with faculty. (b) Ian Brennan asked if the needs assessment needs to include information on how the new program might impact existing programs. Provost Kreminski replied yes and then emphasized that the university is looking for new markets; it does not want to cannibalize students currently enrolled in existing programs. He added that the needs assessment should project the number of new students the program would bring to campus. “New” in this context means new to the university. (c) Margie Massey stated that the greater the specificity of instruction the better it will be for faculty attempting to submit proposals within the quick timeframe. Provost Kreminski replied that some programs may already have proposals in the pipeline (e.g., Masters of Social Work), so some areas may be further along than others in terms of submitting proposals. He, then, suggested methods for conducting the needs assessment, including pulling from national information sources such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics and contacting local high school counselors and teachers. He also suggested partnering with CSU-Ft. Collins or CSU-Global. Lastly, he suggested looking at the competition too, especially since proposals should address regional impact.

3. Provost Kreminski discussed revenue sharing. He stated that the university wants to develop a logical revenue sharing model. He reviewed his call to faculty in the fall to envision new markets and programming, including non-degree options such as certificate programs that could be channeled through Extended

Studies, and he encouraged us to continue to think through possible models for revenue sharing.

4. Provost Kreminski also discussed No Show. He emphasized how important No Show is for the university, stating that we need to have accurate enrollment values. He stated that faculty did a good job with No Show reporting in Fall 2015, which created fewer instances in which Amy Robertshaw had to drop students that needed to be dropped because faculty had not reported No Show. Faculty participation saves Amy time and provides accurate numbers on student enrollment. Regarding student enrollment, Provost Kreminski reported that as of noon, the university had exceeded its budget projection and that it would likely have more students enrolling during the week. He stated that if enrollment persists in this way, the university will have no unbudgeted issues this spring based on enrollment. He, then, asked us to discuss No Show with our colleagues, including adjuncts, to ensure that reporting happens. Amy Robertshaw confirmed that No Show is an option available through PAWS.

5. Lastly, Provost Kreminski discussed Starfish, a commercial product that helps with student retention and success initiatives, including things like early alert, arranging for meeting time, and reporting for athletes. He reported that a vendor for Starfish had made presentations on campus and that feedback was positive. The provost is finalizing plans to use Starfish on campus. The program will be available to faculty and staff advisors perhaps starting as early as this summer with training beginning toward the end of the spring and over the summer. Provost Kreminski stated that he has funding for it from a venture capital proposal he submitted to the CSU system under former Chancellor Mike Martin. His proposal was awarded \$85,000 for student success initiatives that are software-based. The amount will cover two and a half years of Starfish. Margie Massey asked if Starfish will take up all of the \$85,000 the provost was awarded. Provost Kreminski responded yes because the money is earmarked for software.

6. Margie Massey asked if the university has renewed its agreement with Gap Technologies, the company currently managing student evaluations on campus. Provost Kreminski said that we could revisit using the IDEA Center, a company recommended by the Faculty Senate; he will touch base with the IDEA Center to find out what products are currently available through them. Bill Brown stated that the IDEA Center did away with their pen and pencil approach to student evaluations and are currently administering evaluations through smartphones. Scott

Gage if questions of gender and racial bias in student evaluations are part of the discussion regarding the companies the university may partner with for student evaluations. Provost Kreminski responded that the virtue of the IDEA Center is that the company is a not-for-profit affiliated with Kansas St. that conducts research and writes papers on course evaluations. Bill Brown added that in comparison to other companies, the IDEA Center is truly unique because of the research they publish on all aspects of student evaluations.

7. Jude DePalma asked if he's required to do No Show for his graduate classes. Amy Robertshaw responded that faculty can do No Show for graduate classes, but it's not required.

C. Senate President - Margie Massey

1. Margie Massey reported on a forum the IT Board hosted during convocation week. She reported that the university will sign another one-year contract with Blackboard. She said that Faculty Senate has been asked if it is interested in partnering with ITB to host forums for beta testing of potential future products, including future tools to bring into the learning management system. The Senate could also allocate time to have ITB discuss tools at Senate meetings. Brian Vanden Heuvel replied that it might be more useful for ITB to go to the Chairs Council and/or departmental meetings; Senate might not be the best option if ITB is seeking feedback. Margie confirms that ITB is seeking feedback. She will suggest that ITB go to Chairs Council and departmental meetings. Provost Kreminski asked if the purpose of the forums is to demonstrate capabilities? Margie replied that ITB is not sure; they may want to toss Blackboard and explore other options or they may want to explore what tools Blackboard possesses. The provost said that ITB could present at Academic Council and could host a Food for Thought session.

