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 <u>underlined</u>; deletions ~~over scored~~.

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
May 7, 2019 – 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences – Room C101

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.by Tim Gallagher, Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1.   Next Faculty Council Meeting – September 3, 2019– Clark Building – Room A201 – 4:00 p.m.

        Gallagher announced that the last Faculty Council meeting of the semester would be held on September 3, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. – Clark Building, Room A201. Gallagher hopes President McConnell can attend, per his request with her assistant.

2.   Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – March 12 and 26, 2019; April 9 and 16, 2019 (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.   Graduate Student Council Advising Awards – presented by Ryan Czarny, President of Graduate Student Council Advising.

        Czarny said there were over 100 nominations. The certificates will be given to the award winners soon.

        Award winner:
        o   Kristen Rasmussen – Department of Atmospheric Science

        Runner-Up:
        o   Edwin Chong – Electrical and Computer Engineering

        Honorable Mention:
        o   Andrew Bliss – College of Liberal Arts
        o   Heather Leach – College of Health and Human Sciences
        o   Steve Fonte – College of Agricultural Sciences

4.   Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award – Announcement of winner

Gallagher explained the history and criteria of the award.

David Greene, College of Health and Human Sciences, is the recipient of the 2019 Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award. He was nominated by Jenny Morse, Chair, CoNTTF. David influenced innumerable policies--including leave policies, smoking policies, grievance policies, academic integrity, tuition scholarships, promotions, and was involved in every other part of Faculty Council, including serving on CoRSAF, CoNTTF, and the Discipline Panel.

We are very pleased that David is here today to receive this award.   Gallagher presented the award to David Greene with applause from Faculty Council members.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1.   Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – March 5, 2019 and April 2, 2019

Gallagher asked if there were any amendments to the March or April Faculty Council meeting minutes.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): 1) Pages 24 and 30 – repeated information; delete one of these; 2) Page 52 –the response from the Provost appears as a response by Pedros-Gascon. The response should be identified as from the Provost.

Gallagher: With Antonio's changes as amended, please say aye to approve these minutes.

The amended minutes were unanimously approved.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1.   None.

CONSENT AGENDA

1.   UCC meeting minutes – March 29, 2019; April 5, 12, and 19, 2019

Brad Goetz moved for approval of the Consent Agenda.

Gallagher: Unless anyone wishes to have any of these items removed for a separate action, we will vote on the whole consent agenda. All vote to approve?

The Consent Agenda was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

1.   Election – Faculty Council Standing Committee nominees – Committee on Faculty Governance

Steven Reising, CoFG, moved that the following Faculty Council Standing Committee nominees be approved.

Gallagher: Are there any additional nominations from the floor?
There were no nominations.

The following nominees were unanimously approved:

BALLOT
Academic Faculty Nominations to Faculty Council Standing Committees
May 7, 2019

<u>COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE</u>

		Term Expires
LEO VIJAYASARATHY (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CoB	2022
~~BENJAMIN CLEGG~~ ~~(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)~~ (**listed under CoTL**)	~~CNS~~	~~2022~~
TROY OCHELTREE (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	WCNR	2022
STEVEN REISING (*Carry-In*) (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CoE	2022

<u>COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS</u>

KEVIN CROOKS (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	WCNR	2022
KAREN HYLLEGARD (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CHHS	2022
MICHAEL WILKINS (*Carry-in*) (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CAS	2022

COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES

JAMES WILSON _____	CNS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
PATRICIA RETTIG _____	Libraries	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		
JERRY MAGLOUGHLIN _____	WCNR	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		
JIANGUO ZHAO *(Carry-in)* _	CoE	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		

COMMITTEE ON NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

STEVEN BENOIT_____ _	CNS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
LESLIE STONE-ROY _____	CVMBS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
CHRISTINE PAWLIUK _____	Libraries	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
NATALIE OOI _____	WCNR	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

CHRIS WEINBERGER *(Carry-in)* _	CoE	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		

COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND GRADUATE EDUCATION

MICHELLE WILDE ____	Libraries	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		
MATT KIPPER *(Carry-in)* _	CoE	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		
GREG GRAFF *(Carry-in)* _	CAS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		

COMMITTEE ON SCHOLASTIC STANDARDS

KAREN BARRETT_____ ____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CHHS	2022
ZACHARY JOHNSON_____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CAS	2022
MICHAEL GROSS_____ _____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	COB	2022

COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC AND FINANCIAL PLANNING

YONGLI ZHOU _____ _____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance	Libraries	2022
MATTHEW JOHNSTON_____ _____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance	CVMBS	2022
MICHELLE FOSTER_____ _____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance	CHHS	2022

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

BENJAMIN CLEGG_____ _____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CNS	2022
KARAN VENAYAGAMOORTHY_____ ___ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CoE	2022
MATT HICKEY_____ __ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CHHS	2022
COURTNEY SCHULTZ_____ _____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	WCNR	2022

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

JOCELYN BOICE_____ _____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	Libraries	2022

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

MARTIN GELFAND_____ _____ _____ (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CNS	2022

2.   Proposed revisions to Section C.2.1.9.5 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG

Gallagher asked Faculty Council members for permission to change the order of Action Items #2 and #3 in today's agenda packet, and consider Action Item #3 - Section D.2 first, then consider Action Item #2 – Section C.2.1.9.5.

Faculty Council had no objections, so Section D.2 will be addressed first

.

Don Estep, Chair, CoFG spoke to the motion – Section C.2.1.9.5.

Estep stated that this is pretty straightforward and explains that this implements putting this committee into the Code.

Gallagher: This proposal is now on the floor for discussion. Gallagher also stated that because this is a Section C motion, it requires approval of at least 2/3 of the votes cast to pass.

.   Gallagher: All in favor, please say aye.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by strikeouts.

C.2.1.9.5 Standing Committees: Membership and Function

a. Executive Committee *(last revised January xx, 2017)*

The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chairperson of Faculty Council as Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson of Faculty Council as Vice Chairperson, the immediate past Chairperson of Faculty Council (ex officio), the Provost (ex officio), the faculty representative to the Board, and one (1) elected Faculty Council representative from each college and the Libraries. The continuing and newly-elected Faculty Council members from each college shall choose their representative from among themselves in April for a one (1) year term beginning July 1. The immediate past Chairperson of Faculty Council shall be a member of the Executive Committee for one (1) year immediately following the expiration of his or her term as Chairperson of Faculty Council.

The duties of the Executive Committee shall be:

1. To receive, review, and evaluate all recommendations from the various standing committees, and to report them to the Faculty Council.
2. To refer matters to standing committees of the Faculty Council.
3. To act for the Faculty Council between meetings of that body.
4. To execute those duties as may from time to time be given it by the Faculty Council or by the Board.

