

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, e-mail immediately to Amy Barkley.

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

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
December 5, 2023 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

Chair Smith reminded members the meetings are public, and the minutes will be posted on the Faculty Council website. Reminded the members of the rules of engagement and etiquette in the Microsoft Teams environment. Asked members to limit questions to speaker to one question, allowing everyone to ask a question before any additional questions can be asked, and to limit questions and comments to two minutes.

Chair Smith provided an update to the agenda. A motion will be added from the floor for a Clark revitalization resolution, called Section I: New Business. There will also be a report added from the Vice President for University Operations, Brendan Hanlon. That will occur after the report from interim Provost Nerger

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – December 5, 2023

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – February 6, 2024 – Location
TBD – 4:00pm
2. Harry Rosenberg Award

Chair Smith: The Harry Rosenberg Award is now accepting nominations. Those should be sent to the Vice Chair of Faculty Council, Joseph DiVerdi. This award was established in 2016 by Dr. Sue Davis Pendell, who was the fourth Faculty Council chair, in honor of Harry Rosenberg. Dr. Harry Rosenberg was the first elected chair of Faculty Council and a faculty member of the Department of History. Dr. Pendell was a part of the Department of Speech Communication and is a strong supporter of shared governance. Annually, one faculty member who has made significant contributions to Faculty Council will be recognized for the award, a monetary award, and a special plaque. This is presented to the award winner in the Spring term.

Chair Smith: Nominations are open now and can be sent to the Vice Chair of Faculty Council. We will remind you of the March deadline in February.

3. Statement of Appreciation for Interim Provost Janice Nerger

Chair Smith: The final announcement is a statement of appreciation for interim Provost Jan Nerger. This is her last meeting as interim Provost and we are going to read a statement of appreciation on behalf of the Faculty Council Executive Committee.

Chair Smith: On behalf of the Faculty Council Executive Committee, we want to recognize that today is her last meeting in the role of interim Provost. We extend our heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Jan Nerger for her exceptional service and dedication since her appointment in July 2022. Interim roles are challenging, and Dr. Nerger started the role of interim Provost in a particularly complex time for our community and our university. Her efforts helped keep us moving forward during a time of transition at CSU, she did this by emphasizing transparency, embracing accountability, and always doing so with a sharp sense of humor, which we really appreciate.

Chair Smith: In her time as interim Provost, Dr. Nerger finalized the first-year priorities of our Academic Master Plan. These efforts have laid an important foundation for our future academic endeavors at CSU. Moreover, the Provost's Faculty Success initiative has flourished under her guidance. She committed funding beyond the initial grant. That is a testament to her dedication to faculty development and success. Her commitment to faculty and our shared governance on campus has been evident in her constant and continuing engagement for Faculty Council at large and the Faculty Council Executive Committee.

Chair Smith: Under her leadership, Dr. Nerger has resumed the Provost Ethics Colloquium series, and in doing so enabled the campus to begin to tackle the important issue of generative AI.

Chair Smith: She has also enabled an increased focus on student success, which she will speak to today, through improving Fall retention rates and closing opportunity gaps. In doing so she has helped to ensure that our students not only receive quality education but also the essential support they need. Such support is also evident in her work and talk about Faculty Council and a broad set of other campus stakeholders to cover the mandatory fees of graduate students. This initiative has alleviated financial burdens for many students, better enabling them to pursue their academic goals.

Chair Smith: In conclusion, we thank interim Provost Nerger. Her tenure has been marked by an unwavering dedication and deep commitment to the betterment of our academic community. We are profoundly grateful for her contributions and leadership. Thank you, Dr. Nerger, for your exemplary service.

Interim Provost Jan Nerger: Thank you so much, I really appreciate it.

Chair Smith: This statement of appreciation will also be posted on the Faculty Council website.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting – November 7, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from November 7th as seen in the agenda packet.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – September 22, October 27, November 3 & 10, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding the University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Hearing none, consent agenda approved by unanimous consent.

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Revised Fall 2026-Summer 2028 Calendar

Joseph DiVerdi: On behalf of the Faculty Council, move to approve the revisions to the Fall 2026-Summer 2028 calendar as seen in the agenda packet. The changes reflect the later course withdrawal date approved by Faculty Council and the insertion of the paragraph to be transparent about the summer withdrawal period.

Steven Reising: Second the motion.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

2. Election – Faculty Representative to University Benefits Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the election of Hong Miao to the University Benefits Committee as a faculty representative, as shown in the agenda packet.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

3. Election – Faculty Representative to Parking Services Committee– Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the elections of Adam Thomas and Takamitsu Kato to the Parking Services Committee as faculty representatives, as shown in the agenda packet.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

F. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Interim Provost Janice Nerger

Provost Nerger: Provided an update for upcoming searches. The committee has been formed for the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences search and will be charged next week. That is being co-chaired by Sue VandeWoude, Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, and Alonso Aguirre, Dean of the Warner College of Natural Resources. James Pritchett was named the Vice President of Engagement and Extension, and he will be serving in both roles until that position is filled.

Provost Nerger: We recently learned that Ben Withers, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, has accepted a position at Iowa State University. He is going to be leaving in February and we will need to name an interim while the search is ongoing. There has not been a search committee formed yet.

Provost Nerger: Tom Siller, the interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, has announced that he is retiring from CSU. That search committee is being formed. I have been working with Marion Underwood on that and the chair of the search committee has been named. Steve Dandaneau will be chairing the committee, but we are still sorting through names as to who is going to be on that committee. With all three of these positions, we are hoping to get everybody in place by Fall. Maybe even sooner for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs position, because Siller is staying until the end of the semester.

