

PLEASE NOTE: Members, when addressing Faculty Council, please stand and identify yourselves. Guests wishing to speak please fill out a guest card to be handed to the Chair prior to speaking.

PLEASE NOTE: Members planning to introduce amendments are requested to provide copies to the Faculty Council Office, 18A Administration, at least 24 hours before this meeting.

AGENDA
Faculty Council Meeting
Tuesday, October 3, 2017 – 4:00 p.m. – A201 Clark

October 3, 2017 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Faculty Council Agenda – October 3, 2017– Clark A201– 4:00 p.m.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – November 7, 2017 – A201 Clark – 4:00 p.m.
2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website –
 August 15, 2017; August 22, 2017
[\(http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/\)](http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes - September 5, 2017
 (pp. 3-21)

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Faculty Council Standing Committee Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance – (p. 22)

University Committee Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance
 (p. 23)

D. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. President – Tony Frank
2. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda
3. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher
4. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

5. Medical Plan Survey Results – Diana Prieto and Teri Suhr

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – August 25, 2017; September 1, 8, and 15, 2017 (pp. 24-32)

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* - Section E.9 Faculty Productivity - CoRSAF (pp. 33-34)
2. Proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – Section K Resolution of Disputes CoRSAF (pp. 35-78)
3. Proposed revisions to Section E.12.1 Teaching and Advising of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL (pp. 79-81)
4. Proposed revisions to Section I.8 Student Course Survey of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL (pp. 82-83)

G. DISCUSSION

1. None.

Secretary's Note: Please detach at this line, print your name, and leave in attendance box at the Faculty Council Meeting. If you must be absent, you are encouraged to send a substitute representative of academic faculty status in order to provide proper representation at the meeting. Substitutes should turn in the attendance slip at the meeting and indicate on the slip whom they are representing. Members will find it helpful to have copies of the Faculty Council, University Curriculum Committee and Executive Committee minutes available for reference at the meeting.

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, please call, send a memorandum, or E-mail immediately to Rita Knoll, ext 1-5693.

NOTE: Final revisions are noted in the following manner: additions underlined; deletions ~~over scored~~.

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
September 5, 2017– 4:00 p.m. – A201 Clark

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Tim Gallagher, Chair.

Gallagher welcomed the Faculty Council members and explained how Faculty Council meeting agendas are organized.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – October 3, 2017 – A201 Clark – 4:00 p.m.

Gallagher announced that the next Faculty Council meeting would be held on October 3, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. in A201 Clark. President Frank will be attending this meeting at 5:00 p.m.

2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website –
 April 25, 2017; May 9, 2017
[\(http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/\)](http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

Gallagher announced that the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes are posted on the FC website.

3. Schedule of 2017-18 Faculty Council Meeting Dates
4. Faculty Council Membership List 2017-18.
5. Faculty Council Standing Committees Membership List 2017-18
6. University Committees Membership List
7. Parliamentary Motions – Quick Reference
8. Parliamentary Motions – What They Mean

Gallagher noted that Faculty Council has a nice set of checks and balances. Items are approved by Executive Committee to set the Faculty Council agendas. Faculty Council members can override Executive Committee and you can bring an item to the floor, adding this to the agenda, the guidance of Executive Committee notwithstanding. Also, reviewing the Parliamentary Motions is very helpful. Some parliamentary motions used regularly in Faculty Council are: **Motion to Amend** – amendments can only go two people deep, otherwise creates a little chaos.

Also, if a discussion is going 20-30 minutes and there is a perception that nothing new is being added to the conversation, you can **Call the previous question** – essentially saying - Let's stop talking about the main motion and let's vote now. **Division of the question** – Oftentimes come from a Standing Committee. The motion comes bundled with a part of a motion you may not like. You have the right to divide the question, addressing only one part of the motion and the other half at a later time.

9. UCC Minutes – April 28, 2017 and May 5, 2017

Gallagher announced that the UCC minutes were approved by Executive Committee at the May 9, 2017 meeting on behalf of Faculty Council.

Gallagher asked if any faculty member has any objections that EC approved these minutes. Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved by Faculty Council.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – May 2, 2017

By unanimous Faculty Council consent, the minutes of the May 2, 2017 Faculty Council meeting were approved. The minutes will be placed on the Faculty Council website.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Faculty Council Standing Committee Elections – Committee on Faculty Governance

Steve Reising, Co-Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance moved to elect the following faculty to three-year terms on Faculty Council Standing Committees, effective July 1, 2017.

BALLOT

**Academic Faculty Nominations to Faculty Council Standing Committees
September 5, 2017**

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

SCOTT SHULER

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

CHHS

2020

COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

<u>TODD DONAVAN</u>	COB	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES

<u>MEHMET OZBEK</u>	CHHS	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON NON-TENURE FACULTY

Term Expires

<u>DAN BAKER</u>	Engineering	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

<u>MIKE FALKOWSKI</u>	WCNR	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

<u>SVETLANA OLBINA</u>	CHHS	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

<u>MARIE LEGARE</u>	CVMBS	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND GRADUATE EDUCATION

<u>JUYEON PARK</u>	HHS	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON SCHOLASTIC STANDARDS

<u>LIBA GOLDSTEIN</u>	WCNR	2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	(temporary - one year)	

COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC AND FINANCIAL PLANNING

<u>CHUCK SHACKELFORD</u>	COE	2020
---------------------------------	-----	------

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

<u>JOSE LUIS SUAREZ-GARCIA</u>	CLA	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

<u>STUART COTTRELL</u>	WCNR	2018
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

<u>SALLY SUTTON</u>	WCNR	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

<u>DOREENE HYATT</u>	CVMBS	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

Gallagher asked if there were any additional nominations from the floor.

Carole Makela, Chair, UCC moved that Martin Gelfand, - College of Natural Sciences - be placed on the ballot as a UCC representative - term ending in 2019.

<u>MARTIN GELFAND</u>	CNS	2019
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

Gallagher asked if there were other additional nominations from the floor.
Hearing none, Gallagher closed the nominations.

All faculty members were elected to a three-year term beginning July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2020.

2. University Committee Elections

Steve Reising, Co-Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, moved that Faculty Council elect the following faculty to the University Committee – Grievance Panel:

BALLOT
University Committee Nominations
GRIEVANCE PANEL
3-year term
September 5, 2017

FRANK B. PEAIRS

Agricultural Sciences

2020

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

Gallagher asked if there were any additional nominations from the floor. Hearing none, Gallagher closed the nominations.

Peairs was elected to a three-year term beginning July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2020 on the Grievance Panel.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Miranda welcomed Faculty Council members to the academic year.

- Enrollment. Record enrollment. We are up in freshmen but down in transfer students. Not every single metric is up. We are up in nonresidents and flat with resident enrollment. Will watch metrics closely. We have maintained diversity and our academic profile. Today is census day, so we freeze data and start analyzing. More details to follow.
- Extended term of Ajay Menon, Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences. Thanked everyone involved throughout the process.
- Supervisory Training. Really trying to get this going this year. Kicking it up a notch this year. Training now expected of all supervisors. Office of Training and Organization Development is involved.
- Cabinet Evaluations. This year we are undertaking reappointments of certain leadership. Alan Rudolph and David McLean are in their 5th year of appointment so doing a more comprehensive review.
- Facilities. Huge year. Opening of four new major facilities: Chemistry building; Biology building; CSU Stadium, and Health and Medical Center. Very transformational year. Every facility came in on budget and on time. Congratulations to bio faculty--particularly noted in regard to 1st floor—museum quality displays that are just wonderful. A true asset to the campus. Other small projects done too: underpass at Shields street opened up. Most students live on west side and this was a dangerous place prior to this change--making it appropriate for pedestrian and bike traffic. Please take an opportunity to stroll through these facilities.

- Budget. We are now working on the FY19 budget. When we started in August, we presented a skeleton budget to the BOG. Now we need to plug in big ticket items: State appropriations, financial aid, enrollment estimates, mandatory costs from opening new buildings, etc. We have 10 months to work on this. At October BOG meeting is when some version of a balanced budget is presented. Changes to salary rate increases, instruction. Main dials to turn are tuition rates, state appropriation increases, salary rate increases, financial aid increases, and discretionary costs. Will present draft budget at October FC meeting.

We have had three BOG meetings since last May. Everything proposed on the agenda was passed by the Board. The Board has asked the Provost to give a presentation on “How Students Learn”, which started with Anne Cleary from Psychology, who researches memory and student learning. She gave a presentation on the myths and actuals about how students learn. The next presentation will be “Technology Enhanced Learning Environments.” Helps educate the Board about these things. To have the Board’s attention on these things is good

- Students Success Initiatives – Involves six action-planning teams. Each will be implementing plans to execute recommendations. Some are on faculty and staff professional development.
- Access and Enrollment. We had an unfortunate death within VP for Enrollment and Access – Melissa Trifiletti. She unfortunately passed away last month. Leslie Taylor has been appointed the interim VP for Enrollment and Access.
- DACA. Heard news re: DACA. We have 189 students that are DACA eligible and we are working on alternative protections. Tony Frank issued a message that went out this afternoon. Working with legislators and APLU as well. Should we encourage comprehensive immigration reform, or smaller efforts? Not sure what will be effective. Regardless, we have high concern for our students. Letting them know that as a community we want to help. Stay tuned.

Question:

Steve Shulman (CLA): Reviewing and adjusting salary discussions related to gender equity. Updates on degree to which it has been successful?

Miranda: About one month from now, we will be able to do the “deep dive” in terms of local resources.

Steve Shulman (CLA): To what extent did last year’s exercise make a difference?

Miranda: In one month we will harvest all the information.

Steve Shulman (CLA): How did last year compare to the year prior? Change between males and females?

Miranda: When you disaggregate by rank, college, or both. Made progress at the full professor level in specific colleges on distinctions in those locations. In about a month, we will know better about the effects of the Spring efforts and salary exercise. This information will be published as reports—coming in October.

Silvia Canetto (Psychology): Can you clarify how the university defines equity? Different definitions--20% below as cutoff for equity. Mechanisms that initiate audits—mentioned new mechanisms at May meeting and asked for update.

Miranda: It's not definitional but administrative to choose 20% outside, but this does not mean that if you're not outside this that you may not have an equity issues. They are simply triggers that allow supervisors to point out populations rather than a definition of equity.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (Languages, Literatures and Cultures): It's disappointing that the word on the street is that Faculty Council is essentially against the proposal.

Miranda: The administration is trying to encourage the improvement of working conditions of NTTF. Those conditions involve salary, professional development, culture and climate—none of these do we get a grade of “A”. Administration encourages with discussion, resources, and presentations at Faculty Council. The committee came forward with a comprehensive proposal, some of which would require *Manual* changes. Many of the things are attractive. We don't want to prejudice the important conversations of Faculty Council on this. I think there are some low hanging fruit in the proposal as well as more controversial items that will require more conversation.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (Languages, Literatures and Cultures): Is there an understanding by the administration that faculty is against NTTF? Is that the understanding of your administration?

Gallagher: I attended a CoRSAF meeting. CoRSAF had two high priority items that they were dealing with in the spring – the Bullying policy and Section K (not an overhaul of Section K, which held up the examination of the CoNTTF proposal. The next item in their queue is the CoNTTF proposal. The comprehensive proposal is likely to be chunked up by CoRSAF for CoNTTF. Recommendations will come from CoRSAF and Faculty Council will be able to debate.

Tom Chermak (School of Education): Some units on campus that are more heavily involved. School of Ed would be happy to help.

Karen Barrett (HDGS): Why is it that when there are financial implications of increased enrollment, why isn't more money doled out at the college level?

Miranda: Undergraduate level – Money is sent to colleges and should follow students. That doesn't mean that at any particular time a department will get its fair share. In some colleges, it's not a strategically sound approach to evenly distribute the money across all departments. Deans may want to move the resources around more effectively. I like to leave these decisions in the Deans' hands.

Karen Barrett (HDFS): I really meant the decisions about whether colleges get money or not. If a unit is really increasing in student credit production, then shouldn't money go there?

Miranda: It's not my job to take money away from a department that is losing enrollment. It's hard for Deans to move money around short-term. Resignations and retirements provide opportunities for discretionary use of money by Deans.

Mary Meyer (Statistics): Meyer pointed out that on the college's website there is the green book. Since 2005, the general revenues have doubled while college budgets have increased much more slowly than that. It has been dwindling yearly. Increasing at a much slower rate. 30% increase in students but only 14% increase of faculty. Meanwhile, athletic budgeting is going up in uneven ways. In stats enrollment skyrocketing but not hiring. Stretch in units due to lack of growth of faculty and funds in departments and colleges in the context of increasing enrollment. Effectively a budget cut. Please respond.

Miranda: College budgets are complicated—13 funds and 16 funds are all part of the funds. What I will tell you is that the president has invested in athletics a few million more, but the investment comes back in the form of scholarships.

Steve Shulman (CLA): Scholarships are an expense, not a revenue.

Miranda: Well, yes, the president has made a decision to invest there in athletics. 60+% of the budget goes to academics. Changes to a small part of the budget (athletics) compared to changes to large part of the budget (academics) are not exactly comparable. But it is true that the president has invested in athletics with a goal of obtaining a return on that investment. Enrollments are up. Tenure track faculty numbers are up. Research revenue is up. NTTF investment has gone up. First thing on the budget is to place money in academic units if enrollment increases. Prior to that, there was arm wrestling over who gets money. We would like to have more financial aid, better facilities, and so there are all competing demands with constraints.

Miranda: Instruction, research, collaboration with communities, degrees produced—I am proud of what the university has accomplished.

Mary Meyer (Statistics): Moved from 6 million to 22 million investment in athletic subsidy while not commensurate in academic units. Faculty are providing a central piece that is not being properly compensated.

Miranda: Tuition has doubled since 2005. As tuition has gone up, we have continued to offer scholarships that represent an expense on the books. This is an in and out, giving discounts and the value of those scholarships have gone up as tuition has gone up. When you disaggregate the components, it tells a different story. I agree with what Tony has decided.

Moti Gorin (Philosophy): Is there a way of measuring the experiment of whether the current investments are having the impact we think they are having, or that we want them to have?

Miranda: Athletics serves as one front door to market the university to some people. How do we know if a marketing strategy works—an ad in DIA, for instance? We instead can say that a marketing strategy is working overall but difficult to determine which item has had the great impacts. The athletics program is not the only marketing tool we have.

Robert Keller (Economics): The more money that you earn in athletics, the more you spend is a trend. That's shown nationally. Granting aid to student athletes is an expense. We should give all incoming students a full-ride because they each represent an opportunity cost. Grants and aid are an expense. You can't get it for free.

Tuba Ustuner (Marketing): I would like to push back against something you said, Rick. Actually, in the business world, people study marketing metrics and so I'd like to push back on whether a billboard works or whether millions of dollars towards a team works. There is a science behind this that allows for evaluation.

Miranda: Point well taken.

Tom Chermak (School of Education): The School of Education does not have an undergrad program. Licensing program, but no undergraduate degree program. My dean says there are "other leaks in the ship", which result in lack of incentivization for our school to do innovations. Our youth need different educational programs. Is there any consideration of new funding models to help colleges?