5. To receive petitions for calling additional meetings of the Faculty Council (see Section C.2.1.10, Article I, Section I).
6. To prepare the agenda for Faculty Council meetings.
7. To participate in the evaluation of University officers.
8. To recommend policies pertaining to the University calendar.
9. When appropriate, to establish priorities when assigning issues to Faculty Council standing committees.
10. To meet periodically with the faculty representatives to the Benefits Committee in order to ensure timely Faculty Council input and dialogue concerning University benefits programs.
11. To meet periodically with the faculty representatives to the University Policy Review Committee in order to ensure timely Faculty Council input and dialogue concerning development of proposed new University policies and review of major revisions of existing University policies.

b. Committee on Faculty Governance *(last revised December xx, 2017)*

The Committee on Faculty Governance shall consist of one (1) faculty member from each college and the Libraries. The duties of this standing committee shall be:

1. To recommend to the Faculty Council amendments to the University Code, including revisions to update it.
2. To periodically review practices and procedures of the Faculty Council and its standing committees to assure compliance with the University Code.
3. To apportion annually the elected representatives of the colleges and University Libraries to the Faculty Council.
4. To provide interpretations of the University Code.
5. To establish uniform procedures for electing Faculty Council officers and members of its standing committees and to supervise the election of representatives to the Faculty Council.
6. To make and forward nominations for standing committees of the Faculty Council and faculty members of Benefits Committee (see Section D.2.1), University Policy Review Committee (See Section D2.2), Grievance Panel (see Section K.15.1), Sexual Harassment Panel (see Appendix 1.III.B.2), and the University Discipline Panel (see Section I.7.3.2), and submit names of nominees for the offices of Faculty Council Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and Representative to the Board and for other positions as requested by the Faculty Council.

   Rationale:

   University policies have significant impact on the university community. The process for developing new policies and revising existing policies is coordinated and managed by the Office of Policy and Compliance (OPC). OPC helps identify stakeholders, gathers input from stakeholders and subject matter experts, helps the policy proponent assess the impacts of a proposed policy on groups and individuals of the University, and presents policies to the

President's Cabinet for approval. However, there is no representative body for the employee councils and student government to interact in an organized way with OPC, receive input from the community, bring forward questions and concerns about policies, and make recommendations to the Administration. As a consequence, employee and student feedback is received in an ad hoc fashion that can hinder a systematic review.

The proposed committee will extend shared governance to the development and implementation of policies that direct day-to-day operations of the university. It will also provide a point of contact for the Administration when contemplating new policies and policy changes and when they receive employee or student complaints about policy.

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty endorses this motion.

3. Proposed revisions to Section D.2 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG

Gallagher asked Faculty Council to change the order of the Action Items in today's packet and consider D.2 first, then vote on Action Item #2 (C.2.1.9.5). Faculty Council had no objections, so D.2 will be addressed first.

Don Estep, Chair, CoFG spoke to this motion.

Estep and Gallagher felt it would be useful to hear some history on this proposal. It has been over three years in construction for a new committee, after being contacted by Mary Stromberger (former Chair of Faculty Council) and Dan Turk (former Chair, CoRSAF). Stromberger was concerned to state a faculty opinion on major policies. Both the Faculty Council Chair and CoRSAF Chair were being asked to state such opinions. In the past, when this happened, CoRSAF was asked and had to give opinions on nothing with their sphere of responsibility. They also resented being asked as it was very time consuming. Estep said they talked a lot between Stromberger and CoRSAF, and thought it would be good idea to form a new committee.

The previous proposal was quite different than what is proposed here today. The proposal was handed to Estep to shepherd, so "we" (CoFG) could write the proposal. It went to President Frank and Provost Miranda. In Estep's experience as Chair of CoFG, he had trouble getting campus-wide opinions, and he was criticized for doing so. Tony Frank added another dimension, as he had concerns about the first proposal and wanted to see a University Committee, not just a Faculty Council committee. Frank wanted to reformulate the proposal and bring in different "stakeholders". We had an ad hoc committee with Mary Stromberger, Robert Schur, and CoRSAF. So, now you have this proposal in front of you. I wrote a short rationale. The purpose is to gather opinions on campus on major policies, policy changes, or if conflicts develop because of a policy. This committee has no conflict of interest. The same with administration, if administration affects faculty, this committee will organize, gather, summarize,

and present the results. Estep does not believe that faculty voices are fully represented on this campus. He seeks to get opinions of faculty on major Code changes.

Gallagher: The CoFG has made this motion. The floor is now open for discussion.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): The idea is to make this a brainstorm committee, so are we are asking Faculty Council to surrender any kind of power we have now?

Estep does not perceive any such danger.   When there is conflict on policy, it is better to have a group whose sole responsibility is to collect opinions individually and summarize the opinions. This way, someone can't claim that only two people were notified, etc.

Michael Pante (Anthropology): It sounds like it will give faculty a voice before proposals come to Faculty Council. I would speak in favor of this proposal.

Estep confirms.

Jenny Morse (Chair, CoNTTF): Would NTTF be eligible to serve?

Estep: If you are at risk, then yes.

Gallagher: NTTF are faculty.

Cini Brown (BSPM): Can you give us an example of a policy that would have benefited from this committee?

Estep: The original Bullying Policy, graduate student training, and currently a request to edit a Word document to collect comprehensive opinions on an issue. I don't think sending out a broadcast Word document is a good way to get vast opinions.

Karen Barrett (HDFS; Chair, CoSS): I was wondering if there was any timetable included in this? This would be great if it occurs before the policy is implemented, but I don't see anything that would indicate that. Did I miss a timeline involved?

Estep: You're right. It doesn't state a timetable, but we are hoping that this happens sort of organically where the committee precedes committee decision.

Steve Shulman (CLA): Does this mean that every proposal being considered would be routed through this committee? Who determines what proposal goes through this committee first?

Estep: The Chair of Faculty Council, or committees could do so. It's supposed to be open to anyone for access. This could be revisited regarding a timeline, but we don't want this to slow things down, but it would apply to major policy questions.

Dan Baker (CoNTTF): Could this committee be used to negotiate differences between a department code and the *Manual*?

Estep: That kind of question is for the Provost. If there was a systematic disagreement over the entire campus, then it would be the right place to go.

Gallagher: Are we ready to vote? All in favor of the D.2 proposal say Aye.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Additions are <u>underlined</u>, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

D.2 University Committee<u>s</u> of Faculty and Administrative Professionals

<u>D.2.2 University Policy Review Committee</u> *(last revised September xx, 2017)*

<u>The University Policy Review Committee (UPRC) advises the University community regarding University policy.</u>

> *<u>A University policy is a set of governing principles formally approved to provide assistance in the conduct of university affairs. University policies apply across the university and have impact on a substantial segment of the campus population. University policies authorize or constrain actions to enhance the university mission and operational efficiency; mitigate and manage institutional risk; and, in some cases, ensure compliance with federal, state and local laws and regulations.</u>*

<u>The UPRC consists of two (2) faculty members, two (2) administrative professional members, two (2) state classified personnel members, one (1) graduate student, one (1) undergraduate student, and the Executive Director of the Department of Policy, Risk & Environmental Programs (*ex officio* non-voting). Each faculty, administrative professional, and classified personnel representative on the UPRC shall serve a three (3) year term, with terms beginning July 1, and are the ones eligible to chair this committee. Graduate and undergraduate student representatives shall serve 1-year terms, effective immediately following elections at the October Faculty Council meeting. The committee shall annually elect a Chair from its eligible members.</u>

<u>Faculty members shall be nominated by the Faculty Council Committee on Faculty Governance who shall provide nominees for election by the Faculty Council. The administrative professional and classified personnel members shall be appointed by their respective Councils. Nominations of the graduate student member shall be made by the University Graduate Student Council. Graduate student nominations shall be forwarded to the Faculty Council Committee on Faculty Governance for inclusion on the election ballot for voting by Faculty Council. Nominations of undergraduate students shall be made by the ASCSU Director of Academics with the advice and consultation of</u>

the President and the Vice President of ASCSU. All such nominees shall be recommended to the ASCSU Senate and shall have majority approval of the ASCSU Senate before the nominations are forwarded to the Faculty Council Committee on Faculty Governance for inclusion on the election ballot for voting by Faculty Council.