Provost Nerger: The Board of Governors meeting was last Thursday and Friday at the Spur Campus. Armando Valdez, the chair of the Board of Governors, was named the sole finalist for the president of CSU Pueblo position. Now we are in the fourteen-day comment period. During that time, John Fischer was named the chair of the Board of Governors. He was the vice chair, so that came as a bit of a surprise to people in the room, but a pleasant surprise. The Board book will be available for people to see in a couple of weeks.

Provost Nerger: The draft budgets for the three campuses, CSU Global, Pueblo, and ourselves, were presented for discussion. In our case it was the second draft version of the incremental budget and VP Brendan Hanlon presented three versions of that and he is going to be available after my presentation to answer some questions. It will also be online on a campus website for people to look at, and it will also be on the Board of Governors website in a couple of weeks.

Provost Nerger: All the faculty and AP manual changes that were submitted by us were approved. We had sixty-nine sabbatical requests and numerous emeritus appointments, and all of those were approved. Everyone who was approved for sabbatical got the approval email today.

Provost Nerger: It was also announced at the Board of Governors that the next funding tranche from the state was approved. The state funded their portion of the Clark Building, so this is exciting news to reaffirm that the next tranche is arranged. They are going to be working on the Clark B wing first and replacing it with a 120,000 square foot building. Clark A, B, and C will be three buildings. There has also been a plan drafted for relocating all the displaced faculty, and that will occur in three phases. One group will be relocated this year, one group in March, and the final in May of next year. In the drafted plan, all can be housed on the main campus. The priorities were to maintain student access, departmental cohesion, and to manage the cost of the relocation because the cost would be coming out of the budget dedicated to the new building. VP Hanlon is presenting after my report here so that we can answer your questions on what we know about the Clark Building and the incremental budget.

Provost Nerger: The next update is on faculty success. Vice Provost Sue James and the Faculty Success team recommended that we engage Interfolio to use for faculty annual reviews. That is going to launch, and they are going to be working with leadership, faculty, and staff as they transition to the Interfolio system. You will be receiving an email with instructions when your annual review cases are going to be created in the Interfolio system. If you go to the Provost's website, there is an Interfolio link on the home page. It will explain where they are in that process and how it will impact your annual review.

Provost Nerger: The next update is for student success. The Board of Governors provided \$9 million in one-time funding in three tranches, three years of \$3 million, and we spent more than \$9 million. In fiscal year 2024 we allocated \$3.9 million, and we don't know if all of it will be expended because sometimes people don't spend all that they thought they would in a timely fashion. We have pre-approval from the Board of Governors to push that money forward, so we are not going to lose any money if that is the case.

Provost Nerger: We were looking primarily at first to second Fall semester retention and overall, we have 86% of our students returning for the second Fall semester. First generation, racially minoritized, and Pell eligible students return at about 5-6% less than the overall. With six-year graduation, we lose even more students by that time. 69% of our students graduate with a bachelor's degree. The first generation, racially minoritized, and Pell eligible students graduated at a much-reduced rate, 10-15% less. We are trying to close that gap and increase our overall graduation rate. We looked at a comparison group of the 42 other land grant, public four-year R1 institutions with enrollment greater than 20,000. We looked at the mean and median of those schools and it is a little shocking to see that we are so low compared to that group. Our retention is 4-5% below our peers and our six-year graduation rate is about 10% below. We looked at a plot of admission rates to six-year graduation rates and saw that a higher admission rate is correlated with a lower six-year graduation rate, and those that have a much higher six-year graduation rate have an admission rate below 70%. Our goal is to keep steady with our access mission, but graduate over 82% of our students. This is our third year spending the funds from

the Board of Governors, so we don't have any data on our six-year graduation rate yet. We have been working on the first to second Fall semester retention. We want to close the gap and think that the interventions that we have been deploying with these funds might be making a significant difference.

Provost Nerger: With this new data, we need to form some implementation teams. We are going to keep looking at this data that we have collected already and what programs we could scale to a much larger group. We have been able to move some funds over to Student Success. We have applied through the budget process and will be applying for additional funds. AVP for Student Success Ryan Barone will sit between the strategic leadership team and these six new implementation teams. Those implementation teams are chaired by faculty and will include one or two faculty and staff and some students. The chairs of those six committees or task forces get together as a group and meet with Ryan Barone and the strategic leadership team early in the spring semester.

Provost Nerger: Will be meeting with incoming Provost Marion Underwood this week and am going to get her up to speed as to where we are. She has done quite a bit on student success at her previous institution so I'm sure she will have some exciting ideas for what we can do. Underwood will be starting in January, she moved here yesterday so she is in the area. We have been meeting weekly and her first official address to Faculty Council will be at the February meeting. She is already setting up meetings with VPs and her direct reports to hit the ground running. Cass Mosely is also starting in January as the new Vice President for Research. One change over the prior administration is that the VPR will be reporting to the Provost.

Provost Nerger: Finally, thanked Faculty Council for doing amazing work for our campus this last year. It truly has been a privilege to serve you as interim Provost. I will be returning to the College of Natural Sciences as Dean in February and will still plan to attend Faculty Council and help as I can.

Chair Smith: Thanked interim Provost Nerger for her report and opened up to questions.