Miranda: If we think that the money that's going to academic units is not enough, then this can be tweaked for differential tuition. There will be a review of this and we can also revisit the 2-3-6 model, which is new and not mature. I have no philosophical objections to tweaking anything.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Gallagher greeted Faculty Council members and said it's good to be back. Gallagher believes in shared governance. We are entitled to say what we think and ask tough questions. I enjoy energized conversations. Gallagher's job is to facilitate the processes to get things through committees to get things proposed, and then welcome opposition and support of ideas. The level of agreement will vary. He wants to get Faculty Council members/ collective judgment. When Gallagher goes to committees, he tells them that it is their job to offer well-considered proposals. We have checks and balances in the system. The Chair of Faculty Council is an ex-officio member of all Standing Committees. He plans to attend at least one meeting for each Standing Committee. Agendas and minutes from all Standing Committees will go to Rita Knoll and Gallagher reviews in order to get all information the Faculty Council needs so the Faculty Council's collective will can prevail. Gallagher reported that he has been involved in AAUP and recently in an officer capacity. He believes in academic freedom. Shared governance differs on various facets of university operations. He is a member of the President's Cabinet and Deans group. He represents faculty's interest in these locations. Gallagher would be happy to receive the advice of all faculty. Also obligated to meet with AP and State Classified Personnel Committees, Learning Analytics Committee, and a member of the Conflict of Interest Committee. If you have issues in any of these areas, please notify him.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (Languages, Literatures and Cultures): I have a question and am not sure how to channel it. At the last April Faculty Council meeting, I asked President Frank if he could be rated alphanumerically for his evaluation and he was fine with this. I would like to contact the correct committee for this matter.

Gallagher: The faculty voice comes from Executive Committee. You can send your information directly to me. The President's evaluation usually occurs in the spring. The BOG does solicit faculty feedback, which goes to the Board of Governors.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (Languages, Literatures and Cultures): Can the calendar on this occur prior to the spring? Spring is too late to have an effect.

Gallagher: Executive Committee will solicit feedback. Executive Committee must follow the format and timetable given to it by the Board of Governors.

Lisa Langstraat (CLA At-Large): Is there also a mechanism for faculty to be involved with Provost and Vice Provost evaluations? Climate surveys and such that might provide a new opportunity for getting faculty voices more clear.

Gallagher: The President evaluates the Provosts and Vice Provosts. I am not familiar with these processes.

Mary Myer (Statistics): I am happy to see the speedy response of support by Dr. Frank for our DACA students. I also would like to see a strong statement of condemnation for the DACA policy from faculty.

Gallagher: Talk to your Executive Committee representative and recommend that something like this should be on the floor of Faculty Council.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Lenk reported the following:

I am representing all of faculty, just not Faculty Council. I am trained in boards and in accounting, so I have a keener eye in terms of how budgets are being identified. Feel this is a skilled board with good connections to legislature. I have been to three BOG meetings so far. Wide range of experience amongst BOG members. Extremely generous board and strong working relationships. Kim Jordan is a new addition to the Board and is very committed to success of Fort Collins. You can count on me to bring different models to help for a healthy response as our enrollment increases. Dr. Cleary's presentation to the Board on learning to was impressive. There's not much research to show that accommodating learning styles is an effective factor in student learning. There is a new President at CSU-Pueblo with good leadership skills. Gwen Gorzelsky did a presentation on course redesign and featured several very impressive faculty on this. If any of you have great stories to report on what's going on in your units, centers, etc., please pass them on as she sees herself as an ambassador for the university. Industry growing in e-gaming. This is creating a multi-million dollar industry and encourages faculty who are interested to pursue this as a new area. One final thing: CSU Global has invited any faculty from CSU-FC to dinner to leverage shared interests. Lenk invites interested folks to contact her so that she can coordinate such a dinner.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS – Faculty Council Representative Report

Margarita Maria Lenk.

The Board of Governors (BOG) met three times (May 2-3, June 15-16, and August 1-2) since the last Faculty Council meeting. Full BOG meeting minutes are available on the BOG web site. Below are my highlights notes from these meetings, and are not meant to be fully comprehensive summaries of the Board meetings.

The May 2-3 meeting was held on the CSU Fort Collins campus.

- 1) The Board of Governor's Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Award was awarded to Dr. Pallickara.
- 2) Ms. Susy Serrano will replace Allison Horn as the new System Director of Internal Auditing.
- 3) State Budget is not yet approved, SB 17-267 may repeal the state hospital provider fee that includes funding for state capital construction projects, and the new budget may contain a 2% reduction in funding for all state agencies in FY 19. The tentative CSU proposal was approved, pending State budget approvals. If the budget needs to change there will be another Board vote of approval at a later date. CSU –Fort Collins campus will have a 5% tuition increase, 1.4% increase in mandatory fees for resident undergraduate students, 2.9% increase in housing and dining fees, making an average increase of 3.6% in tuition and fees. Faculty salaries increase in this proposal is for 2.25%. The FY 19 combined campuses capital construction prioritization list was approved.
- 4) Proposal for increasing the cost of parking permits by 3% for the next three years was approved.

- 5) Proposal for increasing the fines of traffic citations on campus to be closer to 70% of the similar fines in the city of Fort Collins was approved.
- 6) Paul Doherty, Faculty Representative to the Board expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to serve, and explained his Semester at Sea teaching plans. (per the request of the board).
- 7) Amy Parsons explained that the stadium was proceeding on time and within budget and the progress on the National Western Center. VP Blanche Hughes explained that the Game Day Experience Committee had been meeting for 2 years and was ready for the new stadium events, activities and issues. The re-park policies (signed by residential freshmen living on campus) were explained for at home football games.
- 8) Dr. Frank awarded Mr. Haberecht the Ram Pride Service Award for his work above self and beyond the call of service for his interfaces with the community regarding the new campus stadium, as well as Mr. Barker and Ms. Walsh who assisted a homeless veteran become successfully enrolled at CSU.
- 9) Student representative reported the progress towards online course surveys, sustainability collaborations, alternative transportation, free speech policies, the Bell from Old Main (partnership with the Alumni Association), student fees, a proposed System passport for all students, participation in the CSU-Pueblo ICR conference, food security initiatives and ASCSU's commitment to diverse groups and points of view.
- 10) A new for-profit company, Beyond Campus Innovations (BCI) has been created for CSU-Global Campus' revenues from servicing outsourced organizational training. CSU System Foundation is the only shareholder. BCI will provide annual reports to the Board of Governors.
- 11) Real Estate Committee: The new refresh plan for the Shepardson Hall addition will be included on the state's capital construction list. The JBS Global Food Innovation Center is now in phase II and is added to the state's cash-funded list. Both were approved.
- 12) Academic and Student Affairs Committee: All new program and courses and consent agenda were approved. New graduate degree programs: MS of Science in Materials Science and Engineering, New Bachelor Degree program in Women's and Gender's Studies, 8 new Graduate Certificate programs. All faculty manual changes were approved: C.2.1.9.3, C.2.1.9.4, C.2.1.9.5h, C.2.1.9.5i, E15.1, F.3.2.1, and I.19.
- 13) Gwen Gorzelsky indicated the relationship between faculty and instructional designers with two coursework redesign examples, one from the distance MSW program (Ms. Riep), and the other from the Microeconomics team (Dr. Gebhardt).
- 14) Dr. Frank reported Colorado higher education system leaders will drafting a master plan refresh. The state's master plan has four main goals: increase credential completion; erase equity gaps; improve student success; and invest in affordability and innovation. Dr. Frank explained there is a national goal through a study by the Lumina Foundation for a 60% credential completion rate based on projected work force needs. The CCHE and Colorado determined a rate of 66% is needed by 2025.

The June 16-17 meeting/retreat was held at the Cheyenne Mountain Resort in Colorado Springs.

- 1) Tony Frank provided a thoughtful summary of the heritage of the Land-Grant University system and summarized the current opportunities and challenges. He believes that CSU needs to innovate wherever possible, find system-wide efficiencies, scale successes rapidly, and focus on outcomes, not operations, never settling for less than what we are capable of doing. He believes that CSU can innovate how we deliver courses and what we deliver as the future marketplace for education and skill development is changing. CSU currently ranks in the top 10 as #7 in a national assessment of universities that teach critical thinking, reasoning, writing, and problem-solving. CSU-Global and CSU-Pueblo provided their campus visions.
- 2) Presentation on Future Learn, the platform of choice at CSU for MOOCs.
- 3) Strategic planning and mapping for the CSU system was the topic of the rest of this retreat.

The August 1-2 meeting was held at the CSU – Global campus in Greenwood Village, CO.

- 1) The Board of Governor's teaching award was presented to Dr. Smith, from CSU-Global in math and computer science.

- 2) Academic and Student Affairs Committee will approve all degree candidates at the August board meetings.
- 3) Dr. Frank spoke about faculty activities, earning more sponsored research awards than peer institutions, and making at least 90% of the salaries of peer institutions,
- 4) Dr. Cleary from CSU-Fort Collins' psychology department made a great presentation on the science of learning and how humans have very little insight into what leads to permanent learning, indicating that there are ineffective study habits. She has created a new course, PSY 152 to help students become better learners. Initial results are very positive.
- 5) Joe Parker provided an Athletic report, stating that CSU athletes tracked with CSU students in terms of retention, graduation, and GPA rates. CSU ranks 3rd or higher in Mountain West, with 9 teams finishing in the top 2 positions. Basketball, football and volleyball were ranked 3rd in the nation with the most winningest teams (>75%) Tom Hilbert is the winningest Division I coach in Colorado. Track and Field has the most All American honors.
- 6) Finance and Audit Report: University Disaster Recovery Plan Audit for IT, Financial Commitments, Center for International Programs at Pueblo. CSU-P audit is finishing up, Internal Audit dept. review,
- 7) Lynn Johnson, Office of Budget: state is still considering a 2% reduction of upcoming budget. Most of the academic incentive funding is from the differential tuition, most of it is from the PVM program this year. Currently, at a 9.6 million dollar deficit. Different higher education institutions are asking if the 2% reduction will include tuition in addition to expenditures which may make budget deficits much larger. CSU is performing cost-driver analyses. Colorado is still expected to grow by 6.1%; SB17-267 approved hospital fee, but reduced the Tabor limit for the permanent future. Regarding CSU bonds, a swap contract on the variable rate bonds (<1% to 2.4%ish) with a derivatives policy added is being considered, but the interest rate would still be within in the athletic budgeted rate of 2.4%.
- 8) Amy Parsons: Stadium construction is on time and in budget, and it is expected to finish on time and on budget. VIP areas are sold out. Contingency fees were spent mostly on the practice field features. Alumni Hall may be named soon.

The next BOG meeting will be Oct 5-6 on the Fort Collins Campus.

My overall impression: CSU has a very caring, supportive, knowledgeable, engaged, and skilled board at this time. Their wide range of leadership and experience, along with their generous attitudes towards sharing their foresights, insights, and willingness to work together with each other, as well as with the three administrations, faculty, staff, and students, was extremely evident and palpable. From her comments, and the reaction to her comments, I believe that Kim Jordan will bring many valuable vision and business insights to this board, as well as a commitment to and knowledge about Fort Collins.

Questions:

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (Languages, Literatures and Cultures): Is it possible to have any BOG member join a FC meeting at least once a year so they can understand what Faculty Council does?

Lenk: Presentation President Frank made. Nationwide report.

Lenk's report was received.

4. Faculty Council Standing Committee 2016-17 Annual Reports
 - a. Faculty Council Report to the Board of Governors
 - b. Committee on Faculty Governance
 - c. Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
 - d. Committee on Libraries
 - e. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

- f. Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty
- g. Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education
- h. Committee on Scholastic Standards
- i. Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning
- j. Committee on Teaching and Learning
- k. Committee on University Programs
- l. University Curriculum Committee

Gallagher presented the above written annual reports to Faculty Council. All reports were received.

5. University Benefits Committee

Gallagher asked if there were any questions regarding this report. Hearing none, the report was received.

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Confirmation of Faculty Council Secretary – Rita Knoll – Executive Assistant to Faculty Council
- 2. Confirmation of Faculty Council Parliamentarian – Lola Fehr – Professional Registered Parliamentarian
- 3. UCC Minutes – August 18, 2017

Carole Makela, Chair, UCC moved that Faculty Council adopt the consent agenda.

The consent agenda was unanimously approved by Faculty Council.

ACTION ITEMS

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

Carole Makela, Chair, University Curriculum Committee, moved that Faculty Council approve a New Degree: Ph.D. in Watershed Science.

Monique Rocca (Natural Resources): This is not truly a new Ph.D. in Watershed Sciences. It was at geosciences. This is just an administrative item to align it in the correct department.

Makela: By CSU standards, this is a new degree.

Tom Chermak (School of Education): The department has the capacity to do this?

Makela and Rocca: Yes.

Makela's motion was unanimously approved by Faculty Council, pending final approval by the Board of Governors.