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

a. 1st reading – APSB – Definitions of academic credit hour and catalog wording – Bill Brown

1. Bill Brown explained that the first APSB motion is intended to conclude work started during discussions last year about the academic calendar. The motion would ensure that definitions are consistent and that the revised definition would cover all of the required number of minutes for different kinds of classes offered. Jude DePalma asked for the definition of a credit hour. Bill replied that the definitions are the same as

those included in the calendar changes. Helen Caprioglio stated that the concise definition is 750 minutes of in-class work per each credit hour and twice that amount outside of class. Jude asked if the definition could be distributed to all senators. Provost Kreminski added that when combined with work inside and outside of class, each credit hour should equate to 2250 minutes of work. Jude asked if there had been an increase for graduate classes. The provost responded that a graduate credit hour should equal 3000 minutes of work. Amy Robertshaw explained how the university will track how many minutes are being met. Alan Mills asked if we're trying to define the minimum number of minutes and if there are issues if any classes go beyond the minimum number. Provost Kreminski confirmed that we are establishing a minimum number of minutes and that there is no problem going beyond the minimum. Michael Mincic stated that the motions were ambiguous. He suggested a revision to the language of the motion that would reference the credit hour policy. Margie Massey said that she would attach a fuller definition to the motion when she posts the motion to the I: Drive.

b. 1st reading – APSB – Experiential Education Learning criteria to designate EE courses – Bill Brown

1. Bill Brown stated that the second motion involves site accreditation for 2017. He added that the motion is intended to identify and designate classes as experiential according to specific criteria. The motion will approve the process of course designation with an initial round of approval taking place for Fall 2016. Michael Mincic requested a more clearly-stated motion, including language such as “experiential course designation.” Provost Kreminski identified changes that need to be made, including changing the title of the experiential education “chair” to “director.” Margie Massey replied that David Volk has submitted revised copies of the forms. The provost asked if the motion, then, is to adopt the most up-to-date version. Bill Brown and Margie Massey said yes. Neb Jaksic asked if CAP Board should be to approve course designation. Scott Gage responded that course designation would provide specific numbers on the amount of experiential learning happening on campus, which will benefit the university's QI. He also stated that the Experiential Education Roundtable, in conjunction with the Provost's Office, would be responsible for approving EE course designations. Neb asked how the EE designation would be reflected. Scott responded that it would appear in the same way that Honors designations currently appear. Amy Robertshaw

confirmed that the EE designation would appear on student transcripts. Neb asked what faculty would get out of designating their courses. Scott responded that designation would be helpful for producing numbers to provide to HLC. He added that course designation would provide students with a record of having taken EE-designated classes. Provost Kreminski added that course designation is also part of the Strategic Plan, which says that the university will increase the number of courses offering experiential learning by 2020. He hopes that faculty will take the step to apply for course designation. Ian Brennan asked if there is a version of experiential learning between the binary of whether a teacher is doing it or not. Scott Gage referred him to the web site for the Association of Experiential Education. Justin Goss asked if it's necessary to close the loop. Provost Kreminski replied yes and explained the pedagogical purpose for doing so. Bill Brown added that the proposal allows making different sections of a class experiential.

c. 1st reading – APSB – Catalog changes to graduation planning sheets, commencement details, substitutions, institutional requirements and rights for students' records – Bill Brown

1. There were no questions or discussions.

d. 1st reading – APSB – Catalog changes concerning required grade in prerequisite courses – Bill Brown

1. There were no questions or discussions.

e. 1st reading – APSB – Changing Registrar's process to align with the Catalog language by freezing the term GPA – Bill Brown

1. There were no questions or discussions.

f. 1st reading – CAPB – Catalog changes 2016-2017 – Donna Souder

1. Margie Massey reported that Donna Souder has had to resign from Faculty Senate because of her new responsibilities as Director of the CTL. Dean Folkestad will replace her, but there not time enough to do it for the Senate meeting. Brian Vanden Heuvel stated that CHASS is responsible for replacing Donna on the Senate while it's the Senate's responsibility to replace Donna on CAPB since Donna was the faculty representative from Senate that reported to the executive committee. He asked Ida Whited if she would be willing to serve as a CAPB representative. Ida agreed, and the

Senate approved unanimously. Ida stated that she would like to leave the Faculty Handbook Committee. Brian replied that HSB has to have representation on the Handbook Committee. He will look into options for HSB representation on the committee.