The duties of the UPRC shall be:

1. To facilitate the review of the (potential) impact of proposed new university policies and to facilitate the review of the (potential) impact of current policies when they are significantly revised or when questions arise about their interpretation, effectiveness or impacts, and to gather and collate input from the bodies represented on the committee.

2. To solicit and facilitate input on (potential) conflicts between university administrative policies and the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual and the HR Manual.

3. To help identify parts of the university community that may be affected by university policy for consideration in a review of the impact of university policy.

4. To solicit and facilitate relevant and appropriate dialog within the university community for consideration in a review of the impact of a proposed new university policy or significant revision being carried out by the Office of Policy & Compliance.

5. To recommend evaluation of the impact of proposed university policies and their implementation by the appropriate, impacted groups or units, and of existing university policies when questions or concerns arise.

The UPRC shall consider requests for review of university policy from the university community. It shall transmit the results of reviews and recommendations to the Administration, the Faculty Council, the Administrative Professional Council, Classified Personnel Council, ASCSU, and the University Graduate Student Council.

The UPRC shall develop a set of operating procedures, which shall be made available to all members of the University community. The Chair of the UPRC shall submit copies of committee minutes and present an annual report to Faculty Council, the Administrative Professional Council, Classified Personnel Council, ASCSU, the University Graduate Student Council, and the Executive Director of the Department of Policy, Risk & Environmental Programs.

Rationale:

University policies have significant impact on the university community. The process for developing new policies and revising existing policies is coordinated and managed by the Office of Policy and Compliance (OPC). OPC helps identify stakeholders, gathers input from stakeholders and subject matter experts, helps the policy proponent assess the impacts of a proposed policy on groups and individuals of the University, and presents policies to the President's Cabinet for approval. However, there is no representative body for the employee councils and student government to interact in an organized way with OPC, receive input from the community, bring forward questions and concerns about policies, and make recommendations to the Administration. As a consequence, employee and student feedback is received in an ad hoc fashion that can hinder a systematic review.

The proposed committee will extend shared governance to the development and implementation of policies that direct day-to-day operations of the university. It will also provide a point of contact for the Administration when contemplating new policies and policy changes and when they receive employee or student complaints about policy.

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty endorses this motion.

> 4.   Request for New Department: Systems Engineering, in the Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering - Section C.2.3.1.d Colleges and Academic Departments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual*
>
> Don Estep, Chair, CoFG spoke to the motion and offered to take questions on this motion to create a new Department - Systems Engineering.
>
> Gallagher: This motion is now on the floor for discussion.
>
> There was no discussion

.

> Gallagher: All in favor of approving the motion to create a new Department of Systems Engineering, please say aye.
>
> The motion was unanimously approved.

MOVED, THAT SECTIONS C.2.1.3.1 of the ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by strikeouts.

C.2.3.1 Colleges and Academic Departments

The colleges, each organized under their respective academic dean, have general charge over their respective undergraduate and/or professional degree programs. These are:

a. College of Agricultural Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Agricultural and Resource Economics; Animal Sciences; Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management; Horticulture and Landscape Architecture; and Soil and Crop Sciences.

b. College of Health and Human Sciences *(last revised February 6, 2013)*
Comprising the Departments of Construction Management; Design and Merchandising; Health and Exercise Science; Food Science and Human Nutrition; Human Development and Family Studies; Occupational Therapy; the School of Education; and the School of Social Work.

c. College of Business
Comprising the Departments of Accounting; Computer Information Systems; Finance and Real Estate; Management; and Marketing.

d. College of Engineering *(last revised January 27, 2006)*
Comprising the Departments of Atmospheric Science; Chemical and Biological Engineering;
Civil and Environmental Engineering; Electrical and Computer Engineering; ~~and~~ Mechanical
Engineering; and Systems Engineering.

e. College of Liberal Arts *(last revised March 31, 2019)*
Comprising the Departments of Anthropology; Art and Art History; Communication Studies;
Economics; English; Ethnic Studies; History; Journalism and Media Communication;
Languages, Literatures and Cultures; Philosophy; Political Science; Sociology; and School of
Music, Theatre, and Dance.

f. College of Natural Resources *(last revised June 21, 2011)*
Comprising the Departments of Ecosystem Science and Sustainability; Fish, Wildlife, and
Conservation Biology; Forest and Rangeland Stewardship; Geosciences; and Human Dimensions
of Natural Resources

g. College of Natural Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Biology; Chemistry;
Computer Science; Mathematics; Physics; Psychology; and Statistics.

h. College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Biomedical Sciences; Clinical Sciences; Environmental and
Radiological Health Sciences; and Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology.

Rationalization: The Systems Engineering Program in the College of Engineering was created in
2008 to offer graduate degrees and certificates in Systems Engineering for both resident and
online students. The courses are offered under the general ENGR designation. Since its creation,
it has granted 143 certificates, 102 Master's degrees and 11 Ph.D. degrees. The College of
Engineering proposes to create a Department of Systems Engineering to become the home of the
program. The reasons this is a timely move include:
- Systems Engineering is well recognized discipline with associated departments in over 45
  universities in the United States. For 2019, the CSU Ph.D. in Systems Engineering was
  ranked #1 for Engineering Ph.D. programs available online (https://www.online-phd-
  programs.org/best-online-engineering-doctoral-programs/).
- The number of students has increased steadily so that currently more than 200 students
  are enrolled.
- Establishing a separate code (SYSE) for courses in a Department of Systems Engineering
  will provide students in the program with transcripts that clearly identify their systems-
  engineering specific coursework, make systems-engineering coursework more
  identifiable to students on campus, and provide a stronger basis for recruiting students to
  the program.
- There are currently 5 tenure track faculty associated with Systems Engineering that have
  their tenure home in Engineering Departments. The College of Engineering will hire 2
  more tenure track faculty in Systems Engineering. All of these faculty have been or will
  be hired with the agreement that their tenure home would be transferred to a Department

of Systems Engineering when it is created. A Department of Systems Engineering will strengthen the ability of the systems-engineering faculty to coordinate educational activities and pursue research opportunities and funding.

Notes

- One faculty member in Systems Engineering teaches an undergraduate course in Intellectual Property and we are exploring the possibilities for a minor in Systems Engineering and potential "4+1" options with some of the currently existing undergraduate degree programs.
- Staff and non-tenure track faculty with assignments to support Systems Engineering will be transferred to the new Department. It is not anticipated that additional resources, beyond the normal sharing of tuition from online enrollments, will be needed going forward.