DISCUSSION

1. None

Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

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

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2019
Stephen Coleman	Animal Sciences	2018
Scott Nissen	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management	2018
Adam Heuberger	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2019
Thomas Borch	Soil and Crop Sciences	2020
<u>Jane Choi</u>	College-at-Large	2019
Merlyn Paulson	College-at-Large	2020
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2019
Health and Human Sciences		
Anna Perry	Design and Merchandising	2019
Brian Tracy	Health and Exercise Science	2018
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2019
Karen Barrett	Human Development and Family Studies	2018
Bolivar Senior	Construction Management	2020
Matt Malcolm	Occupational Therapy	2020
Tom Chermak	School of Education	2018
Eunhee Choi	School of Social Work	2019
Business		
<u>Bill Rankin</u>	Accounting	2019
Stephen Hayne	Computer Information Systems	2018
Tianyang Wang	Finance and Real Estate	2019
Troy Mumford (excused)	Management	2018
Tuba Ustuner	Marketing	2018
Lisa Kutcher	College-at-Large	2019
John Hoxmeier	College-at-Large	2019
Engineering		
Russ Schumacher	Atmospheric Science	2018
Travis Bailey	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2019
Rebecca Atadero	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2018
Siddharth Suryanarayanan	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2019
Shantanu Jathar	Mechanical Engineering	2020
J. Rocky Luo	College-at-Large	2019
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Ted Watson</u>	College-at-Large	2018

Liberal Arts

Michael Pante	Anthropology	2020
Marius Lehene	Art (will serve term thru Fall '19)	2019
Julia Khrebtan-Horhager	Communication Studies	2019
Robert Keller	Economics	2020
TBD	English	2017
Albert Bimper	Ethnic Studies	2019
Peter Erickson	Languages, Literatures and Cultures	2018
(substituting for Jonathan Carylyon – Fall Sabbatical)		
Robert Gudmestad	History	2020
<u>Gayathri (Gaya) Sivakumar</u>	Journalism and Technical Communication	2020
<u>Wesley Ferreira</u>	Music, Theater, and Dance	2019
Moti Gorin	Philosophy	2019
Kyle Saunders	Political Science	2018
Tara Opsai	Sociology	2019
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2019
Steve Shulman	College-at-Large	2020
David Riep	College-at-Large	2018
Allison Prashch	College-at-Large	2020
Lisa Langstraat	College-at-Large	2020

Natural Resources

Monique Rocca	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2020
Julie Savidge (Fall 2016 and 2017; Barry Noon (Spring 2017 and 2018)	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2018
Chad Hoffman	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2020
William Sanford	Geosciences	2020
Tara Teel	HDNR in Warner College	2020

Natural Sciences

<u>Jennifer Nyborg</u>	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	2019
<u>Melinda Smith</u>	Biology	2018
George Barisas	Chemistry	2020
Ross McConnell	Computer Science	2019
Yongcheng Zhou	Mathematics	2020
TBD	Physics	2017
Silvia Canetto	Psychology	2019
<u>Mary Meyer</u>	Statistics	2019
Chuck Anderson	College-at-Large	2020
<u>Anton Betten</u>	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Janice Moore</u>	College-at-Large	2018
Brad Conner	College-at-Large	2018
Alan Van Orden	College-at-Large	2020

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

C.W. Miller	Biomedical Sciences	2019
Dean Hendrickson	Clinical Sciences	2019
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2020
Alan Schenkel	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2018
Noreen Reist	College-at-Large	2020
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2020
<u>William Black</u>	College-at-Large	2020
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Anne Avery</u>	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Tod Clapp</u>	College-at-Large	2019
Dawn Duval	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Patrick McCue</u>	College-at-Large	2018
Stuart Tobet	College-at-Large	2018
DN Rao Veeramachaneni	College-at-Large	2018

University Libraries

<u>Nancy Hunter</u>	Libraries	2019
Michelle Wilde	At-Large	2019

Ex Officio Voting Members

Timothy Gallagher	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2018
Sue Doe	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2018
Margarita Lenk	BOG Faculty Representative	2018
Don Estep, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2019
Todd Donovan, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2017
Nancy Hunter, Chair	Committee on Libraries	2019
Jenny Morse, Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Marie Legare, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty	2018
Donald Samelson, Chair	Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education	2019
Karen Barrett, Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2019
Katharine Leigh, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2019
Matt Hickey, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2019
Patricia Rettig, Interim Chair	Committee on University Programs	2018
Carole Makela, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2018

Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members

Anthony Frank	President
Rick Miranda	Provost/Executive Vice President
Brett Anderson	Special Advisor to the President
Kim Tobin	Vice President for Advancement
Mary Ontiveros	Vice President for Diversity
Louis Swanson	Vice Provost for Engagement/Director of Extension
Robin Brown	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
Dan Bush	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Patrick Burns	Vice President for Information Technology/Dean Libraries
Jim Cooney	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Tom Milligan	Vice President for Public Affairs
Alan Rudolph	Vice President for Research
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Kelly Long	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
Lynn Johnson	Vice President for University Operations
Ajay Menon	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Jeff McCubbin	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
David McLean	Dean, College of Engineering
Jodie Hanzlik	Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Jan Nerger	Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Mark Stetter	Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
John Hayes	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Shannon Wagner	Chair, Administrative Professional Council

BALLOT
Academic Faculty Nominations to Faculty Council Standing Committees
October 3, 2017

COMMITTEE ON NON-TENURE FACULTY

		Term Expires
<u>C.W. MILLER</u>	CVMBBS	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
<u>MARY VAN BUREN</u>	CLA	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

<u>HONG MIAO</u>	CoB	2020
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

BALLOT
University Committee Nominations
GRIEVANCE PANEL
3-year term
October 3, 2017

MICHAEL GROSS

(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

CoB

2020

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

A regular meeting of the University Curriculum Committee was held on **August 25, 2017** at 2:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes

The minutes of August 18, 2017 were approved.

Consent Agenda

Informational item only.

Please note: Approved curriculum changes are summarized below. Additional details may be viewed in the Curriculum Management (CIM) system by clicking on the hyperlinked course number or program title below.

New Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
CIVE 458	Environmental Geotechnics		Spring 2018
ETST 260	Contemporary Indigenous Issues	Approved as AUCC 3C: Social & Behavioral Science	Spring 2018
FIN 309	Fundamentals of Entrepreneurial Finance		Spring 2018
HORT 522	Horticulture and Human Health Issues		Spring 2018
LSPA 342	Spanish for Animal Health and Care II		Spring 2018
LSPA 444	The Intercultural Workplace-Animal Health/Ag		Spring 2019
NSCI 611	Leadership in Animal Organizations		Spring 2018
NSCI 631	Marketing for Animal Organizations		Spring 2018
Major Changes to Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes/Changes	Effective Term
MLSC 302	Applied Leadership in Small Unit Operations Changing Environments	Title; description	Spring 2018
Course Reactivations			
Course #	Course Title	Notes/Changes	Effective Term
MU 265A	Singers Diction: German/English	Reactivating course, adding online offering, & revising offering term, offering year, course description)	Fall 2018
MU 265B	Singers Diction: French/Italian	Reactivating course and revising offering year	Fall 2018

CONSENT AGENDA		
Experimental Courses – 2nd Offering (<i>For Informational Purposes Only</i>)		
Course #	Course Title	Effective Term
CS 581A3	Software Maintenance & Evolution	Spring 2018

Minutes approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 9/1/2017.

Carole Makela, Co-Chair
Mike Hogan, Co-Chair
Shelly Ellerby, Curriculum Liaison Specialist

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

A regular meeting of the University Curriculum Committee was held on **September 1, 2017** at 2:00 p.m.
The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes

The minutes of August 25, 2017 were approved.

Consent Agenda

The Consent Agenda was approved.

Please note: Approved curriculum changes are summarized below. Additional details may be viewed in the Curriculum Management (CIM) system by clicking on the hyperlinked course number or program title below.

New Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
CIVE 564	Principles of Structural Load Modeling	Offered previously as CIVE 581A7	Spring 2018
CIVE 661	Stochastic Methods in Structural Dynamics	Offered previously as CIVE 681A3	Spring 2018
FSHN 600	Responsible Conduct of Research	Offered previously as FSHN 580A2	Spring 2018
MIP 768	Advanced Clinical Pathology	Offered previously as MIP 781A2	Spring 2018
VS 665C	Advanced Topics in Veterinary Cardiology: Invasive Catheterization & Hemodynamics		Spring 2018
Major Changes to Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes/Changes	Effective Term
CIVE 467	Design of Reinforced Concrete Structures	Adding Fall offering term; changing from Student Option to Traditional grade mode	Spring 2018
E 311C	Intermediate Creative Writing: Nonfiction	Prerequisite, adding online offering, grade mode	Spring 2018
ECE 303 / STAT 303	Introduction to Communications Principles	Adding online format	Spring 2018
ECE 656	Machine Learning and Adaptive Systems	Adding online format	Spring 2018
ECON 435	Intermediate Econometrics Economic Forecasting	Course title and description; offering year	Spring 2018
EDUC 320	Educational Psychology	Removing correspondence format, adding face-to-face format, keeping online format; change Schedule Type/Credit Distribution	Spring 2018
HDFS 470A	HDFS 470A: Campus Connections–Mentoring At-Risk Youth: Youth Mentor	Adding subtopic to HDFS 470; submitted as a change to 470, which is the preferred process to add subtopics to an existing course; prerequisite/registration information updated	Spring 2018
HDFS 470B	HDFS 470B: Campus Connections- Mentoring At Risk Youth: Mentor Coach	Adding subtopic to HDFS 470 (submitted as new course)	Spring 2018
HDFS 470C	HDFS 470C: Campus Connections- Mentoring At Risk Youth: Program Administration	Adding subtopic to HDFS 470 (submitted as new course)	Spring 2018
SOCR 240	Introductory Soil Science	Adding online format; changing offering term	Spring 2018

New Minor		
Program Title	Notes	Effective Term
Minor in Creative Writing	Approved to be offered as Main Campus Face-to-Face and Distance/Online	Fall 2018

CONSENT AGENDA			
Course Deactivations			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
AGRI 465	Pesticide Management	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Fall 2017
AGRI 468	Management and Control of Turfgrass Pests	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Fall 2017
CIVE 595A	Independent Study: Fluid Mechanics/Wind Engineering	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 595B	Independent Study: Hydraulics	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 595C	Independent Study: Hydrology and Water Resources	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 595D	Independent Study: Mechanics	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 595E	Independent Study: Geotechnical Engineering	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 595F	Independent Study: Structures	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 595G	Independent Study: Environmental Engineering	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 595H	Independent Study: Water Resources Planning and Management	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 595I	Independent Study: Ground Water	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 595J	Independent Study: Bioresource and Agricultural Engineering	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
CIVE 654	Experimental Soil Mechanics	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Fall 2017
HIST 436B	Study Abroad: The Land of Israel–Past and Present	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
Minor Changes to Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
ECE 622 / ENGR 622	Energy Networks and Power Distribution Grids	Offering term and year; prerequisite	Spring 2018
NR 505	Concepts in GIS	Prerequisite	Spring 2018
NRRT 270	Principles of Natural Resource Tourism	Offering term	Spring 2018

Minutes approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 9/8/2017.

Carole Makela, Co-Chair
Mike Hogan, Co-Chair
Shelly Ellerby, Curriculum Liaison Specialist

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

A regular meeting of the University Curriculum Committee was held on **September 8, 2017** at 2:00 p.m.
The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes

The minutes of September 1, 2017 were approved.

Consent Agenda

The Consent Agenda was approved.

Please note: Approved curriculum changes are summarized below. Additional details may be viewed in the Curriculum Management (CIM) system by clicking on the hyperlinked course number or program title below.

New Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
NSCI 621	Workplace Wellness – Animal Organizations	Previously Offered as NSCI 680A2	Spring 2018

Major Changes to Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes/Changes	Effective Term
BUS 662	International Business	Officially adding online format and permanent partial semester designation; edits to course description	Spring 2018
CIVE 524/WR 524	Modeling Watershed Hydrology	Changing offering year from Odd to Every	Spring 2018
HES 303	Biomechanics and Neurophysiology	Adding online format; change to offering term	Spring 2018
HIST 436	HIST 436A: The Land of Israel: Past and Present Study Abroad – Pre & Post Travel: The Land of Israel – Past and Present	Converting study abroad course to on-campus course. Edits to course number, title, description, schedule type/credit distribution; registration information; removing permanent partial semester	Spring 2018
NRRT 671	Strategic Management for Travel and Tourism	Adding mixed face-to-face offering format.	Spring 2018

Major Change to Existing Study Abroad Course			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
EDHE 640A	Study Abroad – Global Perspectives: Higher Education and Student Services Student Affairs Abroad	Adding online format for lecture hours; edits to course title and description	Spring 2018

Approved Third Experimental Course Offering			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
POLS 381A1	Women and Politics	Previous offerings: Spring 2013 (12 students) and Fall 2014 (15 students).	Spring 2018

CONSENT AGENDA

Course Deactivations

Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
EDCT 370	Laboratory Management, Safety, and Liability	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
EDCT 403	Coordination Techniques of Cooperative Programs	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
EDCT 630	Organization of Business Education	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
EDCT 631	Management of Business Departments	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
EDCT 640	Methods in Marketing Education	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
EDCT 641	Programs in Marketing Education	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
EDUC 255	Introduction to Education	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
EDUC 620	Philosophy of Education	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
EDUC 622	Innovative Social Studies Teaching	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
EDUC 623	Innovative Science Teaching	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
FSHN 575	Nutrition Education for a Health Heart	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018

Minor Changes to Courses

Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
HDFS 608	Program Planning and Implementation	Changing offering year from Even to Odd	Spring 2018
HDFS 677	Ethical and Legal Issues	Changing offering year from Odd to Even	Spring 2018

Minor Changes to Programs

Program Title	Notes	Effective Term
Master of Accountancy, Plan C, Data Analytics and Systems Specialization	Adding 10 courses to existing electives list of 3 courses (all from COB)	Spring 2018
Master of Accountancy, Plan C, Financial Analysis, Auditing, and Reporting Specialization	Adding 9 courses to existing electives list of 4 courses (all from COB)	Spring 2018

Minutes were approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 9/15/2017.

Carole Makela, Co-Chair
Mike Hogan, Co-Chair
Shelly Ellerby, Curriculum Liaison Specialist

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

A regular meeting of the University Curriculum Committee was held on **September 15, 2017** at 2:00 p.m.
The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes

The minutes of September 8, 2017 were approved.

Consent Agenda

The Consent Agenda was approved.

Please note: Approved curriculum changes are summarized below. Additional details may be viewed in the Curriculum Management (CIM) system by clicking on the hyperlinked course number or program title below.

New Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
ANEQ 115	Applied Equine Behavior		Spring 2018
ANEQ 200	Applied Horsemanship and Equitation		Spring 2018
AREC 454/ REL 454	Real Estate Appraisal	The content from AREC/REL 452 and AREC/REL 453 are being combined to create this new 3-credit course. Both 2-credit courses will be deactivated.	Spring 2018
CM 506	Protein Basics for NonBiologists	Offered previously as CM 580A1	Spring 2018
EDUC 375	Comparative Education	Distance/Online and Face-to-face	Spring 2018
Major Changes to Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes/Changes	Effective Term
ANEQ 334	Principles of Equine Genetics	Adding online format and Summer offering term; adding Sophomore standing; edits to course description	Spring 2018
ANEQ 344	Principles of Equine Reproduction	Decreasing from 4 to 3 credits (dropping lab hours); adding online offering format, Spring offering term, and 'Sophomore standing' restriction. Required AUCC 4B course for the Major in Equine Science – a program proposal needs to be submitted to adjust the credits on the POS and MCM.	Spring 2018
AREC 328	Small Agribusiness Management	Adding online format and Spring offering term; minor edit to course description	Spring 2018
CO 301A	Writing in the Disciplines: Arts and Humanities	Adding online format to existing AUCC Advanced Writing and GT-CO3 course	Spring 2018
CO 301B	Writing in the Disciplines: Sciences	Adding online format to existing AUCC Advanced Writing and GT-CO3 course	Spring 2018
CO 301D	Writing in the Disciplines: Education	Adding online format to existing AUCC Advanced Writing and GT-CO3 course	Spring 2018
MECH 543	Biofluid Mechanics	Adding online format; graduate standing requirement; adding BIOM 421 and CBE 331 as prerequisite options	Spring 2018

New Degree		
Program Title	Notes	Effective Term
Major in Data Science	'Placeholder' proposal for the B.S. degree	Fall 2018
Major in Data Science, Computer Science Concentration	DSCI 445 – AUCC 4B DSCI 478 – AUCC 4A/4B/4C	Fall 2018
Major in Data Science, Economics Concentration	DSCI 445 – AUCC 4B DSCI 478 – AUCC 4A/4B/4C	Fall 2018
Major in Data Science, Mathematics Concentration	DSCI 445 – AUCC 4B DSCI 478 – AUCC 4A/4C	Fall 2018
Major in Data Science, Statistics Concentration	DSCI 445 – AUCC 4B DSCI 478 – AUCC 4A/4C	Fall 2018