Craig Partridge: Thanked interim Provost Nerger for her services. Related to student success, one of the issues that periodically comes up is that there are so many projects funded across the university from outside the student success umbrella that have been having some level of success and impact on student success within departments. You had mentioned that the student success team was tasked to look at what the university had been doing. I haven't seen an effort so far to reach out to those of us who have external funding, asking us what successes we're having that might be scalable. Is that anticipated at some time in the Spring?

Provost Nerger: It certainly is because there is a lot of good work going on that is independent and we want to leverage that as well. There is also work that has been augmented, for example learning assistants, and we want to support learning assistants. We also know that departments have been doing that on their own. We are going to be looking at how we help both groups. The work that Computer Science has been doing is completely funded external to the university. I would also like to expand it. That is a great example of some good work. The way the implementation teams have been set up, that will be a natural outcome from that.

Jared Orsi: Thanked interim Provost Nerger for her leadership of the university for the last couple of years. The news that you provided about Clark was encouraging and I really like those three goals of student access, cost management, and departmental cohesion. Think they are all important as a current resident of Clark and one of the departments that will be displaced. Asked where the money for the swing space will be coming from. Understand that it may be coming out of the renovation funds for the new Clark building and have some concerns about that. The budget for Clark has already effectively been reduced by inflation by quite a bit. If there is any other source of funding besides taking it out of the building renovation funds, I'd be interested in knowing if there's any conversation around that.

Provost Nerger: The goal is to not reduce the funding, but to minimize what the money that goes into that space would be. Agree with everything you said and will pass it to VP Hanlon.

Vice President Brendan Hanlon: The dilemma is that while we do have a working plan for each of the phases of folks who would be displaced, it is one of the things that we are continuing to look for options and alternatives across campus. They would come with their own tradeoffs, not just for folks in CLA, but also other people who are currently in some of those spaces, which is why I'm not going to get into what those conversations look like at this point in time. We are really trying to minimize the use of those construction dollars as much as we possibly can. We are trying to do all the due diligence we can across campus to try to leverage the space that we currently have. I'm going to talk a little bit about the second version of the incremental budget, and you'll understand why we don't have another easily available source for funding the temporary mobile offices.

Orsi: Thanked interim Provost Nerger and VP Hanlon and all the people around the university who are working on this and especially Ben Withers and Ryan Claycomb in the College of Liberal Arts. We understand this is complicated and we appreciate your efforts.

Mary Van Buren: Would like to know about the funding, because it looks like the stadium was almost entirely funded by bonds and the Biology department building and some of the Vet Med complex that's going up is also funded by bonds. Would like to know if that is going to be the case for the Clark building, including the C wing.

VP Hanlon: That's correct, the stadium was built with revenue bonds and the revenues of the stadium were then pledged against the debt service payment for those bonds. Biology was a little bit before my time, but I understand that those were student fees that also had bonds issued against the student fees that were pledged.

Provost Nerger: That's correct, and the college also indebted itself for that, so the college student fees and bonds.

VP Hanlon: The veterinary hospital and education complex is also bonds through a combination of both university funds as well as enrollment based and tuition-based increases in revenue from the college itself were pledged into that deal. Then to lead into the Clark conversation, part of our issuance last month was \$19 million worth of bonds that closes out the \$136 million total

investment in the project as it stands right now. We are going to be convening a small working group that looks at alternatives for the C wing. Before those construction crews put shovels down and leave campus, and then we have to pay to remobilize, we want to spend some time looking at what those other opportunities are that may or may not include bonds. We have a little bit more work to do there when it comes to considering Clark C.

Marni Berg: Asked if central administration is looking at Clark C and is it thinking about entertaining an idea of contributing, since this is an important building for the whole campus, to contribute for temporary movement, moving of and the displacement of people affected by the renovations of A wing and the demolition of B wing.

VP Hanlon: That was an idea that was considered, but I think I do need to revisit our second version of the budget because it climbs squarely into our conversation of budget for next year and financial capacity. That was considered, but we need to leverage the project funds to do this. Again, that's why we're scrubbing all the opportunities on campus for existing space. While we understand that it would be good to co-locate everybody in the short term with rented type mobile offices that but that isn't an easy button. We are trying to investigate those other options on campus where space is readily available. Maybe we would have to do some modest improvements to it or reconfigure it to make accommodations, but we're trying to look at that as much as we possibly can.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Until very recently, Clark C was part of the project. We were always told that Clark C was part of the project. This is not really a question, but a transmission of the absolute disappointment that many of us have that Clark C is no longer part of the interest of administration.

Provost Nerger: I don't think it's not of interest. I think it had to do with how the funding was coming in. Asked if the new Clark B space would be able to house a lot of the people currently in Clark C, since the new Clark B space will be a lot bigger than it is now.

VP Hanlon: Pedros-Gascon is correct that Clark A and C were part of the original vision. In that original scope, there was no Clark B that was going to be constructed. So, when the inflation occurred, the team by way of our architects and engineers, looked at how much additional square footage could be added, because it was about getting additional square footage as well as renovating the facilities.

VP Hanlon: Well, there were limitations to Clark A and C in terms of picking up the 120,000 gross square foot increase and then we had the dilemma of the price pressures in the market. We took a step back and said how could we best utilize \$136 million if we want to get this kind of additional new space available for Clark and it was a difficult dilemma to go through.