This proposal has been endorsed by:

- The faculty to be associated with the new Department have been hired under the agreement to move to the Department when it is established.
- The Dean and Department Chairs of the College of Engineering have voted to support the motion.
- The University Curriculum Committee has voted to approve the motion.
- The Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning has voted to approve the motion.
- The Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education has voted to approve the motion.
- The Council of Deans and the Provost's Office has voted to support the motion.
- The Registrar's office is aware of the change and prepared to make the necessary adjustments.
- CSU Distance is aware of the change and are prepared to change communications accordingly.
- The Committee on Faculty Governance has voted to support the motion.

5. Request for Department name change in the College of Liberal Arts – Change Department of Anthropology to Department of Anthropology and Geography - Section C.2.3.1.e Colleges and Academic Departments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG

Don Estep, Chair, CoFG spoke to the motion.

Gallagher: This name change is from the College of Liberal Arts.

Gallagher: This is now on the floor for discussion.

There was no discussion.

Gallagher: All in favor of this name change, please say aye.

Unanimously approved by Faculty Council.

The Committee on Faculty Governance submits the following amendment:

MOVED, THAT SECTIONS C.2.1.3.1.e of the ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE
PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by strikeouts.

C.2.3.1 Colleges and Academic Departments

The colleges, each organized under their respective academic dean, have general charge over
their respective undergraduate and/or professional degree programs. These are:

a. College of Agricultural Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Agricultural and Resource Economics; Animal Sciences;
Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management; Horticulture and Landscape Architecture; and
Soil and Crop Sciences.

b. College of Health and Human Sciences *(last revised February 6, 2013)*
Comprising the Departments of Construction Management; Design and Merchandising; Health
and Exercise Science; Food Science and Human Nutrition; Human Development and Family
Studies; Occupational Therapy; the School of Education; and the School of Social Work.

c. College of Business
Comprising the Departments of Accounting; Computer Information Systems; Finance and Real
Estate; Management; and Marketing.

d. College of Engineering *(last revised January 27, 2006)*
Comprising the Departments of Atmospheric Science; Chemical and Biological Engineering;
Civil and Environmental Engineering; Electrical and Computer Engineering; and Mechanical
Engineering.

e. College of Liberal Arts *(last revised March 31, 2019)*
Comprising the Departments of Anthropology and Geography.; Art and Art History;
Communication Studies; Economics; English; Ethnic Studies; History; Journalism and Media
Communication; Languages, Literatures and Cultures; Philosophy; Political Science; Sociology;
and School of Music, Theatre, and Dance.

f. College of Natural Resources *(last revised June 21, 2011)*
Comprising the Departments of Ecosystem Science and Sustainability; Fish, Wildlife, and
Conservation Biology; Forest and Rangeland Stewardship; Geosciences; and Human Dimensions
of Natural Resources

g. College of Natural Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Biology; Chemistry; Computer Science; Mathematics; Physics; Psychology; and Statistics.

h. College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Biomedical Sciences; Clinical Sciences; Environmental and Radiological Health Sciences; and Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology.

Rationalization

Rationale:

1) The name change will more accurately reflect the role of geography in the existing department. The new B.S. in Geography now has in excess of 35 majors. The new Ph.D. in Anthropology has emphases on space, place, and adaptation. Space and place figure prominently in geographical thinking, and these geographical insights will complement the work done by Anthropology Ph.D. students. The name change will provide a foundation for expansion of the geography program to the graduate level by giving prior institutional visibility to the importance of geography in the larger university curriculum. As of this year, one-third of the department's faculty consists of geographers.
2) The name change will help with both student and faculty recruitment in geography, as the more inclusive department name will give recruiting prospects an immediate sense of the curricular breadth of the department. We are especially optimistic about the impact on the recruitment of majors.
3) The name change will align with departments elsewhere that offer a combination of geography and anthropology programs. Louisiana State University, for example, a CSU "peer" university, has a Department of Geography and Anthropology.
4) The name change should enhance the research mission of the department, especially in terms of successful grant production, by communicating to funding agencies the growing importance of the geographical component in the overall research profile of the University.

This proposal has been endorsed by:

- The faculty in the Department of Anthropology have voted in favor of the change.
- The Dean and Department Chairs of the College of Liberal Arts have voted to support the motion.
- The University Curriculum Committee has voted to approve the motion.
- The Council of Deans and the Provost's Office supports the motion.
- The Committee on Faculty Governance has voted to support the motion.
- CSU Distance is aware of the change and are prepared to change communications accordingly.

6. Proposed revisions to Section I.11 Students Called to Active Duty of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL

Matt Hickey, Chair, CoTL spoke to the motion. This is a simple amendment to reflect changes in the *General Catalog*.

Gallagher: This is now on the floor for discussion.

Gallagher: Hearing none. All in favor of approving the Section I.11 motion, please say aye.

The motion was approved.

Deletions ~~Overscored~~   Additions <u>Underlined</u>

I.11 Students Called to Active Duty *(~~last revised May 5, 2005~~)*

In response to military action declared by the President of the United States or Congress in which United States forces are being called into active duty, the University shall apply this policy for the duration of such actions~~,~~<u>.</u> ~~and the Center for Advising and Student Achievement (CASA) shall execute it.~~ <u>As a primary point of contact, students are encouraged to work with Adult Learner and Veteran Services (ALVS) in order to review all options prior to leaving CSU. Depending on when in the semester the student is called to duty, different options may be available including University withdrawal, late withdrawals, or incompletes. Additional information can be found in the General Catalog.</u>
~~Any student called to active military duty may, upon presentation of a copy of his or her orders to CASA~~ <u>ALVS</u>~~, be given a grade of Incomplete in courses for which she/he is registered. The student or his or her designate may make this request in person, by letter, or by telephone. However, the request will not be processed by CASA~~ <u>ALVS</u> ~~until a copy of the orders are received. The CASA advisors~~ <u>ALVS staff</u> ~~will counsel with the student or his or her designate and the student's instructors to select the option (either withdrawal from the University, cancellation of courses, or taking of an Incomplete) that is most appropriate to that student's situation. (Note: The CASA~~ <u>ALVS</u> ~~cannot disclose personally identifiable educational information with a third party, even a spouse or other designee, without a signed FERPA Release Form. The FERPA Release Form authorizes CASA~~ <u>ALVS</u> ~~to disclose the student's educational information to his or her designee. (See Section I.2.)~~
~~If the student chooses to withdraw from the University as a result of an undetermined amount of time required away from his or her studies during military service, the tuition paid for the semester will be refunded. If the student opts for a grade of Incomplete for the course, tuition will not be refunded. The grade of Incomplete shall remain on the student's record for a period not to exceed one year following the end of the semester in which the student re-enrolls at Colorado State University. By this date, the grade will be changed by the instructor or department head of record, or it will convert to a grade of "F." It will be the responsibility of CASA personnel to track these students and to keep the Office of the Registrar notified of the status of these students, since the time period for which the grade of Incomplete may remain on the record may vary from the normal University time limits for resolution of grades of Incomplete~~.
Rationale:
The proposed changes seek to make the manual language consistent with revised language in the General Catalog approved by Faculty Council in December 2016. The faculty manual revisions were

brought to the attention of CoTL by our Registrar's Office representative and the proposed changes shared here have been reviewed by the Registrar's office. Adult Learner and Veteran Services (ALVS) is the primary point of contact for CSU students who are called to active duty service. While the name may be taken to imply services only to retired military veterans, ALVS in fact serves a number of non-traditional student groups in addition to veterans and those students who are called to active duty service. ALVS works closely with the Registrar's Office and other groups on campus to ensure the needs of students who are called to active duty service are met. As such, this motion represents the operational steps already in place for students who are called to active duty service.