CONSENT AGENDA

Experimental Course- 1 st offering			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering			
CIVE 680B1	Stochastic Simulation in Engr Applications		Spring 2018
College of Liberal Arts			
E 380A2	Documenting Globalism		Spring 2018
Warner College of Natural Resources			
GEOL 581B1	Tectonic Geomorphology		Spring 2018
College of Natural Sciences			
NSCI 680A5	Physics for Educators – Mechanics		Spring 2018
STAT 581A1	Statistical Consulting Skills		Spring 2018
STAT 581A2	Directed Statistical Consulting		Spring 2018

Course Deactivations			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
GEOL 560	Clay Mineralogy	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018
GEOL 747	Advanced Sedimentary Petrology	Not referenced in any programs or courses	Spring 2018

Minor Changes to Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
College of Agricultural Sciences			
ANEQ 300N	Topics in Animal Sciences: Seedstock Merchandising	Adding Spring offering term	Spring 2018
CIVE 466	Design and Behavior of Steel Structures	Adding Spring offering term	Spring 2018
College of Liberal Arts			
ANTH 449	Community Development from the Ground Up Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation	Course title change	Spring 2018
HIST 201	Seminar – Approaches to History	Adding ‘Seniors not allowed.’	Spring 2018
INST 492	Seminar	Changing prerequisite from INST 300 to INST 301.	Spring 2018
Warner College of Natural Resources			
NR 566	Natural Resource Inventory and Data Analysis	Adding prerequisite	Spring 2018
NR 577	Wetland Ecology and Restoration	Edits to prerequisites	Spring 2018
RS 630	Ecology of Grasslands and Shrublands	Adding NR 578 as prerequisite option	Spring 2018
College of Natural Sciences			
PH 492	Seminar	Adding prerequisite	Spring 2018

Updates/Corrections to Courses			
Course #	Course Title	Description and Rationale for Update/Correction	Effective Term
FW 455	Principles of Conservation Biology	In consultation with the department and the Registrar’s Office, updated the ‘credit not allowed’ statements on FW 455, FW 555, and NR 300 to be consistent on all three courses. Registration Information: Credit allowed for only one of the following courses: NR 300 or FW 455. Credit not allowed for both FW 455 and FW 555. <u>Credit allowed for only one of the following: FW 455, FW 555, or NR 300.</u>	Spring 2016
FW 555	Conservation Biology	In consultation with the department and the Registrar’s Office, updated the ‘credit not allowed’ statements on FW 455, FW 555, and NR 300 to be consistent on all three courses. A statement to explicitly note that graduate students may be granted an override has been added to the ‘What other information is pertinent to this request’ field in CIM. This statement will also be included at the section level for registration purposes. Registration Information: Credit not allowed for both FW 555 and FW 455. <u>Credit allowed for only one of the following: FW 455, FW 555, or NR 300.</u> Must register for lecture and recitation.	Spring 2016

NR 300	Biological Diversity	<p>In consultation with the department and the Registrar's Office, updated the 'credit not allowed' statements on FW 455, FW 555, and NR 300 to be consistent on all three courses.</p> <p>Registration Information: Credit allowed for only one of the following courses: NR 300 or FW 455. <u>Credit allowed for only one of the following: FW 455, FW 555, or NR 300.</u></p>	Spring 2016
------------------------	----------------------	--	-------------

Minutes approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 9/22/2017.

Carole Makela, Co-Chair
Mike Hogan, Co-Chair
Shelly Ellerby, Curriculum Liaison Specialist

August 25th, 2017

To: Tim Gallagher, Chair, Faculty Council
From: Marie E Legare - Chair, Committee on Responsibility and Standing of Academic Faculty
Subject: Faculty Manual E.9 Faculty Productivity

The Committee on Responsibility and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following motion:

MOVED, THAT SECTION E.9 OF THE *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

E. 9 Faculty Productivity (last revised February 14, 2014)

Decisions concerning tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases are linked to the faculty member's productivity in the three categories of teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and University and professional service. Merit salary increases may also take into consideration negative behaviors that fall outside of these three categories. However, for tenured faculty, this may occur only if these behaviors resulted in disciplinary action through the process in Section E.15. Each academic unit must establish expected levels of productivity for the unit in each of these areas. Productivity is assessed by relating the effort expended to the outcome, in terms of effectiveness, impact, and documentation of the activity. Effort distribution is the allocation of effort into particular areas of responsibilities. Workload describes the professional responsibilities of the faculty. The responsibilities of faculty members for each of these activities will vary, depending upon the mission and needs of the academic unit and the expertise and interests of the faculty. The University recognizes that a faculty member's activities may change over a career and is committed to the use of differentiated responsibilities for individual faculty. Hence, in the evaluation process, reasonable flexibility should be exercised, balancing, as the case requires, heavier responsibilities in one (1) area against lighter responsibilities in another.

Decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases must be consistent with, and based upon, the effort distribution established for each faculty member. The department code shall define the general expectations of effort distribution regarding teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service responsibilities in terms of the academic mission of the department. Where appropriate and consistent with the academic mission of the department, the department code should define outreach/engagement expectations and how those expectations are addressed in the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service effort distribution. During the probationary period and following tenure in the years leading to full professor, there may be a need for changes in the workload and effort distribution originally established at the time of hiring or at the time of tenure and promotion to associate professor. These changes shall be negotiated between the faculty member and the department head (E.9.1, E.9.2). In this event, since promotion and tenure decisions are linked to the faculty member's productivity in line with effort distribution and workload, the promotion and tenure

committee or a subcommittee thereof shall provide input in writing to the department head regarding the extent to which these changes may affect progress toward tenure. Following any negotiated changes, these changes and the committee's response, shall be clearly articulated in writing by the department head to the faculty member.

Rationale

Annual performance reviews are limited to the evaluation of faculty performance in the three categories of teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service and/or outreach. These reviews may document negative behavior, but the result of the review is based only on performance in the three categories mentioned above. On the other hand, Section E.9 states that merit salary increases are only "linked" to faculty productivity, so negative behavior can be a consideration in merit salary increases. On the other hand, Section E.15 states that tenured faculty can be disciplined only through the process in Section E.15. Thus, negative behavior should not be allowed to affect merit salary increases unless disciplinary action has been found to be appropriate via the process in Section E.15.

Date: September 8, 2017

To: Tim Gallagher, Chair, Faculty Council

From: Marie Legare, Chair, Committee on Responsibility and Standing of Academic Faculty

Subject: Proposed revisions to *the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* - Section K Resolution of Disputes

The Committee on Responsibility and Standing of Academic Faculty moves that Faculty Council adopt the proposed revisions to the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – Section K. Resolution of Disputes, as follows:

NOTE: Revisions are noted in the following manner:
 Additions - underlined Deletions - ~~overseored~~

SECTION K. RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES (*Last revised May 8, 2015*)

K.1 General Information

Colorado State University is committed to the timely and fair resolution of disputes. ~~This s~~Section K describes procedures for a CSU employee who is a faculty member or administrative professional to challenge a decision, recommendation or action by a supervisor that has or will have an adverse academic and/or professional impact on the faculty member or administrative professional and that is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory. If a decision, recommendation or action by a supervisor is retaliatory, it may serve as the basis for a grievance if it has or will have an adverse academic and/or professional impact on the faculty member or administrative professional and is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory. ~~The University Grievance Program generally~~ Section K provides three avenues for resolution of such claims: a) informal conciliation, b) mediation, and c) a formal grievance hearing process.

Several offices on campus are available to assist with the resolution of other disputes. See the website for the Office of the Ombuds and Employee Assistance Program for details and contact information. An overview of the

procedures described in ~~this s~~Section K can be found on the website of the University Grievance Officer.

K.1.1 Participants in the ~~Grievance~~ Section K Process and Definition of Terms

Employee Classification – The type of position, either faculty member or administrative professional, held by the employee.

Grievance Panel – A pool of faculty members or administrative professionals who are elected by their peers and who are eligible to serve on Hearing Committees.

Grievant – A CSU employee who is a faculty member or administrative professional and who asserts that one or more decisions, recommendations or actions by a supervisor (1) has an adverse academic and/or professional effect on the faculty member or administrative professional, and (2) is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory.

Hearing Committee – A group of ~~between three and five~~ (3-5) faculty members or administrative professionals from the a University Grievance Panel who are convened to review and make recommendations about a Grievance.

Parties – The Parties to a Grievance are the Grievant(s) and the Supervisor(s).

Responsible Administrator – A university official to whom the ~~s~~Supervisor in a Grievance reports and who oversees the activities of the unit where the Grievant is employed.

Reviewing Administrators – University officials, namely the Provost and President, responsible for reviewing and approving recommendations from a Hearing Committee and deciding whether or not to accept them, ~~namely the Provost and President~~. These senior officials are also responsible for

supporting, respecting, and enforcing the process and providing required financial resources.

Supervisor – A university administrator, faculty member, or administrative professional who either directly oversees the work of the Grievant or who makes decisions directly affecting the terms and conditions of the Grievant's employment. A supervisor also can be a state classified employee who directs the work of an administrative professional.

University Grievance Officer (UGO) – The university official responsible for administering the ~~grievance~~ Section K process, advising Grievants and Supervisors, and coordinating involvement by others.

~~University Grievance Panel – A pool of faculty members or administrative professionals who are elected by their peers and volunteer to serve on a Hearing Committee, as needed and as available.~~

University Mediator (UM) – A neutral person from the university community appointed by the UGO to facilitate a resolution of a dispute or Grievance between a Grievant and a Supervisor.

K.2 Expectations for Members of the University Community

- a. Cooperation and participation by the members of the University community in the resolution of a complaint under these procedures is necessary.
- b. All witnesses shall be truthful in their testimony. Failure to comply with this expectation may result in the imposition of University sanctions.
- c. No person shall restrain, interfere with, coerce, attempt to intimidate, or take any reprisal against a participant in the Section K process. Failure to comply with this expectation may result in the imposition of University sanctions.

K.3 Definition of an Action, Grievable Action, and Grievance

An Action is a decision, recommendation or other act by a Supervisor.

A Grievable Action is an Action by a Supervisor that has or will have an adverse academic and/or professional effect on the Grievant and is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory. If an Action by a Supervisor is retaliatory, it may serve as the basis for a Grievance if it has or will have an adverse academic and/or professional impact on the Grievant and is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory.

A Grievance is a written complaint by a Grievant asserting that a Grievable Action has occurred.

K.3.1 A Grievable Action does not include:

- a. An issue that does not individually affect a faculty member or administrative professional, such as dissatisfaction with a university policy of general application.
- b. Actions specified in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* as “final” and thus not subject to redress through the grievance process. Any action deemed “final” constitutes exhaustion of internal grievance procedures.
- c. An act by any person who is not the Grievant’s Supervisor or ~~responsible administrator~~.
- d. Terms agreed to by the Grievant under a Section K mediation agreement.
- e. Acts in response to ~~possible~~ violations of law or endangerment of public safety.
- f. A subsequent complaint for the same action by the same supervisor once a Grievance regarding the original complaint has concluded.

g. Termination of “at-will” employees. For information about the university’s policy regarding at-will employees and the recommended steps and considerations for termination of at-will employees, employees should refer to the university policy for Administrative Professionals and Non-Tenured Academic Faculty (“At Will” Employment) found in the CSU Policy Library (see also Section D.5.6 and E.2.1 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*). Employees may contact the University Grievance Officer with questions about disciplinary action or termination of at-will employees.

K.3.2 Types of Grievable Actions and Burden of Proof

K.3.2.1 (“Class A”)

In a Grievance that involves a complaint about the following specific actions, the burden of proof falls upon the Supervisor:

- a. termination of contractual rights;
- b. reduction of salary and/or demotion;
- c. violation of academic and/or intellectual freedom; or
- d. assignment of unreasonable workload.

K.3.2.2 (“Class B”)

In a Grievance that involves complaints about a term or condition of employment other than those specific cases that are identified above in Section K.3.2.1, the burden of proof falls upon the Grievant. Examples of such Grievances include:

- a. decision on the amount of salary;

- b. denial of reappointment;
- c. denial of tenure and/or promotion ~~or tenure~~;
- d. receipt of a lower evaluation than deserved on a performance review; or
- e. denial of sabbatical leave.

K.3.3 Determination of the Validity of a Grievance

- a. The UGO shall determine whether a Grievance sets forth a Grievable Action, i.e., whether there is a sufficient basis to pursue ~~mediation (see Section K.8)~~ and/or a hearing (see Section K.9), based on the written complaint by the Grievant and the Supervisor's response, as well as any supporting materials. The UGO may seek appropriate legal advice (see ~~Section K.12.5~~ Section K.12.6). This determination by the UGO shall be made within five (5) working days of receiving the Grievant's written complaint and the Supervisor's response.
- b. If the Grievant disagrees with the UGO's determination, he or she may appeal this decision. Such an appeal must be made in writing to the Chair of the Grievance Panel (see Section K.11.1) having the same Employee Classification as the Grievant within ten (10) working days of receiving written notification via email of the determination by the UGO. If such an appeal is submitted, the Chair of the Grievance Panel shall form an Appeal Committee consisting of three (3) members from the Grievance Panel, including the Chair of the Grievance Panel, for the purpose of reviewing whether the UGO's determination should be reversed or affirmed. The Chair of the Grievance Panel shall chair the Appeal Committee and recruit members following the same procedure as for the formation of a Hearing Committee (see Section K.11.4). The Appeal Committee shall consider the appeal, the written Complaint of the Grievant and any supporting materials provided by the Grievant, as well as the response of the Supervisor and any supporting

materials that are included. Within ~~five (5)~~ ten (10) working days of the submission of the appeal, the Appeal Committee, with legal advice if appropriate, shall make a determination solely regarding the validity of the Grievant's appeal, specifically whether the Grievance sets forth a Grievable Action. The Appeal Committee's determination shall be made by a majority vote. The Appeal Committee's determination shall be final. The Appeal Committee shall include a written report to the UGO and the Grievant notifying them of its decision. If the Appeal Committee reverses the determination of the UGO, the members of this Appeal Committee shall not serve on a Hearing Committee for this Grievance.

c. If it is determined that a Grievance sets forth a Grievable Action, then the UGO shall make a determination of whether the Grievance is Class A or Class B.

K.3.4 Basis of Proof

The basis of proof regarding a Grievable Action is determined by a preponderance of the evidence (i.e., that the claim is more likely to be true than not to be true).

K.4 The Right to Grieve

K.4.1 Persons Entitled to Grieve

Any faculty member or administrative professional may pursue resolution of a Grievable Action. Grievances by more than one employee from a single administrative unit may be joined into a common grievance if, in the opinion of the UGO, their Grievances have sufficient commonality to be heard collectively, and if those employees filing Grievances from a single unit agree to join in a common Grievance.

K.4.2 Process

If a Grievant initiates the Section K process the Grievable Action shall not be effective prior to the completion of the Section K process.