VP Hanlon: We didn't want to walk away from Clark C, but we also wanted to make sure that we leveraged those \$136 million as effectively as we possibly could. They went back to the drawing board and did a rough square footage calculation and found that if we took down Clark B early and brought that project scope forward and added 120,000 square feet into a brand-new facility,

that was more efficient than trying to cobble it into those other two wings. We understood that that would be a disappointment and that is why we also said let us not put pencils down on Clark C while these construction crews are on campus, let's look at different options and alternatives during this time when Clark A and B are being worked on and try to chase that down and do as much due diligence as on it as humanly possible.

Berg: Noted that VP Hanlon said that some buildings that have space might be retrofitted. I don't know the difference in cost between renting portables versus retrofitting, but I also know that it is important to keep departments together for our collegiality, for access, for students, for lots of reasons. If it is more cost efficient to retrofit something, is there going to be every effort put forward to get all of a department to be in the same place so that they are not scattered and so that they can work together and that they have access to students?

VP Hanlon: Every effort is being made to do that, but I'll just acknowledge we don't have a space that is of equivalent size to where people are right now. We are looking at different options, but you bring up a good point that we have to do a cost benefit analysis of what is the cost of a mobile office and that scale for the size of that of that facility versus the amount that we have that would have to go into an existing office or facility to allow and accommodate for co-location. We are going through those machinations right now, but that is what we're trying to do. If that price point while achieving those objectives comes in lower, we're going to want to go down that path.

VP Hanlon: Provided an update on the second version of the budget. Believe there will be a third and the fourth version of this, but just making sure that that there is open communication as to where the budget stands right now. We have some more tangible numbers that are in front of us now. This budget was shared at the Board of Governors meeting last week, and what I want to do is go through this segment by segment like I would with the board and then I'm happy to pause at the end and take some questions.

VP Hanlon: Before I get into the mechanics of it, I just wanted to acknowledge that Chancellor Frank kicked off before any of the campuses presented their budget and acknowledged that the state funding proposal that came out from the governor was less than what we were forecasting in the first version of the budget. It is something that we have experienced in the past and we have been in situations where state funding has not been as robust, and it has impacted our campus. While this is going to be challenging, it is not unfamiliar to us, and this is something to work through.

VP Hanlon: Shared the first version of the budget. We wanted to baseline and make sure that we have a comparison, and then we have two new scenarios that we presented to the board. The first is the proposal that is based off the governor's proposed budget, so the governor's proposed budget does a few things. It limits our resident undergraduate tuition increase to 2%. We had forecasted or assumed that it would be possible to look at a 3% increase, but the governor limited that number to 2%. The state proposal for state revenue was 5% in the first version, the governor's proposal has 3% and then we had a proposal of 3% and this is the first scenario. In this first scenario, it is at 2%, but State Classified is at 3% and that's an important distinction to make here because we have an agreement that we need to adhere to that that sets that 3%. The 2% is a factor that we put into play to acknowledge that if we have less tuition revenue and less state appropriation, that is our single largest investment category. Even moderating that

compensation increase does not solve for our or bottom-line budget challenge at this stage in the budget.

VP Hanlon: This is the second version of what is likely to be four to five different versions. So just on our second version scenario, this is formulated from an assumption that the legislature comes in and provides us some more flexibility as they have done in the past. Instead of a 2% limitation, let's say it was a 4% limitation and instead of the state allocation from the governor's budget proposal at 3%, let's say it's at 6% and the state line especially has some history that comes into play. That is basically the proportion as to how much the legislature has changed the governor's proposal in the past. With that increase in revenue, we then reversed our 2% back to 3% for all the parties involved.

VP Hanlon: The resident tuition increase is what was limited by the governor. That is why in this first scenario, it is at 2%, 4% in the second scenario. In the second scenario, we match that 4% increase again to create some examples around whatever new proposition would be for graduate rate increase, 3% for both for all the scenarios and for resident and non-resident. This is making sure that we're checking in and that we're still within the market, because if we go too high, then enrollments can decline. While we would be raising more with a rate increase, we would then be dampening our enrollment possibilities. PVM functions in the same fashion. Differential tuition is a 2% and a 4% function, fees are modeled at the 3% and then the 6% forecast.

VP Hanlon: Financial aid resources remain primarily a factor of the tuition increases. Multi-year central investment stayed the same. State classified is still at 3%, but we also have step increases that are being proposed that we have to factor into this line. That is something that does not move with the changes of scenario, even though it is compensation. Based academic incentive funding is a function of tuition because it is differential tuition and tuition sharing on campus. Mandatory costs change 9.7 to 10.7 primarily due to interest rates that we saw in the market when we issued bonds this past month.

VP Hanlon: At the end of October, quality enhancements remain the same. Budget reallocation changed from \$3 million to \$6 million. It means that we have more work to do in the lines above for this third version, but we need to start thinking through what some of those more difficult decisions are going to look like as we begin to develop that third version of the budget.

Partridge: Asked for clarification regarding the 2% reduction, if that is going to be across the board in every department, and how that affects the new budget model.

VP Hanlon: Clarified that the goal today is not to announce the rollout of budget reduction targets. This is one of the those first two early exercises. It is an effort to minimize surprises as much as possible and try to keep campus informed as to what we are seeing and what we are communicating to the Board. I am not announcing that today in the process, but we have to have that conversation.

VP Hanlon: Clarified that these are still two distinct processes. This is the incremental budget process for the next fiscal year. We are running that process separately from our budget model conversations. These two things are moving in parallel and are independent.

Michael Antolin: Asked to explain a line shown in new expenses of \$2 million deficit across all three categories.