7.   Proposed revisions to Section E.9.2 Individual Faculty
        Workload of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative
        Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the motion.

Legare: With the ever-adapting and changing roles of faculty within the university system, additional clarification is given for activities considered under workload assignments that should be credited to the faculty during evaluations. Additionally, changes were made to conform to amendments passed on the floor of Faculty Council in the previous year.

Gallagher: This is now on the floor for discussion.

There was no discussion.

The motion is approved.

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

MOVED, THAT SECTIONS E.9.2 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~   Additions Underlined

E.9.2 Individual Faculty Workload *(last revised ~~February 14, 2014~~xxx)*

Individual workloads for each area of responsibility may vary over time in accordance with the needs and missions of the different academic departments and shall be negotiated between the faculty member and the department head subject to the provisions of Section C.2.6.2.e. Factors for which workload ~~can~~ should be adjusted include, but are not limited to, course credits, class size, course level, method of course delivery, type of course (lecture, laboratory, independent study, internship, supervised student research, thesis/dissertation, clinical, practicum), service as a course coordinator or facilitator, advising/mentoring load, off-campus assignments, number of course preparations, new course preparations, contact hours, and teaching assistants~~,~~. For research and scholarly activity factors may include the size and activity of the research program or other creative activity, recognition of the research or creative activity in the form of shows, exhibits, presentations, awards, grants, publications and patents. Additionally, ~~and~~ service,

<u>outreach and engagement should be included in the faculty evaluation. Department codes shall make it clear how workload percentages are determined and set expectations accordingly.</u>

8.   Proposed revisions to Section E.12 Performance
      Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary
      Increases of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative
      Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the motion.

Legare: There is a greater push to advising and mentoring, and those roles have expanded, so these changes reflect those changes to make the *Manual* align more fully with reality
.
Gallagher: The motion is now on the floor for your consideration.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): Redundancy on page 90, the part that is just before the added section?

Legare: There are a lot of people that do things totally separate and that is why it is written this way. They are separate concerns.

There was no more discussion.

Gallagher: Please vote to approve by saying aye.

The motion is approved.

Deletions O̶v̶e̶r̶s̶c̶o̶r̶e̶d̶   Additions <u>Underlined</u>

E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases
(last revised J̶u̶n̶e̶ ̶2̶1̶,̶ ̶2̶0̶1̶1̶<u>xxx</u>)

All faculty members being considered for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate a level of excellence appropriate to the rank under consideration and consistent with the standards of their discipline, their unit's institutional mission, and the faculty member's individual effort distribution in teaching and advising/<u>mentoring</u>, research and other creative activity, and service. Outreach and engagement efforts (as described in Section E/12/4) should be integrated into the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service responsibilities, as appropriate.

Annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of a faculty member's performance are addressed in Sections C.2.5, E.12, and E.14, and the expectations articulated in this section are applicable to those reviews. The basis for annual and periodic comprehensive reviews shall be the set of criteria in place at the beginning of the review

period. A faculty member shall provide evidence, consistent with their stated effort distribution, of teaching and advising/<u>mentoring</u> competence, and/or sustained research and other creative activity, and/or service (see Section E.9.1) for annual and periodic comprehensive reviews, as well as for tenure and promotion. The department code shall establish clearly articulated criteria and standards for evaluation in these areas. <u>Performance expectations may take into consideration the current rank</u> ~~and base salary~~ <u>of the faculty member.</u>

E.12.1 Teaching<u>,</u> ~~and~~ Advising <u>and Mentoring</u> *(last revised ~~December 1, 2017~~<u>xxx</u>)*

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; <u>on-line instruction;</u> individual tutoring; supervision and instruction of student researchers; clinical teaching; field work supervision and training; preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; <u>supervision of field trips;</u> <u>teaching abroad;</u> service learning; outreach/engagement; <u>organization, coordination, marketing, and promotion of official university educational activities;</u> 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 and should be included in portfolio materials and be considered as part of the evidence of teaching effectiveness. 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 and engagement activities as specified by the department/unit, are important to CSU as a land-grant institution and should be integrated into teaching efforts, as appropriate (see Section E.12.4). This includes teaching efforts of faculty members with Extension appointments. Examples of engaged teaching include service-learning and conducting workshops, seminars and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes. Other examples can be found in the "Continuum of Engaged Scholarship".

Excellent teachers are characterized by their command of subject matter; logical organization and presentation of course material; ability to help students recognize relationships 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 must, within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. <u>Department codes shall make it clear what is needed for a faculty member to meet teaching expectations and what is needed to exceed expectations.</u> Evaluation of teaching should be designed to highlight strengths, identify deficiencies, and improve <u>overall</u> 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 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; 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.

Importantly, student perceptions of the learning environment are, by definition, *not* evaluations of teaching effectiveness and cannot be taken as such; they are simply the student perspectives on their experience in a learning environment. Departments must not use student survey responses as a direct or comparative measure of teaching effectiveness nor use student responses or attendant metrics derived from student responses independent of multiple sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness. The use of student survey responses is appropriate only in the context of multifactorial reviews of multiple resources oriented toward an instructor's continuous improvement in fulfilling our teaching mission. Given this, reflection on, and use of, student perceptions can be one part of instructors' formative development because these perceptions can offer insights into the learning environment that only the students can provide. As such,results from student course surveys should be shared with department heads and promotion and tenure committees and considered only *in context of* a multifactorial review for the purpose of mentoring and evaluating teaching that includes information on courses taught, patterns in student survey responses, and instructors' reflections on such patterns in teaching portfolios that document their accounts of how they have used this and other feedback. 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 should take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., <u>lecture, practicum, lab courses, independent and group study courses;</u> 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 the context of the type and level of courses taught. The University provides resources to support the evaluation of 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 and mentoring of students, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, is a vital part of the teaching/learning process. Advising/mentoring 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/mentoring students for official university activities and advising student organizations. Advising/mentoring of graduate students includes, but is not limited to, supervision of and/or assistance with thesis, dissertations, publications, presentations and project-related products. In particular, the advising/mentoring commitments are different for non-thesis masters students, thesis masters students, doctoral students, and postdoctoral fellows.