~~K.4.3 Responsibility to Respond~~ [moved to Section K.6]

~~a. The Supervisor whose decision, recommendation or action was the basis for the Grievance shall be responsible for responding to the Grievant and the UGO within five (5) working days from the day the Grievance is submitted to the UGO and the Supervisor.~~

~~b. If the Supervisor whose Action is being challenged no longer is employed by the university or no longer holds the relevant supervisory position, then the responsible administrator(s) for the unit, at his or her discretion, shall decide who should represent the unit in the Section K process. The unavailability of the original Supervisor does not affect the right of a Grievant to seek resolution. If no person in authority responds to the Grievance, the UGO shall continue with the Section K process.~~

~~c. When a faculty member has been denied promotion or tenure (see Section E.10.5.1, paragraph 6, E.13.1 paragraphs 4 and 5) in the case of a negative recommendation by the department chair, the complaint shall be directed to the department chair, who shall be responsible to respond. In the case of a negative recommendation at the college level, the complaint shall be filed against the dean, who shall be responsible to respond. In the case of a negative recommendation at the provost level, the complaint shall be filed against the provost who shall be responsible to respond.~~

K.4.43 Section K Process

In the spirit of reaching an expeditious resolution of disputes, an aggrieved party employee shall follow all applicable parts of the Section K process before initiating legal action with external agents or agencies. However, the Grievant has the right to seek legal advice from outside counsel at any point during the

Grievance process. Nothing in ~~this s~~Section K supersedes the Grievant's rights under federal and/or state laws.

K.5. Initiation of the Section K Process

~~A claim of a Grievable Action must be submitted in writing by~~ In order to initiate the Section K process, an administrative professional or a faculty member ~~to must contact~~ the UGO in writing no later than twenty (20) working days after the date of the Action giving rise to the Grievable Action or that point in time when the individual could reasonably be expected to have knowledge that a basis for a grievance existed. The UGO shall then meet with the ~~administrative professional or the faculty member~~ Grievant to discuss the claim.

If the administrative professional or faculty member does not contact the UGO in writing within the required twenty (20) working days, then they forfeit their right to pursue the Section K process (unless the UGO, at his or her discretion, decides that extenuating circumstances justify an extension of this deadline).

Within five (5) working days after meeting with the Grievant, the UGO shall contact the Supervisor to schedule a meeting to discuss the claim. After meeting with the Supervisor, the UGO will attempt to resolve the dispute through informal conciliation for a period of up to twenty (20) working days. This may include additional meetings with the Grievant and the Supervisor individually and/or together, as well as meeting with other persons as approved by the Grievant. If informal conciliation is not successful in resolving the dispute, the UGO will notify both the Grievant and the Supervisor of this outcome.

The UGO is not required to pursue informal conciliation if the Action does not constitute a Grievable Action. However, the UGO, at his or her discretion, may decide to pursue informal conciliation prior to making a determination of whether or not the Action constitutes a Grievable Action.

K.6 Mediation

K.6.1 Initiation of the Mediation Process

If the Grievant is notified by the UGO that informal conciliation was not successful in resolving the dispute, then the Grievant may choose to initiate the mediation process. This must be done within five (5) working days of receiving such notification, and this is done by submitting to the UGO a formal written Complaint. This Complaint must specify the Supervisor and the Grievable Action(s); how this Action has or will have an adverse academic and/or professional impact on the Grievant; and how the Supervisor was unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, and/or discriminatory. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Complaint to the Grievant for editing before it has an acceptable format.

If the Grievant does not contact the UGO in writing within the required five (5) working days, then they forfeit their right to pursue the mediation process or the hearing process (unless the UGO, at his or her discretion, decides that extenuating circumstances justify an extension of this deadline).

Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Complaint from the Grievant, the UGO shall forward the Complaint to the Supervisor for a formal written Response. The Supervisor shall submit this Response to the UGO within five (5) working days of receiving the Complaint from the UGO. This Response shall be limited to addressing the claims and statements made in the Complaint. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Response to the Supervisor for editing before it has an acceptable format. Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Response from the Supervisor, the UGO shall forward the Response to the Grievant.

If the Supervisor whose Action is being challenged no longer is employed by the university or no longer holds the relevant supervisory position, then the Responsible Administrator(s) for the unit shall decide, at his or her discretion,

who should represent the unit in the Section K process. The unavailability of the original Supervisor does not affect the right of a Grievant to pursue the section K process.

When a faculty member is grieving the denial of tenure and/or promotion (see Section E.13.1, paragraphs 4 and 5 or Section E.10.5.1 paragraph 6), in the case of a negative recommendation by the department head, the Complaint shall be filed against the department head, who shall be responsible to respond. In the case of a positive recommendation by the department head, but a negative recommendation by the dean of the college, the complaint shall be filed against the dean, who shall be responsible to respond. In the case of positive recommendations by both the department head and the dean, but a negative recommendation by the Provost, the complaint shall be filed against the Provost, who shall be responsible to respond.

Within five (5) working days after receiving the ~~written claim of a Grievable Action~~ Response from the Supervisor, the UGO shall ~~assign~~ select a University Mediator (UM) from the pool to mediate the dispute, and the UGO shall notify the Grievant and the Supervisor of the UM selected. The UM shall have the same Employee Classification as the Grievant. The ~~Mediation participants~~ Grievant and/or the Supervisor shall have five (5) working days from the date of ~~the assignment of the UM~~ this notification to object to ~~such an assignment~~ the choice of UM. ~~Such a~~An objection may be ~~raised only~~ based only on the UMs prior or current relationship with the ~~Mediation participants~~ Grievant and/or the Supervisor and/or the UM's knowledge of previous related disputes. If objections arise, the UGO may decide to select a different UM. The UGO shall make the final decision on the assignment of a UM, and the UGO shall notify the UM of his or her assignment within three (3) working days of this decision.

The UGO is not required to pursue mediation if the Action does not constitute a Grievable Action. However, the UGO, at his or her discretion, may decide to

allow mediation to occur prior to making a determination of whether or not the Action constitutes a Grievable Action.

In some cases, the UGO may decide that mediation is unlikely to be productive and that the mediation process should not be initiated. This is generally the case when a faculty member is grieving the denial of tenure and/or promotion. If the UGO decides not to initiate the mediation process, he or she shall notify the Grievant and the Supervisor of this decision. The Grievant shall then decide whether or not to initiate a formal grievance hearing (see Section K.9).

~~K.6 Documentation~~ [moved to Section K.7]

~~a. Either the UGO or the UM assigned to the case may request, and is entitled to receive promptly, any and all materials from the participants in the Grievable Action that either the UGO or the UM may deem relevant to the dispute.~~

~~b. Any formal resolution reached during Mediation by the participants must be in writing and is subject to approval of legal sufficiency by the Office of General Counsel and approval by any other necessary individuals.~~

~~K.7 Right to Clerical Assistance~~ [moved to Section K.8]

~~Any person initiating the Section K process has the right to clerical support from University personnel for preparation of documents for use in This process. Because maintenance of confidentiality is an important element of the Section K process, the clerical support should come from a unit at the next higher level than the one in which the Covered Member is housed (e.g., from the dean, for a faculty member, or from a vice president, for a dean).~~

K.86.2 Mediation Process

a. Within ten (10) working days of being assigned by the UGO, the UM shall meet with the ~~Mediation participants~~ Grievant and the Supervisor, discuss their respective positions, and review relevant information.

b. If the UM believes there is a reasonable chance that ~~M~~mediation efforts may produce a resolution of the dispute, the ~~Mediation participants~~ Grievant, the Supervisor, and the UM shall enter into a ~~M~~mediation ~~P~~period of up to twenty (20) working days to attempt to resolve the dispute. ~~If the Mediation Period reaches its twenty (20) working day limit without producing a resolution of the dispute, the Mediation participants may mutually agree to extend the Mediation Period by an additional ten (10) working days if they believe that this is likely to produce a resolution of the dispute. However, after the initial twenty (20) working days, either party may choose to terminate the Mediation Process and refuse any extensions of it.~~

c. The goal of mediation is for the Grievant and the Supervisor to come to a mutual agreement where reconcilable differences are resolved and where the Grievant and the Supervisor are able to work together in an amicable and productive manner in the future. Successful mediation generally requires compromise by both the Grievant and the Supervisor. If a successful agreement is reached, then the Section K process is completed. However, failure by the Supervisor to abide by the terms of the agreement is grievable.

ed. If the UM decides that ~~M~~mediation efforts are not productive, then the UM may choose to terminate the ~~M~~mediation ~~P~~period at any time.

de. If the ~~M~~mediation ~~P~~period expires or is terminated ~~by any party as described above,~~ the UM shall immediately notify the UGO and all Mediation participants of this situation in writing within three (3) working days. The UGO shall then notify the Grievant and the Supervisor of this situation within three (3) working days of receiving this notification from the UM. The Covered Member Grievant shall then have five (5) working days after the date the UM provides such notice receiving this notification from the UGO to initiate the formal Grievance hearing process regarding any Grievable Action (see Section K.9).

~~e. The UM may continue to work with the Mediation participants even after a formal Grievance is initiated. However, the UM's Mediation efforts must cease before the beginning of a Grievance Hearing.~~

~~f. If the formal Grievance process is not initiated within the five (5) working day limit described in Section K.8.d, or if a claim of a Grievable Action is not referred to the UGO within the twenty (20) working day limit described in Section K.5, then the Grievable Action is not eligible to be heard by a Hearing Committee under the Grievance Procedure of Section K.10.~~

~~g.~~ Documentation and other communication created specifically in connection with the resolution of a dispute shall be considered to be part of the ~~Covered Member's~~ Grievant's and the Supervisor's personnel files.¹ Under the Dispute Resolution Act, C.R.S. 13-22-301 et seq., documents and communications that ~~resulted~~ are created solely from the ~~M~~mediation process are confidential and shall not be disclosed, and they may not be used as evidence during a Grievance Hearing, except by mutual agreement of the ~~Mediation participants~~ Grievant and the Supervisor, or as may be required by law. When a resolution is reached, documentation and other communication created during the ~~M~~mediation process shall be forwarded to the UGO, who shall retain the materials. Records created ~~by a Covered Member or a Responsible Administrator~~ prior to the a Covered Member's initiation of the ~~M~~mediation process are not considered confidential communications and may be used in a Grievance Hearing. Information and documents that are otherwise relevant do not become confidential merely because they are presented, discussed, or otherwise used during the course of mediation.

K.7 Documentation

a. Either the UGO or the UM assigned to the case may request, and is entitled to receive promptly, any and all materials from the participants in the Grievable Action that either the UGO or the UM may deem relevant to the dispute.

b. Any formal resolution reached during mediation by the participants must be in writing and is subject to approval of legal sufficiency by the Office of General Counsel and approval by any other necessary individuals.

K.8 Right to Clerical Assistance

A Grievant has the right to clerical support from University personnel for preparation of documents for use in this process. Because maintenance of confidentiality is an important element of the Section K process, the clerical support should come from a unit at the next higher level than the one in which the Grievant is housed (e.g., from the college level, for a faculty member, or from the Office of the Provost, for a department head).

K.9 Initiating the Grievance Hearing Process

~~A formal Grievance must be initiated by the Grievant submitting a written complaint to the UGO and to the supervisor whose action is being challenged no later than ten (10) working days after the expiration of the Mediation Period or after the decision by the UM that Mediation will not take place, as described in Section K.8. The written Complaint shall:~~

- ~~a. Describe the nature of the Grievable Action;~~
- ~~b. Name the parties to the grievable dispute;~~
- ~~c. Describe how the Action being challenged is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory;~~
- ~~d. Identify how the Action adversely affects the Grievant in his or her present or future academic and/or professional capacity; and~~
- ~~e. Summarize the material that the Grievant is prepared to submit to support the claim. Upon receipt of the complaint from the Grievant, the supervisor shall prepare a written response (hereinafter referred to as the "Response") to the~~

~~complaint and submit it to the UGO and the Grievant no later than five (5) working days after receiving the complaint. This Response should be limited to addressing the claims and statements made in the complaint.~~

If the Grievant is notified by the UGO that mediation was not successful in resolving the dispute, then the Grievant may choose to initiate the hearing process. This must be done within five (5) working days of receiving such notification, and this is done by informing the UGO in writing of the decision to initiate the hearing process. This may be done only if the Action(s) specified in the Complaint have been determined to be Grievable Action(s).

Within ten (10) working days of notification that mediation was not successful, the Grievant must submit to the UGO in writing a list of the materials that he or she intends to submit at the Hearing, a list of the witnesses that he or she intends to call at the Hearing, and the relevance of these materials and witnesses. Within twenty (20) working days of notification that mediation was not successful, the Grievant must submit to the UGO copies of the materials that he or she intends to submit at the Hearing. To the extent permitted by law and University policy, each of these submissions from the Grievant shall be forwarded to the Supervisor within three (3) days of their receipt by the UGO.

Within ten (10) working days of receiving the Grievant's list of materials and witnesses, the Supervisor must submit to the UGO in writing a list of the materials that he or she intends to submit at the Hearing, a list of the witnesses that he or she intends to call at the Hearing, and the relevance of these materials and witnesses. Within twenty (20) working days of receiving the Grievant's list of materials and witnesses, the Supervisor must submit to the UGO copies of the materials that he or she intends to submit at the Hearing. To the extent permitted by law and University policy, each of these submissions from the Supervisor shall be forwarded to the Grievant within three (3) days of their receipt by the UGO.

The UGO has the right to question and determine the applicability, reasonableness, and relevance to the hearing process of any submitted material. This right may include the refusal by the UGO to accept and forward submitted materials until the UGO judges that they are in compliance with the requirements of Section K (see Section K.10.4). Failure by either the Grievant or the Supervisor to bring documents into compliance with Section K requirements by a deadline set by the UGO shall, at the discretion of the UGO, result in the forwarding by the UGO of redacted materials. In this case, the person who submitted the materials will be notified of this decision and sent copies of the redacted materials. In an extreme case, the UGO may decide that the Grievant has forfeited his or right to pursue the hearing process and notify the Grievant of this decision.

K.10 Grievance ~~Procedure~~ Hearings

K.10.1 Hearing Committee

As described in Section K.11.4, a Hearing Committee shall be ~~formed~~ selected by the UGO which consists of five (5) members, one of whom shall serves as the Chair of the Hearing Committee. The UGO shall notify the Parties of the members. The Parties shall then have three (3) working days to challenge for cause members of the Hearing Committee. A challenge for cause must be based on a claim that the challenged member of the Hearing Committee, through involvement with the Grievant, the Supervisor, and/or the Grievable Action, may be incapable of rendering an impartial judgment regarding the Grievance. The UGO, with appropriate legal advice (see Section K.12.56), shall decide all such challenges. Members successfully challenged shall be excused from the Hearing Committee and replaced by the UGO as described in Section K.11.4. The UGO may excuse a member of the Hearing Committee even though actual cause cannot be proven.

The UGO shall then set the date(s), time(s), and location(s) for the Hearing and forward the ~~Complaint and the Response~~ to the members of the Hearing

Committee the Complaint, the Response, the lists of witnesses to be called by the Parties, the materials to be submitted by the Parties, the relevance of these witnesses and materials, and any additional material that the UGO deems to be relevant to the Hearing. The UGO shall provide copies to the Parties of all material submitted to the Hearing Committee. If the UGO has decided to redact some of the material submitted by either Party, then that Party may appeal this decision in writing to the Chair of the Hearing Committee. This must be done within five (5) working days of this person being notified of the submission by the UGO. If such an appeal is submitted, the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall make a decision regarding the matter within five (5) working days of receiving the appeal. The decision of the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall be final.