VP Hanlon: Clarified that was in the revenue category. We are reviewing the treatment of our investment returns as a revenue category in our base budget and making sure that is sustainable. That is a reduction of that revenue category from our general fund E&G budget. Holding off on other conversations, what I try to do is make sure that if there were any of those kinds of marginal changes that might be happening, I put them in as early as possible.

Andrew Norton: Noted your description of Chancellor Frank's placing the budget in context. In that context, we have had revenues from the state that didn't match up with our needs at the time because of inflation or other things that were happening. That has happened in the past, and we've also had times when faculty salaries don't match inflation, and sometimes they do. In that sense, this is not an unusual situation for the university, but I think it's also useful to think about the historic context of this, that this has been going on for 10 or 15 years now, and the cumulative impacts of that are that we've been raising tuition faster than inflation by quite a bit in 10 or 15 years ago, we might have been in the bottom quintile of tuition and fees for our students compared to our peers.

Norton: We're now in the middle and maybe even a little bit above. Noted that there are some difficult conversations that are going to be coming up over the next year and probably the next few years about how we make these allocation decisions.

G. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: The main thing I wanted to report on is with respect to a meeting that myself, Andrew Norton, and Joseph Diverdi had with Athletics Director Joe Parker and Matt Klein, who is also the APC chair. It was a follow up to the Faculty Council meeting in November and Joe Parker's presentation. We were happy to meet with them and discuss what went on and the kind of feedback that was received for his presentation. We asked that they provide additional information to Faculty Council with respect to the Athletics budget and in particular the mismatch between the state audit and the budget report that we saw. We have received that report and Executive Committee is in the final process of reviewing that and we will be sending that out to Faculty Council members. The idea with that report is to provide additional information and if there is still more information that is required and based on feedback from Faculty Council, we will continue to ask and get that information from the Athletics Director.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: Thanked interim Provost Nerger and VP Hanlon for covering most of the information from the Board of Governors meeting. The System Office is undertaking a marketing campaign. This is in response to a survey that both CSU and CU systems undertook a couple of years ago. I

saw the report in 2022 and what that survey showed was that public perception of the value of a four-year degree has gone down. That is a nationwide pattern, but it is strong and particularly strong in some parts of the state. The other thing that we found out from that survey is that public perception here in the state is that a four-year college degree is much more expensive than it is, approximately twice as expensive as what people think. This marketing campaign is not designed to promote any one university, but it is designed to promote the idea of college in the state of Colorado. That will initially go out to historically underserved and minoritized communities within the state and they'll be following that up with the data collection effort to see if that's moving the needle. The overall goal of that is to increase enrollment at four-year degree institutions within the state.

Norton: The other point is also relevant to the discussions that we've been having this evening around finance. The board made a change to its investment policy. There is about \$400 million as of September 30th, it's probably gone up since then that is mostly in index funds, exchange traded funds SP500, pretty generic growth kinds of stuff. The Board's investment policies have been to maintain sufficient liquidity for daily operating, comply with self-liquidity requirements, diversify investments, and control the costs of doing that. They added a new goal, which is to generate income for current operations and so this is designed to give flexibility to look at investment options that are going to generate revenue when that looks like a good thing to do at a high interest rate environment such as now that can then be more readily transferred to the campuses for investment purposes.

Norton: Noted that Armando Valdez is now the sole finalist for the CSU-Pueblo presidency, all the feedback that I've heard from faculty there has been really positive about that, and I think he's an excellent choice and he will hit the ground running.

Pedros-Gascon: Noted that for the second time we have the Board of Governors identifying a sole finalist for the President position. I am concerned about how that kind of procedure discourages public discussion, engagement, and competition and the idea and perception of lack of transparency and equitability on the Board of Governors performance. Asked if there was a national search.

Norton: I was not on the search advisory committee. My understanding is that there were four semifinalists identified and that they were not able to find the right person in that first group before.

Pedros-Gascon: I would also say that if the Board of Governors is sure about that kind of decision, I don't see why it cannot advance more than one sole candidate. Think it speaks poorly or it gives a very terrible perception about the way in which the upper administration functions and this situation certainly discourages equity, transparency, and public engagement.

3. Budget Model Report – Jennifer Martin, Rob Mitchell

Rob Mitchell: There are a number of conversations going on around budget. What VP Hanlon was talking about was the upcoming budget for next year that uses the incremental budget model. What we've been working on in terms of the presidential fellowship and this budget

model redesign, which moves beyond this incremental model that just takes the little bit of money that might change in a year and divides it up, and what that really means is up to this point. Our strategy with respect to budgeting has been inertia and that's not a great strategy from the perspective of all the changes that are happening externally.

Mitchell: Norton was alluding to some of those and what this is intended to do is allow us to be more strategic in the process. There is not going to be a perfect model, so there are always going to be some tradeoffs, but the tradeoff we hope to have with a new model is that it allows us to be more strategic and consistent with the values that we have as a university. As we are managing those tradeoffs, we can't reduce all risks. We can try to manage those risks and uncertainty but can't reduce it completely. There is a lot of complexity around these topics and what is happening externally. What intend to do is create a robust process that can allow us to address these tradeoffs in a way that is strategic and helpful for us as a university and consistent with our values and our mission.