Advising and mentoring is characterized by being available to students, keeping appointments, providing accurate and appropriate advice, and providing knowledgeable guidance. Evaluation of advising/mentoring effectiveness can be based upon signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty members, and professional peers. Evaluation of advising/mentoring should take into account the quality of the advising/mentoring and the time spent on advising/mentoring activities. Department codes ~~The faculty in each academic unit~~ shall specify criteria and standards ~~for evaluation and methods~~ for evaluating ~~teaching and~~ advising/mentoring effectiveness and shall evaluate advising/mentoring as part of annual and periodic comprehensive reviews. ~~These criteria, standards, and methods shall be incorporated into departmental codes.~~

Rationale:

1. As teaching, advising and mentoring duties have expanded among faculty, an updated version incorporating some of these examples has been submitted for consideration.
2. As there is a greater push to have mentoring defined and recognized as a significant work load effort for some faculty, this was added to E.12.1.

9.   Proposed revisions to Section E.12.3 Service of the
        Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual
        – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the motion.

Legare explained that Engagement needed to be clarified. This went through Faculty Council a couple months ago, but clarification was requested from the Provost's Council on Engagement.

Gallagher: This is now on the floor for discussion.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Can you clarify what is meant by consulting? Does that include paid consulting?

Legare: We were keeping this as broad as possible. If paid, then it seems like contract work. But, if you think it needs to be amended to say "unpaid consulting" we could do that.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon moves to add the word "unpaid" prior to the word "consulting."

Provost Miranda: I would speak against this myself. There are quite a few paid consultants that are valuable to the university, so I don't think it's appropriate to exclude those activities just because they are compensated. One may not reward with the same compensation mechanisms, but to forbid supervisors to take this into account at all I don't think is right.

Legare provides an example re: Toxicology lab, which provides an enormous service to the county and so perhaps we ought not to exclude.

Richard Eykholt (UGO and CoRSAF member): There are many duties that are paid through the university, such as Supplemental Pay.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): What I'm concerned about is when paid service substitutes for unpaid service that is needed but then not done.

Doug Cloud (English): I also want to speak against this amendment. Honorariums may not compensate the full cost of participation.

Gallagher calls for a vote on the amendment.

The amendment is not approved.

Gallagher now calls for a vote on the main motion.

The main motion was unanimously approved.

Subject: Faculty Manual E.12.3

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

MOVED, THAT SECTIONS E.12.3 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~   Additions <u>Underlined</u>

E.12.3.4 Service with External Partners and Communities (*new section xxx*). As a land-grant institution, the University is committed to engagement efforts that work with external partners to serve current and future needs of local, state, national and international communities (see Section E.12.4). Therefore, departments and units should encourage and support faculty efforts that are focused on such engagement. Examples of engaged service include technical assistance, consulting, and policy analysis. Other examples can be found in the "Continuum of Engaged Scholarship".

E.12.3.45 Extension Service. Extension is dedicated to serving current and future needs of the population within the state, as well as nationally and internationally, through educational information and programs to address important and emerging community issues using dynamic, science-based educational resources. CSU Extension is highly valued for inclusive, impactful community engagement in support of our land-grant university mission.

Rationale:

1. The Provost's Council for Engagement, a faculty-driven initiative with representation from all eight colleges and Libraries, helped to clarify and strengthen existing manual language regarding outreach and engagement, defined as a particular approach to teaching, research and service and extension in support of the university's land-grant mission. The addition of E.12.3.4, further defining Service with External Partners and Communities is a helpful addition to the Faculty and Administrative Manual.

> 10.   Proposed revisions to Section E.17 Renewal of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the motion.

Legare explains that TTF are technically not at-will employees, so renewal should require more due process than the *Manual* correctly provides. Legare would like to defer this particular motion to Richard Eykholt, who has worked with the Office of General Counsel on this.

Eykholt: Two meetings ago, we put an appeals process in for the termination of TTF, but since they have to be renewed every year, a Chair could just not renew the person. So, this addresses that loophole and potential problem if the Department Chair does not allow faculty to get tenure.

Gallagher: This motion is now on the floor for discussion.

.

There was no discussion.

Gallagher: All in favor of approving the Section E.17 motion, indicate by saying aye.
The motion is approved.

E.17 Renewal of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments

Tenure-track faculty appointments are for a specified period of time and must be renewed periodically. Prior to the expiration of such an appointment, the Tenure and Promotion Committee within the Department shall meet and discuss the performance of the faculty member. This committee shall then prepare a report regarding the progress of the faculty member toward tenure and promotion. This report shall be submitted to the Department Head along with a recommendation whether or not to renew the tenure-track appointment. The Department Head shall then decide whether or not to renew the appointment.

If the Tenure and Promotion Committee within the Department recommends the renewal of a tenure-track faculty appointment, but the Department Head decides not to renew the appointment, then the Department Head shall notify the Tenure and Promotion Committee of this decision. The Tenure and Promotion Committee shall then reconsider their recommendation for renewal. If the Committee still believes that renewal is appropriate, then it shall prepare a document (hereinafter referred to as the Recommendation) explaining the reasons for recommending renewal, and this Recommendation shall be sent to the Department Head. If the Department Head still decides not to renew the appointment, then the Department Head shall prepare a document (hereinafter referred to as the Decision) explaining their reasons for this decision. The Recommendation and the Decision shall then be provided to the faculty member.

In this case, the faculty member may appeal the nonrenewal decision by the Department Head. This section of the Manual sets forth the procedures for such an appeal. The University Grievance Officer (UGO) shall be charged with overseeing this appeal process. At the discretion of the UGO, any of the time limits in this section may be extended for reasonable periods. Such extensions shall be reported immediately to all parties concerned.

E.17.1. Initiating the Appeal Process

When the faculty member is provided with a copy of the Recommendation and the Decision, the Department Head shall notify the faculty member of their right to appeal the nonrenewal decision and refer them to Section E.17 of the Manual. The faculty member then has ten (10) working days to submit to the UGO an Appeal in writing of the nonrenewal decision, along with the Recommendation and the Decision. If an Appeal is submitted within this time frame, then the UGO shall notify the Provost within three (3) working days.

If the faculty member fails to submit an Appeal within this time frame, then they shall forfeit the right to appeal the nonrenewal decision (unless the UGO decides that extenuating circumstances justify an extension of this deadline). If the Provost has not been notified by the UGO of an Appeal within twenty (20) working days of receiving the Recommendation from the Recommender, then the Provost may assume that no Appeal will be filed.

The Appeal should provide all of the information that the Appeal Committee (see Section E.17.2) will need in order to make its decision whether to support or oppose the nonrenewal decision. This may include relevant documentation and persons that the Appeal Committee may contact for additional supporting information. The relevance of each person should be stated in the Appeal. The Appeal Committee is not required to contact all of the persons listed in the Appeal. The UGO will review the Appeal to make sure that the information included is relevant to the issue of nonrenewal. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Appeal to the Appellant for editing before it is acceptable.

Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Appeal from the Appellant, the UGO shall forward the Appeal to the Department Head and to the members of the Appeal Committee. The Department Head shall then have ten (10) working days to provide a Response. This Response should provide all of the information that the Appeal Committee will need in order to make its decision whether to support or oppose the nonrenewal decision. This may include relevant documentation and persons that the Appeal Committee may contact for additional supporting information. The relevance of each person should be stated in the Response. The Appeal Committee is not required to contact all of the persons listed in the Response. The UGO will review the Response to make sure that the information included is relevant to the issue of nonrenewal. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Response to the Recommender for editing before it is acceptable.

Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Response from the Recommender, the UGO shall forward the Response to the Appellant and to the members of the Appeal Committee.

E.17.2 Appeal Committee

The Appeal Committee shall consist of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the Chair of Faculty Council, and the College Dean. The Chair of Faculty Council shall serve as the Chair of the Appeal Committee. After receiving both the Appeal and the Response from the UGO, the members of the Appeals Committee shall begin their consideration of the Appeal. As part of this consideration, they shall meet with the Department Head, the Appellant, the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and any other persons that they consider relevant to their consideration of the Appeal. All three members of the Appeal Committee must be present at each of these meetings. At their discretion, the members of the Appeal Committee may request additional information from the Department Head and/or the Appellant, and they may choose to meet more than once with some persons.

E.17.3 Report of the Appeal Committee

After the completion of the process described in Section E.17.2, the three members of the Appeal Committee shall meet to discuss the case and to reach a final decision by majority vote whether to support or oppose the nonrenewal of the Appellant.

After the conclusion of this meeting, the Chair of the Appeal Committee shall prepare a final Report. This Report shall include the overall vote of the Appeal Committee and the reasons supporting its decision. If the vote was not unanimous, then the Report shall also summarize the reasons given by the dissenting member. The Report shall be submitted to the UGO within twenty (20) working days of the receipt from the UGO of both the Appeal and the Response by the members of the Appeal Committee.

E.17.4 Final Decision by the President

Within three (3) working days of receiving the Report from the Chair of the Appeal Committee, the UGO shall send the Report to the President, along with the Recommendation, the Decision, the Appeal, and the Response. Within twenty (20) working days of receiving these materials from the UGO, the President shall make a final decision regarding the termination of the Appellant and send it in writing to the UGO. This written decision shall include the reasoning that supports the decision. The UGO shall forward this decision by the President to the Appellant, the Department Head, and the Provost. This decision by the President is final.

Rationale:

1. We are proposing to insert this new section into the Manual. Currently, the decision whether or not to renew the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member rests solely with the department head. However, faculty on tenure-track appointments are not at-will employees, so the nonrenewal of such an appointment should require more due process than just a decision by the department head. This new section creates such due process.?

   12. Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – Admissions Requirements and Procedures, Application: International Students – CoSRGE

   Sid Suryanarayanan, Chair, CoSRGE spoke to the motion.

   Suryanarayanan indicates that this revision is intended to keep up with the times and offers to take questions from the FC members.

   Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Can you speak to the price of doing one exam or the other?

   Suryanarayanan: No, I cannot speak to that but the paper-based exam use has fallen off.
   Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Concerned that internet-based exams will be too expensive for some international students.

Suryanarayanan explains that one does not preclude the other. When a paper exam shows up, it is up to the department and the Graduate School to determine the application.

Gallagher: All in favor of approving the proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin*, please say aye.

The motion was approved.

ADDITIONS - <u>UNDERLINED</u> - DELETIONS ~~OVERSCORE~~

Application: International Students

CSU requires that proficiency in English language be demonstrated either by the TOEFL, IELTS, or PTE Academic tests prior to admissions. The minimum TOEFL score for admission without condition is ~~550 (paper -based), or~~ 80 <u>for the</u> (internet-based <u>exam</u>). <u>Contact the Graduate School for guidance on interpreting paper-based exam scores</u>. The minimum IELTS score for admission without condition is 6.5. The minimum PTE Academic Score for admission without condition is 58. Official scores, taken within two years prior to admission, must be submitted directly from the testing agency.

To be considered for conditional admission, a student must have a minimum TOEFL score of<u>f</u> ~~475 on the paper based test or~~ 50 on the internet based test<u>, a</u> ~~or~~ minimum IELTS score of 5.5 or PTE scores from 40-57. After receiving conditional admission, the student must satisfactorily complete the INTO CSU Academic English Program. Enrollment in regular CSU academic courses is at the discretion of the INTO CSU Academic English Program. Approval of both the department and the Dean of the Graduate School is necessary for such conditional admission.

Rationale:

1. ETS has discontinued its old paper-based test so the current Bulletin language regarding paper-based test scores is irrelevant.

2. There is a new revised paper-delivered TOEFL exam, but ETS does not report a total score for this exam. The reason is because the new paper-based exam consists of only three sections (Reading, Listening, and Writing) and does not include the 4th section (Speaking) that is part of the internet-based exam. ETS recommends that admissions decisions be partly based on scores in each of the three sections of the new paper-based test.

3. Because so few applicants submit scores from the paper-based TOEFL exam (only 1-2 over the last few years), CoSRGE recommends that admissions committees consider the scores of individual sections on paper-based tests on a case-by-case basis by the admitting department

and graduate school. If the number of applicants submitting paper-based test scores increases, CoSRGE will consider a University-wide policy regarding minimum scores on each section of the paper-based test.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1.　　Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

The university budget, for next year, was approved by the Finance Committee of the Board this morning. It has not changed, other than we did lose another third of a million dollars in State appropriations in the last couple of weeks. It's not a huge blow--just a lot of volatility going on. The requirements of the fairly significant State increase of about 12% is that we keep undergraduate tuition flat. We have agreed to that.

The Provost's Council on Engagement has openings and invites membership interest. People will begin to rotate off of that council. Miranda mentioned the changes to the *Manual* that CoRSAF just recommended as reflective of Engagement's importance to our campus.

Our relationship with Semester at Sea is going well, and they have occupied the building on Centre Avenue, which was named Crabtree Hall, for the former President of Semester at Sea operation--Loren Crabtree, who was very instrumental to Semester at Sea. Development people have moved into the lower floors of Crabtree Hall and have therefore freed up space on Howes Street where they were formerly. This space is being held by the VP for University Operations for swing space for upcoming renovations.

If you haven't been to the Veterinary School to see the new Translational Medicine Institute—it's fantastic! The Board is meeting there, as we speak, and the Board will continue with their meeting tomorrow morning.

Gallagher: Any questions of the Provost?

There were no questions.

Miranda's report was received.

2.　　Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

The President's Council on Culture will host a listening session regarding NTTF on Friday, May 10 from 10-11 a.m. in LSC 328-330.   The panelists will be

Provost Miranda; Dan Bush, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; and Jenny Morse, Chair, CoNTTF. It is an opportunity for NTTF, TTF, and anyone else who would like to express their views. Gallagher has been in a number of conversations relating to NTTF.   Gallagher mentions one example in a meeting with Jenny Morse and the Provost regarding the standard offer letter to a NTTF faculty, and the contract language that states the stipulations, which includes reference to sufficient financial resources. Gallagher put the letter on the overhead for Faculty Council members to see. Gallagher highlighted the area that caused concern. This highlighted area could be interpreted as meaning the university could break the contract if the department had inadequate resources. The Provost indicated that this was never the intention and the financial resources at the university level are what should come into play here. The Provost will look at this over the summer and work on the letter to ensure that the intent is made clear. The plain meaning of the words do not provide the level of protection that they should.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): I am appreciative of this but wonder if anything is going to be done for the faculty that are affected by renewals.   Someone who possibly recently signed this letter, how might that be handled?