Any member of the Hearing Committee may request that the UGO provide additional materials or that additional witnesses be called (with the relevance of such witnesses being explained). Upon approval of the Chair of the Hearing Committee, these requests will be accommodated to the extent permitted by law and University policy. Each Party will be sent copies of such additional materials and notified of additional witnesses and their relevance.

~~At the request of either party, or on its own initiative, the Hearing Committee may:~~

- ~~a. Instruct the parties to file further written statements and/or~~
- ~~b. Direct the parties to produce additional documents relevant to the Complaint, to the extent permitted by law, and to identify possible witnesses and the relevance of these witnesses.~~

~~The UGO has the right to question and determine the applicability, reasonableness, and relevance of any material to the Section K process. This right may include the refusal by the UGO to forward the Complaint, the Response, and/or any supporting document(s) to the Hearing Committee until~~

~~the UGO judges that the documents are in compliance with the requirements of Section K (see Section K.10.4). Failure by either party to bring documents into compliance with Section K requirements by a deadline set by the UGO shall, at the discretion of the UGO, result in either forfeiture by that party of the right to pursue the matter through Section K or the forwarding by the UGO of redacted documents to the Hearing Committee.~~

~~If the Covered Member disagrees with such a decision by the UGO, he or she may appeal this decision. Such an appeal must be made in writing to the Chair of the Grievance Panel within three (3) working days of being notified of the decision by the UGO. If such an appeal is submitted, the Chair of the Grievance Panel shall refer the matter to the Chair of the Hearing Committee, who shall make a decision regarding the matter within five (5) working days of the submission of the appeal. The decision of the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall be final.~~

For a Class B Grievance, S~~ince the burden of proof for a Class B Grievance is on the Grievant, the Hearing Committee may decide a Class B Grievance without a Hearing if the Hearing Committee determines that the Complaint lacks substantive merit under the criteria specified in Section K.3 and that a Hearing will not take place. Such a decision requires a unanimous vote by the Hearing Committee.~~ The Grievant shall have the right to appeal to the Provost a decision rendered recommendation made by the a Hearing Committee without a Hearing.

K.10.2 Conduct of Grievance Hearings

The rules and procedure outlined below shall apply in any formal Grievance Hearing conducted by a Hearing Committee.

a. ~~The Hearings of a Grievance shall begin no later than ten (10) working days following the receipt of the Complaint from the Grievant. However, each party has the right to request a delay of no more than ten (10) working days upon~~

~~showing a necessity to allow the proper development of the evidence and arguments, and the UGO shall have the authority to delay Hearings in order to facilitate the joining of Complaints as provided for in Section K.4.1.~~ Grievance Hearings are confidential and closed to the public.

b. Each pParty to the Grievance shall be permitted to have a maximum of two (2) advisors present, consisting of peer advisors and/or legal counsel. These advisors may help the pParty prepare for the proceedings, including the preparation of any required written documentation, and may advise the pParty during the proceedings, but no advisor may participate actively in the proceedings. Advisors may not make statements, objections or attempt to argue the case (however, if an advisor is called as a witness, he or she is allowed to participate in this capacity). The only persons who have standing to speak at the Hearing are the members of the Hearing Committee, the UGO, the pParties to the Grievance, and any witnesses called. Each pParty shall identify his or her advisors at the opening of the Hearing and neither pParty shall have the right to delay the Hearing because of a lack of or unavailability of advisors, except if an emergency occurs.

c. The Chair of the Hearing Committee (see Section K.11.4) shall open the Hearing by determining that all parties are present and by identifying the advisors chosen by each party.

~~ed.~~ Once initiated, the Hearings shall continue on a daily ~~or nightly~~ basis, depending on the convenience of the pParties, ~~and in all cases,~~ the Hearing shall be concluded within ten (10) working days of its opening.

~~de.~~ The PParties to a Grievance have the responsibility to attend all scheduled meetings of the Hearing. No substitutes for the pParties shall be allowed. If a pParty is unable or unwilling to attend any scheduled meeting of the Hearing, the meeting may be held ex parte.

~~ef.~~ If it is deemed appropriate by a majority of the members of the Hearing Committee, a person may participate in the Hearing from a different physical location (e.g., by video conference or teleconference). However, the questioning of witnesses must occur in a real-time, spontaneous format, unless a majority of the Hearing Committee concurs that this is not feasible. Any request to appear or participate in the ~~h~~Hearing from a different physical location must be made in writing and must be submitted to the Hearing Committee at least five (5) working days before the Hearing.

~~fg. Parties to Grievances~~ The Grievant, the Supervisor, and their advisors for such parties are responsible for abiding by the procedures herein established. ~~Those parties~~ Anyone failing to adhere to the procedures, ~~or failing to assure that their advisors adhere to the procedures,~~ may be excluded from participation in the Hearing by a majority vote of the Hearing Committee, and judgment shall be rendered without the presence of ~~those parties~~ any excluded persons.

~~g. The Chair of the Hearing Committee (see Section K.11.4) shall open the Hearing by determining that all parties are present and by identifying the advisors chosen by each party.~~

~~h. The Chair of the Hearing Committee shall provide each member of the Hearing Committee the opportunity to excuse himself or herself from service prior to the Hearing because of having an involvement with one or both of the parties and/or with the Action being challenged that renders him or her incapable of rendering an impartial judgment concerning the Grievance.~~

~~i. The Chair of the Hearing Committee shall provide each party the opportunity to challenge for cause members of the Hearing Committee.~~

~~1. A challenge for cause must be based on a claim that the challenged member of the Hearing Committee, through involvement with one or both of the parties~~

~~and/or with the Action being challenged, may be incapable of rendering an impartial judgment regarding the Grievance.~~

~~2. The UGO, with appropriate legal advice (see Section K.12.5), shall decide all such challenges. Members successfully challenged shall be excused from the Hearing Committee and replaced as described in Section K.11.4. The UGO may excuse a member of the Hearing Committee even though actual cause cannot be proven.~~

~~j~~h. The entirety of the Hearing shall be recorded. Upon request, either ~~p~~Party shall be provided with a copy of this record, as well as any written material submitted during the Hearing. The Office of the Provost shall bear the cost of producing these copies.

K.10.3 Order of Proceedings for Grievance Hearings

Subject to the restrictions of Section K.10.2.~~eg~~, the following persons are entitled to be present during the Hearing:

- a. The ~~p~~Parties and their advisors;
- b. The UGO, the Hearing Committee members, and their legal counsel;
- c. Witnesses when testifying; and
- d. Such other persons as are specifically authorized by a majority vote of the Hearing Committee, unless their presence is objected to by either ~~p~~Party and the objection is sustained by the UGO.

The Hearing should proceed in the following order (although this order may be altered by a majority vote of the Hearing Committee with the approval of the UGO):

a. Statement by the pParty having the burden of proof (hereinafter referred to as the “First Party”).

b. Statement by the other pParty (hereinafter referred to as the “Second Party”).

c. Presentation by the First Party of witnesses and materials, subject to the restrictions of Section K.10.4. The First Party shall have the right to call himself or herself as a witness and to call the Second Party as a witness. The Second Party shall have the right to challenge the relevancy and/or authenticity of witness testimony and submitted materials and to question each witness called by the First Party after that witness has been questioned by the First Party. Decisions on such challenges shall be rendered by the Chair of the Hearing Committee. Challenges of procedural decisions by the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall be decided by a majority vote of the remaining members of the Hearing Committee, with tie votes sustaining the Chair.

d. Presentation by the Second Party of witnesses and materials, subject to the restrictions of Section K.10.4. The Second Party shall have the right to call himself or herself as a witness and to call the First Party as a witness. The First Party shall have the right to challenge the relevancy and/or authenticity of witness testimony and submitted materials and to question each witness called by the Second Party after that witness has been questioned by the Second Party. Challenges shall be decided as described in the previous paragraph. ~~The members of the Hearing Committee shall also have the right to question each witness called by the Second Party after that witness has been questioned by the First Party.~~

~~e. If either party claims to have been denied access to relevant University records and/or documents, the Hearing Committee may consider this claim in making its final recommendation (see Section K.10.5).~~

~~fe.~~ Members of the Hearing Committee shall have the right to direct questions to witnesses called ~~or~~ and to the ~~p~~Parties during these proceedings.

~~gf.~~ Summary arguments by the First Party.

~~hg.~~ Summary arguments by the Second Party.

~~ih.~~ The members of the Hearing Committee shall have the authority to direct any further questions to either or both ~~p~~Parties following both summary arguments, to schedule additional meetings of the Hearing to develop points not yet clarified sufficiently, and/or to call additional witnesses. A decision to schedule additional meetings of the Hearing requires a majority vote of the Hearing Committee, ~~and such a decision shall be announced by the~~ The Chair of the Hearing Committee ~~to both parties. Both parties shall~~ notify the Parties in writing of the scheduling of additional meetings, ~~also be informed of any points that the Hearing Committee feels require further clarification,~~ and the names and relevance of any additional witnesses to be called by the Hearing Committee.

~~ej.~~ If either ~~p~~Party claims to have been denied access to relevant University records and/or documents, the Hearing Committee may consider this claim in making its final recommendation (see Section K.10.5).

K.10.4 Rules Regarding Witness Testimony and Submitted Materials

The following rules shall apply to any Grievance Hearing before a Hearing Committee:

a. It shall be the responsibility of the ~~p~~Party seeking to call a witness or submit material to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Chair of the Hearing Committee the authenticity and relevance of the witness or material.

b. Witnesses called shall have direct and personal knowledge of the points attested to and may be challenged on the ground that they lack such

knowledge. A pParty calling a witness shall first establish the relevance of the testimony of the witness.

c. Material introduced by either pParty shall be accompanied by a showing of authenticity and relevance to the Grievance. Decisions, recommendations, and actions that occur prior to the Grievable Action may be relevant to the Grievable Action if they establish a pattern of action over time.

d. During a witness' testimony, either pParty may object to such testimony on the grounds that the witness lacks personal knowledge for such testimony or that such testimony is not relevant to the Grievance. The pParty making the objection shall state the reason(s) for the objection, and the other pParty shall have the opportunity to respond to the objection. The Chair of the Hearing Committee shall rule on the objection.

e. The UM assigned to a specific case may neither attend the Hearing nor be called as a witness for that case.

K.10.5 Recommendation of the Hearing Committee

a. Following the completion of the Hearing, the Hearing Committee shall retire for the purpose of discussion, conference, and decision. These deliberations shall remain confidential to the full extent permitted by law. The Hearing Committee shall review the pertinent information and the Grievable Action of the Responsible Administrator which is the basis for the Grievance solely to determine whether this Action is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory, but not to substitute its judgment regarding the substantive merits of the decision which is the basis for the Grievance Grievable Action. If the Hearing Committee concludes that there was a procedural deficiency which materially inhibited the review process, it may specify the nature of this deficiency and refer the matter back to the appropriate administrator for correction and subsequent return to the Hearing Committee.

b. When the Hearing Committee has agreed on a recommendation (hereinafter referred to as the "Recommendation") by a majority vote, a written statement of the Recommendation shall be prepared that summarizes the relevant information and explains the reasoning that supports the Recommendation. It also shall state specifically any action necessitated by the Recommendation and identify any proposed relief to be provided. Normally, the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall oversee the preparation of this written statement of the Recommendation. However, if the Chair of the Hearing Committee opposes the majority vote, the members of the majority shall choose from among themselves a person to oversee the preparation of the written statement of the Recommendation. This person shall also represent the Hearing Committee, if necessary, during reviews and appeals.

c. If the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee is not unanimous, the report shall explain the reasoning of the dissenting minority ~~shall prepare a written statement reflecting the minority opinion,~~ as well as that of the majority.

d. The written Recommendation from the Hearing Committee, ~~together with any minority report,~~ shall be submitted to the UGO by the Chair of the Hearing Committee within ten (10) working days of the completion of the Hearing.

e. Within ~~two (2)~~ three (3) working days after receiving the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee, the UGO shall ~~announce~~ send a copy of this Recommendation to both the pParties and provide Written copies of the Recommendation, together with any minority report, to both parties. Within this same time frame, the UGO shall provide ~~written~~ copies of the Recommendation, ~~any minority report,~~ the Complaint, the Response, the record of the Hearing, and any written material submitted during the Hearing (hereinafter referred to collectively as the "Hearing Record") to both the Provost and the President, unless the Provost and/or the President is a pParty to the Grievance. If the Provost is a Party to the Grievance, but the President is not the Hearing Record shall be sent only to the President. If the President is a

Party to the Grievance, the Hearing Record ~~in which case, the UGO shall instead send these copies~~ be sent to the Board.

f. If the Grievable Action is the denial of tenure and/or promotion, the Hearing Record shall not be sent to the Provost.

K.10.6 Appeals and Administrative Reviews

~~Decisions of a~~ A Recommendation from the Hearing Committee that no action be taken as a result of the Grievance Hearing is final, unless the Grievant chooses to appeal this Recommendation (see Section K.10.6.1). Any Recommendation from the Hearing Committee that action be taken as a result of the Grievance must be reviewed by both the Provost and President before it becomes final, unless the Provost or the President is a party to the Grievance. If the Provost is a party to the Grievance, but the President is not, the review shall be made only by the President. If the President is a party to the Grievance, the review shall be made only by the Board.

If the Grievable Action is the denial of tenure and/or promotion, only the President shall review the Recommendation.

K.10.6.1 Appeal of the Recommendation From the Hearing Committee

Whether or not the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee suggests that action be taken as a result of the Grievance, the Grievant has the right to appeal this Recommendation. This appeal must be made within ten (10) five (5) working days of receipt of the written Recommendation from the Hearing Committee, ~~and it must provide reasons for the appeal, and it must not exceed five (5) pages with normal font size. Failure of the Grievant to file an appeal within this time frame shall constitute his or her acceptance of the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee.~~ This appeal shall be submitted to the Provost, unless the Provost and/or the President is a pParty to the Grievance. If the Provost is a pParty to the Grievance, but the President is not,

the appeal shall be submitted to the President. If the President is a party to the Grievance, the appeal shall be submitted to the Board.

If the Grievable Action is the denial of tenure and/or promotion, the appeal shall be submitted only to the President.

If the Grievant submits an appeal to the Provost, he or she shall send a copy of this appeal to the UGO at the same time. The UGO shall then send a copy of this appeal to the Supervisor.

K.10.6.2 Review by the Provost

~~If neither the Provost nor the President is a party to the Grievance, the Hearing Record is sent to the Provost, he or she shall review the Hearing Record, together with~~ and any appeal from the Grievant (hereinafter referred to collectively as the "Appeal Record"), unless the Recommendation ~~from the Hearing Committee is suggests~~ that no action be taken as a result of the Grievance and no appeal was submitted by the Grievant within the five (5) working day limit. This review shall be based only on the Appeal Record. No ~~party may introduce~~ new substantive issues may be introduced.