Jennifer Martin: The key piece here is that it is a phase process that is not happening overnight. There is certainly quite a bit of detail and work going into this. We are wrapping up the research and planning and moving into this design phase. The key highlight for those phases is a lot of consultation with other universities who have gone through similar processes, as well as consulting firms who guided the universities in this process. One piece to highlight in this planning stage is the opportunity to collect feedback from campus. Over the past six to eight weeks, we hosted over twenty listening sessions, various meetings with academic college Deans, and visits to various committees across the campus to discuss and collect feedback about the process and to understand what is working well with the current incremental process. We hosted a formal Canvas launch of this process on October 25th, and for those of you who weren't able to see that or would like more information that is available on the budget model redesign website. In all those different formats, we had over 350 participants from across campus representing faculty, staff and students and have seen robust engagement from the institution and a lot of great feedback. We are currently working to summarize that feedback and will provide it to the committees as they begin their work. We do intend to host additional sessions in the spring of 2024, so more information is coming soon on the continued opportunity to provide feedback.

Martin: While we are waiting for those in-person, campus facing sessions we want to point people to the budget model website where there is a feedback link where you can provide feedback as questions and comments come. That feedback comes directly to Mitchell and I, and we are providing that to the committee so that as they begin their work they are informed of what the campus has to say and the concerns or questions popping up from around campus. We recognize everyone has a ton of things on their plate, but we want to offer thanks for all of the folks who participated in the various lunches or coffee chats or committee meetings. It was great to see such robust and engaging conversations and participation from our campus community.

Mitchell: We have three committees and there are more details on the website. If you go to the operations website, you can see who is on these committees. There is also a link there where you can provide additional feedback to us if you have questions, and we make sure that that gets to each of these committees.

Van Buren: Asked when and in what format we will learn about what the possible policies will be that determine funding and particularly what will determine what programs get subvented and

what off the top funding will take place because right now it's all about process. We haven't heard anything about what the actual implications are of any of these decisions.

Mitchell: At the end of this year, we hope to have a prototype model. That would be information that will then run in the background next year in this shadow budget year and there could be some learning there as well. Hopefully there are a number of points in time where we're seeing where we are and can continue to learn to find what really works best for us.

Martin: One of the roles of the steering committee is to be that communication resource to the rest of campus. As the prototype is developed that will be communicated to the campus via the budget model website as well as SOURCE stories, emails, and things of that nature. As things are determined by that committee and by the technical committee, they will then communicate those to campus when appropriate. They are just now truly beginning their work. No decisions have been made relative to what those decisions and processes look like. Once they do, the budget model website would be the best resource to learn.

Mitchell: Clarified that this would be the end of the academic year. Coming into the end of our fiscal year we to have that prototype and communication, we hope to have similar listening sessions in the spring to keep people up to date in terms of what is happening.

Partridge: Noted that in CNS, I've been trying to create a spreadsheet that allows you to see what your department budget might look like under different versions of the RCM model consistent with Executive Vice President Miranda's talk in October. That is proving a very useful discussion tool for people to informally get a sense of what it would look like. If there is a way to create some sort of discussion before the end of the academic year, I think that would be useful.

Martin: What we have seen in other institutions that have done this is those variables come out of the steering committee, so whatever the metrics are for CSU, particularly development of some sort of tool that's a commonly shared tool at the university level. Appreciate the work that you're doing in that space as the steering committee makes progress toward what those variables are, I anticipate something similar existing perhaps through the operations website.

Mitchell: Noted that we don't know yet where these values, priorities, and approaches may land for us. That will be helpful as the steering committee decides on different approaches that fit what we are doing and can enable the kinds of opportunities and possibilities that can exist for us.

Partridge: I'm going to push back and say don't wait for them to tell you because one of the interesting things I'm discovering and playing around with the spreadsheets is that there are so many variables and so many knobs they can turn and an awareness of where the knobs are that matter, and which ones don't is useful. That is why we're playing with the spreadsheet. If you wait for someone to tell you how that knob that you didn't think matters is set, and then realize it's the one that matters, you're in some trouble.

Mitchell: Clarified one point, that the technical committee will also be working on that exact same process, and they'll be really looking at those knobs and using that data. Don't want to have two parallel committees that are working. Think it would be great for us to feed all this information that you are noticing through these feedback forms so that we can learn what you're learning and make sure that we are all on the same page.

4. Opportunities and Risk Analysis of the RCM Budget Model
Report – Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning – Gamze Cavdar

Chair Smith: Reminder that with all standing committee reports, these are received and open to discussion and questions, but not for changes.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked the committee for their work on this issue.

H. DISCUSSION

1. Future Faculty Council Meetings Format

Chair Smith: Postponing the discussion on future Faculty Council meetings format in the interest of time and moving on to the new business and motion from the floor.

I. NEW BUSINESS

1. Resolution regarding the Clark revitalization

Alex Bernasek: I am one of the CLA-at-large representatives to Faculty Council and it is in that capacity that I bring a resolution forward for your consideration. I will read through the resolution and then make a couple of comments. This resolution is to request that the central administration provides support to minimize disruption to displaced departments and centers during the Clark revitalization, whereas the Clark building is essential to the daily and long-term academic mission of the university. Whereas disruption of working and learning space will result during the much-needed renovation and replacement of Clark building from December 2023 through 2025, whereas the university should prioritize mitigating the displacement of students, faculty, and staff from cohesive and accessible on-campus spaces to remote work or scattered across campus. Whereas the prolonged disruptions will harm the success of students, faculty and staff of the affected departments and centers, be it resolved, that Faculty Council hereby requests that the central administration work with the College of Liberal Arts to ease these disruptions by providing financial and logistical support to displaced departments and centers in on campus spaces that keep each unit co-housed and working together.