Provost Miranda: We might tear up the old contracts and give a new one, or be more passive and wait in case someone's contract is terminated due to a financial resources problem, although it is pretty rare this would happen. The contract should be honored. The intent was that financial resource problem is at a much higher level as in financial exigency that applies to a whole college, or the university as a whole. We will work on this over the summer to try to clarify and correct this. Not intended to be a local fiscal difficulty. If we are talking about grant money, that is different.

Silvia Canetto (Psychology): I was looking at the composition of the listening session on Friday and it seems to me that there should be more representation from faculty to expand the voices represented there. Could there be one or two more faculty?

Gallagher stated that he will be at the listening session.   Gallagher invited all FC members, and beyond, to attend and express their opinion on the NTTF issues.

Dawn DeTienne (CoB): Wishes to announce the meeting to her faculty and requests to take a picture of the slide information advertising the event on the overhead.

Gallagher's report was received.

3.   Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

Gallagher: Lenk is in attendance at the Board meeting today, as we speak, so there is no BOG Faculty Representative report today.

4.   Dawn DeTienne and Jennifer Welding, Sesquicentennial Committee

Jennifer Welding speaks to her job of executing the Sesquicentennial. The university will be celebrating from September 2019 through June 2020. Welding explains how the committee has worked, including their objectives. Has divided the year into sections and explains the parts and how tied to teaching, research and service as the university mission. There will be things prior to President McConnell's official launch. There will be celebratory packets to distribute. Athletics will have the insignia as well as the CSU marching band. Activities are explained as planned. Brought handouts to distribute and offers her contact information and Dropbox location that includes the work plan and current events as well as assets and brand-marking that will be used. If you would like access to anything, she can be contacted, or will distribute via Tim Gallagher.

5.   Task Force on the Ethics of Learning Analytics (written report) – CoTL

Gallagher asked if there were any questions of Hickey's report.

There were no questions.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): I do have a question, but it is not specific to your report. It's regarding looking into football games, etc., as discussed a couple months ago.

Hickey has no progress to report.

Provost Miranda: We do have four Friday games, but none of them are on campus, except the day after Thanksgiving.

DISCUSSION

1.   None.

Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 5:11 p.m.

Tim Gallagher, Chair
Sue Doe, Vice Chair
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant to Faculty Council

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
<u>UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING</u>

ELECTED MEMBERS	**REPRESENTING**	**TERM**
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2019
Jason Bruemmer	Animal Sciences	2021
Cynthia (Cini) Brown	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management	2021
Adam Heuberger	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2019
<u>Thomas Borch</u>	Soil and Crop Sciences	2020
<u>Jane Choi</u>	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Ruth Hufbauer</u>	College-at-Large	2020
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2019
Health and Human Sciences		
<u>Stephanie Clemons</u>	Design and Merchandising	2021
(substituting for Nancy Miller sabbatical Spring '19)		
Raoul Reiser	Health and Exercise Science	2021
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2019
Karen Barrett	Human Development and Family Studies	2020
Bolivar Senior	Construction Management	2020
<u>Matt Malcolm</u>	Occupational Therapy	2020
<u>Thomas Chermack</u>	School of Education	2021
<u>Anne Williford</u>	School of Social Work	2019
Business		
<u>Bill Rankin</u>	Accounting	2019
Stephen Hayne	Computer Information Systems	2021
Tianyang Wang	Finance and Real Estate	2019
Dawn DeTienne	Management	2021
Kathleen Kelly	Marketing	2021
Joe Cannon	College-at-Large	2019
John Hoxmeier	College-at-Large	2019
Engineering		
<u>Kristen Rasmussen</u>	Atmospheric Science	2021
<u>Travis Bailey</u>	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2019
Peter Nelson	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2021
Siddharth Suryanarayanan	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2019
<u>Shantanu Jathar</u>	Mechanical Engineering	2020
<u>J. Rockey Luo</u>	College-at-Large	2019
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2019
<u>Jason Quinn</u>	College-at-Large	2021

Liberal Arts

Michael Pante	Anthropology	2020
Marius Lehene	Art	2019
Julia Khrebtan-Horhager	Communication Studies	2019
Ramaa Vasudevan	Economics	2020
Doug Cloud	English	2020
Albert Bimper	Ethnic Studies	2019
Jonathan Carlyon	Languages, Literatures and Cultures	2019
Thaddeus Sunseri	History	2020
Michael Humphrey	Journalism and Technical Communication	2020
Wesley Ferreira	Music, Theater, and Dance	2019
Moti Gorin	Philosophy	2019
Peter Harris	Political Science	2021
Tara Opsal	Sociology	2019
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2019
Steve Shulman	College-at-Large	2020
Allison Prasch	College-at-Large	2020
Lisa Langstraat	College-at-Large	2020
Marcela Velasco	College-at-Large	2021
Del Harrow	College-at-Large	2021
Maura Velazquez-Castillo	College-at-Large	2021

Natural Resources

Monique Rocca	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2020
David Koons	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2021
Chad Hoffman	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2020
Bill Sanford	Geosciences	2020
Tara Teel	HDNR in Warner College	2020

Natural Sciences

Jennifer Nyborg	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	2019
Melinda Smith	Biology	2021
George Barisas	Chemistry	2020
Ross McConnell	Computer Science	2019
Yongcheng Zhou	Mathematics	2020
Dylan Yost	Physics	2021
Silvia Canetto	Psychology	2019
Mary Meyer	Statistics	2019
Chuck Anderson	College-at-Large	2020
Anton Betten	College-at-Large	2019
TBD	College-at-Large	2018
Brad Conner	College-at-Large	2021
Alan Van Orden	College-at-Large	2020

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

DN Rao Veeramachaneni	Biomedical Sciences	2019
Dean Hendrickson	Clinical Sciences	2019
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2020
Tony Schountz	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2021
Noreen Reist	College-at-Large	2020
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2020
William Black	College-at-Large	2020
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2019
Anne Avery	College-at-Large	2019
Tod Clapp	College-at-Large	2019
Dawn Duval	College-at-Large	2019
TBD	College-at-Large	2018
Gerrit (Jerry) Bouma	College-at-Large	2021

University Libraries

Linda Meyer	Libraries	2019

***Ex Officio* Voting Members**

Timothy Gallagher	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2018
Sue Doe	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2018
Margarita Lenk (excused)	BOG Faculty Representative	2018
Don Estep, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2019
Todd Donavan, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2017
Jerry Magloughlin, 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
Sid Suryanarayanan, Chair	Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education	2019
Karen Barrett, Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2019
Joseph DiVerdi, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2019
Matt Hickey, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2019
Mo Salman, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2018
Bradley Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2018
Susan (Suellen) Melzer	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
Denise Apodac**a**	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
Christine Pawliuk	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Ashley Harvey (substituting for Patty Stutz-Tanenbaum)	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Daniel Baker	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Leslie Stone-Roy	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Mary Van Buren	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Steve Benoit	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Natalie Ooi	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019

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
Leslie Taylor	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
Pam Jackson	Interim Vice President for External Relations
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
Mary Stromberger	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