Upon completion of this review, the Provost shall submit a written recommendation to the President, along with a copy of any appeal from the Grievant. The recommendation from the Provost shall include a summary of the relevant information and the reasoning that supports the recommendation. The recommendation from the Provost shall modify may differ from the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee only if he or she the Provost finds that this the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory. The Provost shall also send a copy of his or her recommendation to the UGO, and the UGO shall send copies of this recommendation to the Grievant and the Supervisor. The Provost shall send his or her recommendation to the President and the UGO Wwithin ten (10) working days of receiving an appeal from the Grievant or the expiration

of the five (5) working day limit for submitting an appeal, ~~the Provost shall respond by providing to all parties to the Grievance and to the UGO a written statement of his or her recommendation, which shall include a summary of the relevant information and the reasoning that supports this recommendation. A copy of this recommendation shall also be provided to the President, along with a copy of any appeal to the Provost from the Grievant.~~

K.10.6.3 Appeal of the Recommendation From the Provost

~~If the Provost modifies the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee, t~~The Grievant has the right to appeal the new recommendation from the Provost. This appeal must be made within five (5) working days of receipt of the written recommendation from the Provost, it must provide reasons for the appeal, and it must not exceed two (2) five (5) pages with normal font size. Failure of the Grievant to file an appeal within this time frame shall constitute his or her acceptance of the recommendation from the Provost.

If the Grievant submits an appeal to the President, he or she shall send a copy of this appeal to the UGO at the same time. The UGO shall then send a copy of this appeal to the Supervisor and the Provost.

K.10.6.4 Review by the President

~~If the Hearing Record is sent to the President is not a party to the Grievance, he or she shall review the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee~~Hearing Record, together with any ~~minority report, the recommendation from the Provost (unless the Provost was a party to the Grievance), and any appeals from the Grievant (hereinafter referred to collectively as the "Final Appeal Record"), unless the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee is that no action be taken as a result of the Grievance and no appeal was submitted by the Grievant within the five (5) working day limit. This review shall be based only on the Final Appeal Record, ~~the Provost's recommendation and any~~~~

~~appeal by the Grievant. No party may introduce new substantive issues~~ may be introduced.

Upon completion of this review, the President shall make a final decision regarding the Grievance. This decision shall be in writing, and it shall include a summary of the relevant information and the reasoning that supports the decision. Regardless of the recommendation from the Provost, the decision of the President shall modify may differ from the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee only if ~~he or she~~ the President finds that ~~this the~~ Recommendation from the Hearing Committee is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory. The President shall send his or her written decision to the UGO ~~W~~within twenty (20) working days of receiving an appeal from the Grievant or the expiration of the five (5) working day limit for submitting an appeal. The UGO shall send copies of this decision to the Grievant, the Supervisor, and the Provost, ~~the President shall respond by providing to all parties to the Grievance, the UGO, and the Provost a written statement of his or her decision, which shall include a summary of the relevant information and the reasoning that supports this decision.~~ The decision of the President is final.

If the decision of the President includes taking action as a result of the Grievance, ~~he or she~~ the President shall notify the appropriate ~~parties~~ individuals of the action to be taken.

K.10.6.5 Review by the Board

If the President was a party to the Grievance, the Board shall review the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee, together with ~~any minority report and~~ any appeal from the Grievant (hereinafter referred to collectively as the "Final Appeal Record"), unless the Recommendation suggests that no action be taken as a result of the Grievance and no appeal was submitted by the Grievant within the five (5) working day limit. This review shall be based

only on the Final Appeal Record. No new substantive issues may be introduced.

Upon completion of this review, the Board shall make a final decision regarding the Grievance. This decision shall be in writing, and it shall include a summary of the relevant information and the reasoning that supports the decision. The decision of the Board may differ from the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee only if the Board finds that the Recommendation from the Hearing Committee is unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory. The Chair of the Board shall send this written decision to the UGO, and the UGO shall send copies of this decision to the Grievant, the Supervisor, the Provost, and the President. The decision of the Board is final.

If the decision of the Board includes taking action as a result of the Grievance, the Chair of the Board shall notify the President and the UGO of the action to be taken, and the President shall notify the appropriate individuals. ~~†This may involve special Board action and/or instruction regarding action to be taken by administrators.~~

K.11 Grievance Panels and Hearing Committees

K.11.1 Grievance Panels *(last revised August 2, 2013)*

The Faculty Grievance Panel shall be a pool of eligible Hearing Committee members consisting of ~~twenty-one (21) tenured faculty members, with at least one (1) from each college~~ one (1) tenured faculty member from each academic department and one (1) tenured faculty member from the University Libraries, and.

The Administrative Professional Grievance Panel shall be a pool of eligible Hearing Committee members consisting of twenty-one (21) administrative professionals, representing at least four (4) administrative areas. ~~Administrative~~

~~professionals~~ Each member shall have had at least five (5) years employment at half-time (0.5) or greater at Colorado State University.

No person having administrative duties, as described in Section K.11.2, shall be qualified to serve on the either Grievance Panel.

K.11.1.1 Duties *(last revised August 2, 2013)*

As specified elsewhere in ~~this s~~Section K, individual members of the Grievance Panel may be recruited to a) serve on individual Hearing Committees, b) serve on search committees to select a new UGO, and c) consult with the leadership of Faculty Council or the Administrative Professional Council, as appropriate, on policy matters related to procedures outlined in Section K and the activities of the UGO.

K.11.1.2 Chairs *(last revised August 2, 2013)*

~~Each year, a Grievance Panel Chair shall be appointed jointly by th presidents the Chair of the Faculty Council and Administrative Professional Council shall select a Chair for the Faculty Grievance Panel from among the panel's its elected members, and the Chair of the Administrative Professional Council shall select a Chair for the Administrative Professional Grievance Panel from among its elected members. This volunteer position shall be filled by a faculty member in academic years ending in an odd number and by and administrative professional in academic years ending in an even number.~~

As specified ~~elsewhere~~ elsewhere in this Section K, the ~~chair's~~ duties of the chairs are:

- a. To meet with the UGO ~~at least quarterly or~~ as needed to review activities of the UGO,
- b. To review challenges to the qualification ~~and classification~~ of grievances by the UGO (Section K.10.13.3),

- c. To appoint a subcommittee to seek nominations for the position of UGO and interview prospective UGO candidates (Section K.12.1),
- d. To confer with the Provost and either the Chair of Faculty Council or the Chair of the Administrative Professional Council on the appointment of a Temporary Special University Grievance Officer, as needed (Section K.12.67),
- e. To advise the UGO on policy and procedural matters covered in ~~this~~ Section K,
- f. To advise the Faculty Council and Administrative Professional Council on matters pertaining to rights and responsibilities described in ~~this~~ Section K,
- g. To provide input for the UGO's annual report (Section K.12.4.hi),
- ~~h. To assist the Faculty Council and the Administrative Professional Council in their annual evaluation of the UGO by receiving and reporting on questionnaires to parties inquiring about or involved in mediation or the grievance process. These questionnaires will be distributed by the UGO (Section K.12.4.1),~~
- ~~ih.~~ To provide input on the UGO's annual performance review (Section K.12.1).

K.11.2 Administrative Duties

With respect to qualification to serve on the Grievance Panel, administrative duty or duties refers to the service of those persons acting as the administrators responsible for the various administrative units, departments, colleges, and the University, and responsible for budgets and supervising and evaluating personnel other than state classified personnel, students, or postdocs. ~~The term shall cover persons having the title "Assistant Dean" or "Associate Dean". This shall include administrators at the level of department head or above, but not assistant or associate department heads. However,~~

~~Service by persons as chairs of committees, or as Principal Investigators on contracts and grants,~~ shall not be considered to be administrative duties.

K.11.3 Election of Grievance Panel Members

~~Faculty members shall be nominated by the Faculty Council Committee on Faculty Governance, who shall provide a full slate of nominees for election by the Faculty Council. Each academic department and the Libraries shall elect one (1) member of the Grievance Panel from among the eligible members of that unit. The electorate eligible to vote for this member of the Faculty Grievance Panel shall consist of all regular full-time, regular part-time, senior teaching, special, and transitional members of the faculty in that unit who have no administrative duties (see Section K.11.2). The Faculty Council Committee on Faculty Governance shall establish uniform nomination and election procedures throughout the University and shall supervise elections in academic departments and the Libraries to ensure secret ballots and impartial election procedures.~~

Administrative professionals shall be elected by the Administrative Professional Council.

Nominations for candidates shall be opened on February 15, annually, and election shall be held in April. Election shall be for a three (3) year term starting on the first (1st) day of Fall semester, with the terms staggered so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the faculty members and one-third (1/3) of the administrative professionals have their terms expire each year. ~~Grievance Panel members who have served two (2) consecutive terms shall be ineligible for re-election for a period of two (2) years.~~ Vacancies shall be filled by elections at other times throughout the year following the procedures set forth above.

~~When a vacancy occurs on the a Grievance Panel, it shall be filled by appointment, unless the vacancy occurs within one (1) month before the next~~

~~regular election, in which case, the unexpired term shall be filled at that election. An appointment of a faculty member shall be made by the Faculty Council Committee on Faculty Governance, and an appointment of an administrative professional shall be made by the Administrative Professional Council.~~

K.11.4 Formation of Hearing Committees

The UGO shall establish a rotation schedule for the members of the Grievance Panels to serve on Hearing Committees. However, at the discretion of the UGO, members may be skipped due to issues such as conflicts of interest, availability, or appropriate criteria (such as faculty rank). A Hearing Committees shall consist of five (5) members having the same appointment Employee Classification (faculty member or administrative professional) as the Grievant. The UGO shall provide each selected member of the Hearing Committee the opportunity to excuse himself or herself from service because of having an involvement with one or both of the parties and/or with the Action being challenged that causes him or her to be incapable of rendering an impartial judgment concerning the Grievance. The UGO shall select replacements for any members who excuse themselves.

Each Hearing Committee scheduled to hear a Grievance shall select from its membership a Chair, who shall be a voting member of the Hearing Committee, preside over the Hearing, maintain orderly procedures, and supervise the preparation of the written Recommendation regarding the Grievance.

~~If a member of the Hearing Committee excuses himself or herself as described in Section K.10.2.g or is excused by the UGO due to a challenge for cause, he or she shall be replaced on the Hearing Committee by the next person of the same appointment classification in the rotation order. If the Chair of the Hearing Committee is replaced in this manner the new members of the Hearing Committee shall select a new Chair from among themselves. In the event that it is impossible to establish a full Hearing Committee from the membership of the~~

Grievance Panel, ~~each of the parties in the Grievance shall nominate two (2) persons for each vacant position, and the UGO shall name the replacements from among those nominees~~ the UGO and either the Chair of Faculty Council or the Chair of the Administrative Professional Council, whichever has the same Employee Classification as the Grievant, shall jointly select the remaining members of the Hearing Committee, subject to further challenge for cause as provided in Section K.10.12.h.

K.12 University Grievance Officer

K.12.1 Selection, Qualifications, and Term of the University Grievance Officer

In October of the third year of the UGO's term of office, the chairs of the Grievance Panels shall jointly appoint a subcommittee of the Grievance Panel memberships, consisting of three (3) faculty members and three (3) administrative professionals, to provide nominations for a UGO to serve the next three-year term. In November, this subcommittee shall solicit nominations, and, in January, it shall recommend ~~two (2) or three (3)~~ qualified persons to the President through the Provost. The UGO shall be selected by the President, after consultation with the members of the subcommittee during the second week of February. The selection must be confirmed by a majority vote of those cast by the Faculty Council and a majority vote of those cast by the Administrative Professional Council in April, such confirmations being conducted separately. In the event that a majority vote of those cast is not attained by both the Faculty Council and the Administrative Professional Council, another candidate shall be proposed by the President. The UGO shall take office on July 1 following the vote and shall report to the Provost. The Provost shall keep the President informed regarding the activities of the UGO.

The UGO shall be a tenured, full-time member of the faculty with at least the rank of associate professor and shall have no administrative duties (see Section K.11.2) throughout the term of service. The term of office shall be three

(3) consecutive one (1) year appointments. There is no limit to the number of terms a UGO may serve.

The UGO shall be evaluated annually. In February, the Executive Committee of Faculty Council and the Executive Committee of the Administrative Professional Council shall each send a written performance evaluation to the Provost. The Provost shall prepare the official evaluation of the UGO and submit it to the President ~~preceding~~ each year prior to the reappointment. The Provost shall also send a copy of this evaluation to the department head of the UGO for use in his or her annual evaluation. If the position of UGO becomes vacant before expiration of the term, the Grievance Panel shall recommend an interim appointment to the President, through the Provost, to serve until a confirmed UGO, selected the following February, takes office on July 1.

K.12.2 Oversight of the University Grievance Officer *(last revised August 2, 2013)*

The UGO shall be accountable to the Faculty and Administrative Professional Councils on matters pertaining to carrying out the responsibilities of the UGO. The UGO shall seek the ~~advise~~ advice of the Chairs of the Grievance Panels on procedural matters. The UGO shall report administratively to the Provost.

K.12.3 Service of the University Grievance Officer

The UGO shall be appointed part-time, depending upon the work load. The appointment fraction and associated funds shall be negotiated ~~at least annually~~ among the UGO, the Provost, and the UGO's department head and may be reviewed as necessary ~~during the year~~. Adequate secretarial and expense support shall be provided by the Office of the Provost.

K.12.4 Duties of the University Grievance Officer *(last revised May 8, 2015)*

The UGO shall be responsible for:

- a. Maintaining a record of actions taken as part of the processes in Section K and Section E.15.
- b. Coordinating and facilitating the activities of the Grievance Panels by maintaining the records of the Panels, scheduling all meetings of the Panels for informational and organizational purposes, scheduling meetings of its Hearing Committees, calling individuals to appear before the Hearing Committees, and establishing the rotation order for service by the members of the Panels on Hearing Committees.
- c. Overseeing the processes of Section K and Section E.15 and preparing reports to the Grievance Panels, including recommendations for improving these processes.
- d. Assuring that faculty members and administrative professionals are familiar with the provisions, components, purposes, and procedures of the processes of Section K and Section E.15.
- e. Consulting with at-will employees and the Office of General Counsel about disciplinary action or termination of at-will employees, as discussed in Section K.3.1.g.
- f. Making recommendations to Hearing Committees regarding guidelines for the operation of these committees pursuant to Section K and Section E.15.
- g. Advising potential and active parties to a Grievance of their prospects for sustaining a Grievance, including their responsibilities for following the procedural rules of Section K.10.
- h. Facilitating the conduct of Hearings ~~decision~~ pursuant to Section K and Section E.15.
- i. Preparing an annual report, ~~in consultation with the Chair of the Grievance Panel~~ each ~~June~~ December for the Faculty Council and Administrative

Professional Council, which summarizes activities and recommendations during the previous year.

j. Maintaining and updating the list of University Mediators (UMs).

k. Appointing appropriate UMs to mediate disputes involving faculty members, administrative professionals, and/or administrators.

l. Coordinating orientation and training of University Mediators and Grievance Panel members

m. Assisting ~~the~~ Faculty Council and ~~the~~ Administrative Professional Council in their annual evaluations of the UGO by ~~distributing questionnaires to parties inquiring about or involved in mediation or the grievance process, and assigning numerical identifiers to each questionnaire, thus maintaining participants' anonymity~~ notifying all participants in the Section K process of the opportunity to participate in anonymous surveys regarding the performance of the UGO.