Bernasek: Move to consider this resolution.

Berg: Second the motion.

Bernasek: I think what we have heard today has been quite heartening about efforts by central administration to get involved with the Clark renovation. I think there are still many unanswered questions. There was a bit of equivocating that I think is a bit concerning. I'm not one of the people who will be displaced, but we are talking about people who are going to be displaced for at least three and a half years from their offices. Many of them have labs in the basement of Clark A and they won't have access to those labs. It's the thought that I would be facing that really disturbs me. The timeline is interesting, and I think speaks to some urgency to this matter. Some faculty are being told that they are going to have to pack up their offices by December

20th, which is just around the corner, without knowing where they are going to go. On behalf of the faculty in the departments and centers that are being displaced, I am asking you to please give your support to this resolution. It is not a hostile or aggressive or combative resolution. It is simply formalizing our concern and our requests that these matters be handled in the best way that they can be. Asked if there were any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Move to amend the document that is being presented by my colleague Alex Bernasek, to include an additional line.

Fabiola Ehlers-Zavala: Second the motion to amend.

Chair Smith: We will only be considering that amendment right now and it is open to discussion.

Pedros-Gascon: The amendment includes an additional commitment to have the Clark C wing integrated in the sequencing of this development though it was an integral part of this project in all previous status be resolved.

John Slater: Thanked Bernasek for introducing this amendment and or this motion and to expressed support for it because we don't really know how things are going to work yet. I think that this is a valuable contribution.

Chair Smith: Noted that the discussion is just on the amendment right now, we can return to your comments. Asked if there was any discussion on the amendment that is currently being considered.

Van Buren: Yes, I just want to speak in favor of this amendment. As I talked to Vice President Hanlon, I think it's clear that the administration is interested in continuing with the Clark C wing, but I have heard no actual commitment or discussion of funding, and I think that this resolution will allow them to see that a lot of faculty are very concerned about this issue.

Marilee Long: Reiterated what Van Buren said that it was heartening to hear from VP Hanlon today however, something in writing would go a long way for those of us who are in the Clark C wing. We are very excited about what is going on in the Clark B wing, but if we could have something in writing from our fellow faculty across campus, that would be a big bolster for us.

Martin: Asked to clarify what commitment means as it is written in the amendment.

Pedros-Gascon: It indicates something more than just words that may not end in the total abandonment of any project with regards to Clark C. Commitment may indicate a clear sequencing of the development. It doesn't mean to have it pinned down for a certain time, but the idea that there will be an integral solution to the whole building.

Ehlers-Zavala: Also in support of the amendment, I think it is important to support our colleagues and believe that much needs to happen and the more commitment that we can obtain is much appreciated.

Tracy Brady: Would also like to speak in support of the Clark C wing. Anyone who has ever taught in the Clark C wing knows it is in desperate need of renovation and I wanted to add my voice to that as well. I don't think the building lives up to the wonderful work that's being done there, so would be great to see some more support for that.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote for the amendment to the motion in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Chair Smith: Motion to amend is passed. We will return to the discussion of the motion with that amendment.

Slater: I support the idea of communicating how important logistical support may be during this process. Especially since we have seen a map about where the new ADA parking is going to be, and we know where the ADA access on the north side of Clark C is, and it's a lot further than it used to be. During these years of construction, it could be complicated. This is important and there may need to be a variety of forms of support just for moving around and accessing a building when there is a construction site right where the ADA access to Clark C is. Grateful for this proposal and thanked Bernasek and all of the folks who are supporting it.

Ehlers-Zavala: I think it is very much needed, I believe in shared governance, and this can give us an opportunity to continue to work closely with our university leaders.

Ryan Claycomb: As a bit of background here, recognize that after some CLA faculty presented at the last Faculty Council meeting, and even a bit before, the administration has been largely quite involved in the procurement of new space. I'm happy to hear the information that VP Hanlon just presented here and just want it to be noted that that logistical support has been rich and robust since the last meeting.

Chair Smith: Asked if there anyone would like to speak in opposition to the amended motion. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms to approve the amended resolution for the Clark revitalization.

Chair Smith: Motion has passed. As with all resolutions that Faculty Council approves, we will post this on the Faculty Council website under the resolutions tab.

Chair Smith: Hearing no other business, called the meeting adjourned.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

Melinda Smith, Chair
Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair
Andrew Norton, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING
2023-2024

Vice-Chair: Joseph DiVerdi

BOG Representative: Andrew Norton

(substituting for Amy Barkley)

Professional Registered Parliamentarian: Lola Fehr

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephen Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2025
Jennifer Martin	Animal Sciences	2024
Jane Stewart	Agricultural Biology	2024
Kelly Curl	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2025
Esten Mason	Soil and Crop Sciences	2026
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2026
Andrew Norton	College-at-Large	2026
Health and Human Sciences		
Ruoh-Nan (Terry) Yan	Design and Merchandising	2024
Jennifer Richards	Health and Exercise Science	2025
Susan Baker	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2026
Blake Naughton	Human Development and Family Studies	2026
Erin Arneson	Construction Management	2024
Jen Weaver	Occupational Therapy	2026
(substituting for Aaron Eakman, Fall 2023)		
Sharon Anderson	School of Education	2024
Elizabeth Kiehne	School of Social Work	2025
Mohammed Mehany	College-at-Large	2024
(substituting for Brian Butki, Fall 2023)		
Business		
Nate Nguyen	Accounting	2026
John Hoxmeier	Computer Information Systems	2024
Bharadwaj Kannan	Finance and Real Estate	2025
Rob Mitchell	Management	2024
Jonathan Zhang	Marketing	2026
Engineering		
Peter Jan van Leeuwen	Atmospheric Science	2024
Ashok Prasad	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2025
Hussam Mahmoud	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2024