VI. Committees/Boards Reports

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

1. APSB had no report.

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

1. Brian Vanden Heuvel reported two open positions on the Faculty Disciplinary and Action Board; one position is in CHASS and one is faculty-at-large. The faculty-at-large position was left vacant by the Senate last year, and nothing happened. Brian made a motion to leave the position open for AY 2015-2016. Provost Kreminski asked how many people are currently serving on the board. Brian replied approximately 16. Neb Jaksic seconded Brian's motion. Unanimous approval of the motion.

2. Brian Vanden Heuvel reported that the Library Board currently has an open position for a full-time lecturer. He stated that Paul Brown, a full-time lecturer in Biology, is willing to serve on the board. Brian also stated that he could reach out to full-time lecturers and perform a search. Unanimous approval of Paul Brown serving on the Library Board.

3. Bill Brown asked if Dora Luz-Cobian's vacancy on the FPP had been filled. Brian Vanden Heuvel replied no.

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

1. Michael Mincic submitted the document submitted by CAPB for a first reading.

2. CAPB had no report.

d. Faculty Compensation Committee (FCC) – Margie Massey

1. Margie Massey reported that the FCC has not met yet, but with the completion of the equity study, it will be meeting with the equity study committee. Alan Mills asked if Margie could check with the FCC to find out if the issue of adjunct

pay was included in the equity study, especially since there was no CHASS representation during Chris Piccici's sabbatical. Margie stated that a request was made of Dean Folkestad to replace Chris, but he left the position open. Alan would like the issue to be revisited since there was no CHASS representation on the committee. Provost Kreminski stated that Alan's question might be mute because information on adjuncts may be included in the report.

e. Faculty Handbook Committee (FHC) –

1. Margie Massey reported that the FHC has no report because the committee needs a representative to report to the executive committee. She hopes someone will volunteer to serve in that role.

f. Faculty Procedures and Policies Committee (FPP) -

1. Margie Massey reported that the FPP is in the same situation as the FHC. The committee has no report because it needs a representative to report to the executive committee. She added that the committee met regularly in the fall and is waiting for instruction on how to proceed with APRs.

g. General Education Board (GEB) – Donna Souder

1. GEB had no report. Margie Massey stated that Senate also needs representation on the GEB since Donna Souder is no longer serving.

h. Graduate Studies Board – (GSB) Neb Jaksic

1. GSB had no report.

i. Information Technology Board (ITB) – Margie Massey

1. Margie Massey reported that ITB is working on an approach to addressing Blackboard, including consideration of new tools and consideration of new platforms. She said that ITB will have additional information to provide at the next meeting.

j. Scholarly Activities Board (SAB) – Neb Jaksic

1. Neb Jaksic did not have a report, but he did remind everyone to submit proposals for this year's round of Seed Grants.

k. University Budget Board (UBB) – Margie Massey

1. Margie Massey asked Helen Caprioglio to update the Senate. Helen said that the UBB's next meeting would be the following Wednesday.

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

1. Michael Mincic reported that the board will meet on February 4.

VII. Faculty Representatives

a. Board of Governors (BoG) – Mike Mincic

1. Michael Mincic reported that the next BoG meeting will take place February 4 and 5. Bill Brown asked when the BoG will discuss the Senate's revisions to the APR scoring. Michael replied that it's possible APRs could be discussed during his report on February 5.

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

1. Michael Mincic reported that the council will host a meeting at the university in April.

VIII. New Business

1. Bill Brown mentioned information about generous adjustments at CSU-Ft. Collins as information that should be distributed to the Senate if not more broadly. Margie Massey said that she would email a link to the information to all Senators.

2. Provost Kreminski asked if there is a committee looking at the senior lecturer position and if so, whether or not there are updates regarding the position. Margie Massey replied that FPP was responsible for the senior lecturer position but that the committee would likely push the matter down with the APR issue left to address. She added that lecturers at the university were concerned that they had not been given a voice about the senior lecturer position and that they would like their perspective to be considered before a motion is put forward.

IX. Adjournment

1. Brian Vanden Heuvel motioned to adjourn. Unanimous approval. The meeting adjourned at 5:21.