K.12.5 Right to Extend Deadlines

At his or her discretion, the UGO may extend any deadlines or timelines described in Section K and Section E.15. An individuals involved in these processes may submit to the UGO an objection to such an extension, and the UGO shall give such an objection serious consideration. However, the final decision regarding an extension rests with the UGO.

K.12.56 Legal Advice

At any time, the UGO may seek legal advice from the Office of General Counsel for the University. If the UGO determines that it is appropriate to seek legal advice from outside the Office of the General Counsel for the University, he or she may request that the Office of the General Counsel engage the services of an attorney from the Colorado Attorney General's Office to give

legal advice to the UGO. If the UGO determines that it is necessary to seek legal advice from an attorney who is outside of the Office of the General Counsel and the Colorado Attorney General's Office, the UGO may make such a request to the Office of the General Counsel. Any such engagement must be approved by the Colorado Attorney General's Office. A denial by the Colorado Attorney General's Office of such a request is ~~not grievable~~ final.

K.12.67 Temporary Special University Grievance Officer

In the event of a conflict of interest by the UGO in a dispute, or in the event that the UGO becomes a Grievant or requests to be recused, the ~~Provost~~ President, after consultation with the chairs of the Grievance Panels ~~and the President~~, shall appoint a Temporary Special UGO for that dispute. The Temporary Special UGO shall have all the duties described herein of the UGO for the duration of the specific dispute for which he or she is appointed.

K.13 University Mediators

K.13.1 Qualifications of University Mediators

The individuals nominated and recommended as UMs shall be presently employed or retired faculty members or administrative professionals who have the skills, credibility and commitment that would enable them to discharge their duties effectively as UMs. ~~A~~ C~~urrently employed individuals~~ shall obtain prior approval from their department head/supervisor. The UGO is not eligible to serve as a UM.

K.13.1.1 Qualifications of University Mediators for Faculty

Each UM for faculty members shall be a tenured, full-time faculty member with at least the rank of associate professor or a person ~~a faculty member with a transitional or emeritus/emerita appointment~~ who previously held such a rank an appointment. He or she shall have no administrative duties (see Section

K.11.2) throughout the term of service. ~~Within ten (10) working days of an appeal from the Grievant or a Hearing Committee decision that was not appealed, the Provost shall respond by providing to all parties to the Grievance and the UGO a written statement of the decision rendered with a summary of relevant evidence and the reasoning that sustains the decision.~~

K.13.1.2 Qualifications of University Mediators for Administrative Professionals

Each UM for administrative professionals shall be employed at least half-time (0.5) as an administrative professional at Colorado State University or, ~~if retired, shall have been employed by the University at least half-time (0.5) as an administrative professional~~ a person who previously held such an appointment.

K.13.2 Selection, Terms, and Evaluation of University Mediators for Academic Faculty *(last revised August 2, 2013)*

The Chair of Faculty Council and the Provost shall solicit nominations for faculty UMs ~~from the faculty members~~ prior to the end of each academic year. In consultation with the Executive Committee of Faculty Council ~~Executive Committee, the Council of Deans, and any other appropriate groups~~, the Chair of Faculty Council and the Provost shall jointly forward recommendations to the President. The President shall appoint at least two (2) faculty UMs for the upcoming year. The faculty UMs ~~for faculty members~~ shall take office on July 1 following their appointment by the President.

University Mediators may be eligible to receive supplemental pay based on hours devoted to mediation activities. Moreover, the Provost and the faculty member's ~~immediate supervisor~~ department head may choose to provide an adjustment in effort distribution and/or workload. In this case, individuals appointed as ~~academic~~ faculty UMs may negotiate this change in effort

distribution and/or workload with their ~~immediate supervisor~~ department head, to reflect their involvement in the ~~M~~mediation process.

The term of office for a faculty UM shall be three (3) consecutive one (1) year appointments on an at-will basis. There is no limit to the number of terms a UM may serve. ~~Each UM shall be evaluated annually. A faculty UM who has mediated one or more cases during the calendar year shall be evaluated the following February by the Executive Committee of Faculty Council, who shall send a written performance evaluation to the Provost. The Provost shall then prepare the official evaluation of the UM and submit it to the President prior to the reappointment of the UM. In February, the Executive Committee of Faculty Council who shall send a written performance evaluation to the Provost, and the Provost shall then prepare the official evaluation of the UM and submit it to the President preceding each reappointment.~~ If the need arises to appoint an additional UM during the academic year, the Chair of Faculty Council and the Provost shall recommend jointly an interim appointment to the President to serve until a new UM is selected and takes office the next July 1.

K.13.3 Selection, Terms, and Evaluation of University Mediators for Administrative Professionals *(last revised August 2, 2013)*

The Chair of the Administrative Professional Council and the Vice President for University Operations shall solicit nominations for administrative professional UMs ~~for administrative professionals~~ prior to the end of each academic year. In consultation with the Executive Committee of the Administrative Professional Council ~~and any other appropriate groups~~, the Chair of the Administrative Professional Council and the Vice President for University Operations shall jointly forward recommendations to the President. The President shall appoint at least two (2) administrative professional UMs for the upcoming year. The administrative professional UMs ~~for administrative professionals~~ shall take office on July 1 following their appointment by the President.

University Mediators may be eligible to receive supplemental pay based on hours devoted to mediation activities. Moreover, the Vice President for University Operations and the administrative professional's immediate supervisor may choose to provide an adjustment in effort distribution and/or workload. In this case, individuals appointed as administrative professional UMs may negotiate this change in effort distribution and/or workload with their immediate supervisor to reflect their involvement in the Mmediation process.

The term of office for an administrative professional UM shall be three (3) consecutive one (1) year appointments on an at-will basis. There is no limit to the number of terms a UM may serve. An administrative professional University Mediators UM who ~~have~~ has mediated one or more cases during the calendar year shall be evaluated ~~in that calendar year~~ the following February by the Executive Committee of the Administrative Professional Council, who shall send a written performance evaluation to the Vice President for University Operations. The Vice President for University Operations shall then prepare the official evaluation of the UM and submit it to the President ~~preceding each~~ prior to the reappointment of the UM. If the need arises to appoint an additional UM during the academic year, the Chair of the Administrative Professional Council and the Vice President for University Operations shall jointly recommend an interim appointment to the President to serve until a new UM is selected and takes office the next July 1.

~~K.14 Key Time Limits Within the Mediation and Grievance Processes~~

Action		Maximum Number of Working Days
(a)	Action discovered	
(b)	Submission of written claim to UGO	20 days after (a)
(c)	Appointment of University Mediator (UM)	5 days after (b)
(d)	Decision by UM whether to attempt mediation	10 days after (c)
(e)	Mediation Period	20 days after (d)
(f)	Submission of written Grievance Complaint	5 days after (d) and (e)
(g)	Written Response from Responsible Administrator	5 days after (f)

(h)	Form Hearing Committee and begin Hearing	10 days after (f)
(i)	Conclude Hearing	10 days after (h)
(j)	Recommendation of Hearing Committee	10 days after (i)
(k)	Notification of Recommendation by UGO	2 days after (j)
(l)	Appeal of Hearing Committee Recommendation	5 days after (k)
(m)	Review by Provost	10 days after (k) and (l)
(n)	Appeal of Provost Recommendation	5 days after (m)
(o)	Review by President	20 days after (n)

¹ The term “~~personal~~ personnel file” refers to information collected because of the employer-employee relationship, and it does not necessarily refer to a single physical file. In order for information to be part of the personnel file, there must be a reasonable expectation that such information will be kept private. Information in the personnel file is generally not made available for public inspection, but it is available to the individual and to his or her supervisors.

September 18, 2017

To: Tim Gallagher, Chair, Faculty Council
From: Matt Hickey, Chair, Committee on Teaching and Learning
Subject: Appropriate Uses of the ASCSU Student Course Survey

The Committee on Teaching and Learning submits the following motion:

MOVED, THAT SECTION E.12.1 OF THE *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

E.12.1 Teaching and Advising (~~last revised August 2, 2013~~)

As part of its mission, the University is dedicated to undergraduate, graduate, professional, and continuing education locally, nationally, and internationally. Toward that end teachers engage learners, transfer knowledge, develop skills, create opportunities for learning, advise, and facilitate students' transfer of knowledge across contexts and their academic and professional development.

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, classroom and/or laboratory instruction; individual tutoring; supervision and instruction of student researchers; clinical teaching; field work supervision and training; preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; service learning; outreach/engagement; and other activities that organize and disseminate knowledge. Faculty members' supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that do not confer any University credit also is considered teaching. Associated teaching activities include class preparation; grading; laboratory or equipment maintenance; preparation and funding of proposals to improve instruction; attendance at workshops on teaching improvement; and planning of curricula and courses of study; and mentoring colleagues in any of these activities. Outreach/engagement activities such as service learning, conducting workshops, seminars, and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes, may be integrated into teaching efforts. These outreach activities include teaching efforts of faculty members with Extension appointments.

Excellent teachers are characterized by their command of subject matter; logical organization and presentation of course material; ability to help students recognize formation of interrelationships among fields of knowledge; energy and enthusiasm; availability to help students outside of class; encouragement of curiosity, creativity, and critical thought; engagement of students in the learning process; understanding of how students learn and encouragement of effective learning strategies; use of clear grading criteria; and respectful responses to student questions and ideas.

Departments shall foster a culture that values and recognizes excellent teaching, and encourages reflective self-assessment. To that end, departmental codes ~~should~~ will, within

the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching should be designed to highlight strengths, identify deficiencies, and improve teaching and learning. Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching shall must involve substantive review of multiple sources of information such as course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; integration of service learning; appropriate course surveys of teaching and/or summaries of how the instructor used information from student feedback to improve course design or instructional delivery, as well as any evidence of the outcomes of such improvements; letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and evidence of the use of active and/or experiential learning, student learning achievement, professional development related to teaching and learning, and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Anonymous letters or comments shall not be used to evaluate teaching, except with the consent of the instructor or as authorized in a department's code. Evaluation of teaching ~~effectiveness~~ effectiveness should take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., face-to-face and online settings; lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching assignments, in particular in the context of the type and level of courses taught. The ~~University~~ University provides resources to support the evaluation of ~~teaching~~ teaching effectiveness, such as systems to create and assess teaching portfolios, access to exemplary teaching portfolios, and professional development programs focusing on teaching and learning.

Effective advising of students, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, is a vital part of the teaching/learning process. Advising activities include, but are not limited to, meeting with students to explain graduation requirements; giving academic advice; giving career advice or referring the student to the appropriate person for that advice; and supervision of or assistance with graduate student theses/dissertations/projects. Advising is characterized by being available to students, keeping appointments, providing accurate and appropriate advice, and providing knowledgeable guidance. Evaluation of advising effectiveness can be based upon signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty members, and professional peers. The faculty in each academic unit shall develop specific criteria and standards for evaluation and methods for evaluating teaching and advising effectiveness and shall evaluate advising as part of annual and periodic comprehensive reviews. These criteria, standards, and methods shall be incorporated into departmental codes.

Rationale:

The proposed changes to the language incorporate recommendations from the 2015 TILT/UDTS Task Force Report on Teaching and Learning and are consonant with proposed

change to the language in the Faculty Manual in section I.8 that addresses student course evaluations. Providing coherent guidance in both I.8 and E.12.1 of the Faculty Manual on the appropriate use of student course surveys will help to ensure that information gathered through them will not constitute the sole or primary basis for judging teaching effectiveness. Making this change in policy will help lead departments to adopt evaluation strategies that can support fairer and more accurate evaluations than is possible through use of student course survey results alone.

September 18, 2017

To: Tim Gallagher, Chair, Faculty Council
From: Matt Hickey, Chair, Committee on Teaching and Learning
Subject: Appropriate Uses of the ASCSU Student Course Survey

The Committee on Teaching and Learning submits the following motion:

MOVED, THAT SECTION I.8 OF THE *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

I.8 Student Course Survey (~~last revised June 21, 2011~~)

The Student Course Survey is designed to provide feedback to course instructors and is to be used for course improvement. In addition, it is designed to provide information for students to make informed choices about courses. If used for teaching mentoring or as part of the evaluation of teaching, the student course surveys must be used ONLY in conjunction with other sources of evidence (see section E.12.1). Thus, these surveys may not be used, in whole or in part, as the primary source of evidence for an instructor's teaching effectiveness and must be treated as one element of limited weight alongside a range of evaluative tools (as mentioned in E.12.1). The use of course feedback as a stand-alone tool is not a credible means of evaluating the quality of teaching.

Each term, course instructors shall conduct at least one student survey of all the courses they teach through a system administered by the University utilizing the standardized University-wide instrument. ~~At the end of each term, survey forms shall be digitized and responses shall be tabulated.~~ Summaries of responses for each course surveyed shall be posted at <http://coursesurvey.colostate.edu>. Access to the summaries shall be granted to anyone with a CSU eID. Access to digital copies of the survey forms shall be granted only to the course instructor(s), to individuals explicitly granted access by the instructor(s), and to any other persons granted access by the department code. Costs for conducting and providing access to survey results shall be shared by the University and the Associated Students of Colorado State University (ASCSU). ASCSU's financial contribution shall not exceed half of the required financial resources to operate this program.

The Committee on Teaching and Learning is responsible for making recommendations regarding the survey instrument and its use. Changes to the Student Course Survey shall be approved by Faculty Council.

Rationale: The ASCSU Student Course Survey has been used for more than three decades, in various forms, as a source of information in annual evaluations of faculty as well as in tenure and promotion processes. A steady accumulation of research on the use of student course surveys indicates, however, that student responses to such surveys, in isolation, cannot substitute for the judgment of peers and the careful examination of course materials, classroom activities, and student learning outcomes. A recent review article by Stark & Freishtat (2014), for example, concluded that although students can offer valuable information about student experiences in a class, particularly in the areas of *“clarity, pace, legibility, audibility, and their own excitement (or boredom),”* they are poor judges of teaching effectiveness (p. 13). In their review, Stark and Freishtat also reported, *“Controlled, randomized experiments find that SET [student evaluations of teaching] ratings are negatively associated with direct measures of effectiveness. Importantly, SET seem to be influenced by the gender, ethnicity, and attractiveness of the instructor”* (p. 19).

In August 2013, the Faculty Council approved changes to section E.12.1 of the manual that direct departments to ensure that their codes, “within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness.” Providing coherent guidance in both I.8 and E.12.1 of the Faculty Manual on the appropriate use of student course surveys will help to ensure that information gathered through them will not constitute the sole or primary basis for judging teaching effectiveness. Making this change in policy will help lead departments to adopt evaluation strategies that can support fairer and more accurate evaluations than is possible through use of student course survey results alone.