Steven Reising	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2025
Soheil Fatehiboroujeni	Mechanical Engineering	2026
Thomas Bradley	Systems Engineering	2026
Sybil Sharvelle	College-at-Large	2026
Pinar Omur-Ozbek	College-at-Large	2026

Liberal Arts

Mary Van Buren	Anthropology & Geography	2026
Marius Lehene	Art & Art History	2025
(substituting for Mary-Ann Kokoska, Fall 2023)		
Mark Saunders	Communication Studies	2025
Ramaa Vasudevan	Economics	2024
(substituting for Anders Fremstad, on sabbatical 2023-2024)		
Genesea Carter	English	2026
Maricela DeMirjyn	Ethnic Studies	2025
John Slater	Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	2025
Tracy Brady	History	2026
Marilee Long	Journalism and Media Communication	2025
Forest Greenough	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2025
(substituting for Madeline Harvey, Fall 2023)		
Eirik Harris	Philosophy	2026
Marni Berg	Political Science	2024
Laura Reynolds	Sociology	2025

Alexandra Bernasek	College-at-Large	2026
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2025
Emily Morgan	College-at-Large	2026
Lisa Langstraat	College-at-Large	2024
Allison Goar	College-at-Large	2024
Abigail Shupe	College-at-Large	2024
Sanam Emami	College-at-Large	2026
Fabiola Ehlers-Zavala	College-at-Large	2026
Mohammed Hirchi	College-at-Large	2026

Natural Resources

Randall Boone	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2026
Camille Stevens-Rumann	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2024
(substituting for Chad Hoffman, Fall 2023)		
Joel Berger	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2024
(substituting for Yoichiro Kanno, on sabbatical 2023-2024)		
William Sanford	Geosciences	2026
Christina Cavaliere	Human Dimensions of Natural Resources	2026

Natural Sciences

Olve Peersen	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	2025
Mike Antolin	Biology	2024

Brittney Morgan	Chemistry	2026
Craig Partridge	Computer Science	2026
Emily Hardegree-Ullman	Physics	2024
Silvia Canetto	Psychology	2025
Ander Wilson	Statistics	2025
Steve Benoit	Mathematics	2026
Alan Van Orden	College-at-Large	2026
James Liu	College-at-Large	2026
Kim Henry	College-at-Large	2026

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

DN Rao Veermachaneni	Biomedical Sciences	2025
Shari Lanning	Clinical Sciences	2025
TBD	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2026
Tony Schountz	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
Roxann Karkhoff-Schweizer (substituting for Katriana Popichak, Fall 2023)	College-at-Large	2025
Fiona Hollinshead	College-at-Large	2025
Doreene Hyatt	College-at-Large	2024
Tara Nordgren	College-at-Large	2025
Del Leary	College-at-Large	2026
Dan Regan	College-at-Large	2026
Zaid Abdo	College-at-Large	2025
Brian Geiss	College-at-Large	2025
Jennifer Rawlinson	College-at-Large	2026

University Libraries

Christine Pawliuk	Libraries	2025
--------------------------	-----------	------

***Ex Officio* Voting Members**

Melinda Smith	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2024
Joseph DiVerdi	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2024
Andrew Norton	BOG Faculty Representative	2024
Steve Reising, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2024
Gregg Griffinhagen, Chair	Committee on Information Technology	2024
Shane Kanatous, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2024
Jerry Magloughlin, Chair (excused)	Committee on Libraries	2024
Ryan Brooks, Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
Jennifer Martin, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty	2024
William Sanford, Chair	Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education	2024
Alan Kennan, Chair (excused)	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2024
Gamze Cavdar, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2024
Lumina Albert, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2024
Peter Jan van Leeuwen, Co-Chair	Committee on University Programs	2024

Tian Wang, Co-Chair	Committee on University Programs	2024
Brad Goetz , Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2024
Karen Thorsett-Hill	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2026
Thomas Conway	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
Sean Bryan	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Ann Hess	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Jennifer Reinke	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Scott Wiebensohn	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025

Ex Officio Non-Voting Members

Amy Parsons	President
Rico Munn	Chief of Staff
Jan Nерger	Interim Provost
Derek Dictson	Vice President for Advancement
Kathay Rennels	Interim Vice President for Engagement & Extension
TBD	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
TBD	Vice President for Equity, Equal Opportunity & Title IX
Susan James	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Eric Ray	Vice President for Human Resources
Kauline Cipriani	Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
Brandon Bernier	Vice President for Information Technology
Kathleen Fairfax	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Laura Jensen	Vice Provost for Planning and Effectiveness
Christa Johnson	Interim Vice President for Research
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Tom Siller	Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
Kyle Henley	Vice President for University Marketing & Communications
Brendan Hanlon	Vice President for University Operations
James Pritchett	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
Allen Robinson	Dean, College of Engineering
Lise Youngblade	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Colleen Webb	Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Karen Estlund	Dean, Libraries
Simon Tavener	Interim Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Susan VandeWoude	Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
A. Alonso Aguirre	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Matt Klein	Chair, Administrative Professional Council