

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
February 6, 2024 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

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

Chair Smith reminded Faculty Council members that Faculty Council meetings are public and recorded for purposes of the minutes. Those minutes will be posted to the Faculty Council website. Asked that members keep their cameras and microphones off unless speaking. We ask that you raise your virtual hand to ask a question and do not use the chat. We ask that speakers limit themselves to one question per agenda item until everyone has had a chance to ask questions and that comments be limited to two (2) minutes. This allows everyone to have the chance to participate in the discussion. We ask that members refrain from interrupting or talking over others and avoid the use of acronyms. As always, personal attacks are not tolerated in this venue. Requested members introduce their college before speaking.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – February 6, 2024

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – March 5, 2024 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm
- b. Harry Rosenberg Award – Nominations due on March 29, 2024 – [Harry Rosenberg Award | Faculty Council | Colorado State University \(colostate.edu\)](https://colostate.edu/harry-rosenberg-award)

Chair Smith: The Harry Rosenberg Award was established in 2016 by Dr. Sue Davis Pendell. This award is in honor of Dr. Harry Rosenberg, the first elected chair of Faculty Council. This award is given annually to one faculty member who has made significant contributions to Faculty Council. Asked that any nominations be sent to Vice Chair Joseph DiVerdi. Nominations are due by March 29th.

- c. Faculty representative needed for Employee Appreciation Board
 1. Contact EAB Chair, Erin Mercurio, if interested in serving: erin.mercurio@colostate.edu
- d. Faculty Council Officer Elections to be held on March 5, 2024

1. Elections will be conducted by the Committee on Faculty Governance. Eligibility for candidacy is specific in Section C.2.1.3.3 of the Manual.

Call for Nominations:

- Faculty Council Chair
- Faculty Council Vice Chair
- Board of Governors Faculty Representative

Please email nominations, including a 1-2 page statement of intent, to Steven.Reising@colostate.edu

Nominations are due by Tuesday, February 20, 2024.

Chair Smith: The Faculty Council Officer elections will be held at the March Faculty Council meeting. If you have a nomination, either from the community or a self-nomination, those 1–2-page statements of intent should be emailed to Steve Reising. Those nominations are due on February 20th.

- e. Presidential Evaluation Survey
- f. University Grievance Officer Survey

Chair Smith: The Presidential Evaluation survey and University Grievance Officer survey are administered by Faculty Council. These are important surveys, and they provide feedback to both the President and the University Grievance Officer, who serves Faculty Council and the broader community. Both surveys will open on February 7th and close on February 19th. Encouraged members to participate in those surveys.

- g. Faculty Council Meet and Greet – February 14 from 3:30pm-5:00pm in Lory Student Center Rooms 308-310
 1. Please RSVP here: [RSVP for Faculty Council Meet & Greets \(office.com\)](https://www.colostate.edu/office/office.com)

Chair Smith: We will have the first Faculty Council meet and greet on February 14th from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Lory Student Center, rooms 308-310. Provost Marion Underwood will be in attendance. Encouraged members to attend and to meet Faculty Council members and Faculty Council officers, as well as talk informally with Provost Underwood. The RSVP is not required to attend, but we are asking for RSVPs for planning purposes. There will be several more meet and greets this semester.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

- a. Faculty Council Meeting – December 5, 2023

Chair Smith: We have minutes from the Faculty Council meeting on December 5, 2023. Asked if there were any edits to these minutes.

Hearing none, Faculty Council minutes approved as submitted.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – December 8, 2023 & January 19, 2024

Chair Smith: Asked if there was anything to be pulled from the University Curriculum Committee minutes for further consideration.

Hearing none, University Curriculum Committee minutes approved as submitted.

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Election – Student Representative to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Steve Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the election of Jessica Laffey as the undergraduate student representative to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any comments with respect to this motion.

Reising: Thanked Amy Barkley for helping interface with the Associated Students of CSU and the Graduate Student Council.

Chair Smith: Thanked Reising. Hearing no other comments or questions, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

2. Proposed Revisions to Section E.3.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Jennifer Martin: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, we would like to propose a revision to Section E.3.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual as reflected in the agenda packet. This revision would add a gender-neutral term, “emerit,” for the section regarding emeritus and emerita status.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding this motion. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved. Will be sent to the Office of General Counsel for review.

3. Proposed Revisions to Section E.12.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty proposes a revision to Section E.12.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. This change reflects the inclusion of librarianship as a form of scholarship. Expressed appreciation to Mark Shelstad from the Libraries for getting this amendment to us.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin. Asked if there were any questions regarding this motion. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved. Will be sent to the Office of General Counsel for review.

4. Resolution in Support of Libraries Licensing Priorities – Karen Estlund, Dean of Libraries and Amy Hoseth, Associate Dean

Chair Smith: The final action item is a resolution in support of libraries licensing priorities. This is presented by both Dean Karen Estlund of the Libraries, and Amy Hoseth, Associate Dean of Libraries. This will require a motion and second. Requested a motion.

Andrew Norton: Moved.

Joseph DiVerdi: Seconded.

Chair Smith: Asked if Dean Estlund or Associate Dean Hoseth could speak to this resolution.

Associate Dean Amy Hoseth: Indicated that Dean Estlund is away on travel, so will be explaining this resolution. This is a resolution to support libraries licensing priorities as we negotiate with vendors ranging from Elsevier to the many other academic research vendors that we work with on a regular basis. Both Wyoming and University of Colorado Boulder have both had their faculty support similar resolutions. We are hoping we can get CSU faculty to support our work in this area as well. This resolution is not specific to any one vendor but would help support general licensing priorities for the Libraries going forward.

Associate Dean Hoseth: We presented this to Faculty Council Executive Committee in December 2023, and we had support from several members of Faculty Council Executive Committee who contributed feedback and input. This is similar to resolutions introduced at places like Wyoming and Boulder. Expressed appreciation for the opportunity to thank Faculty Council Executive Committee and those individuals for their support in getting this cleaned up and ready to present to Faculty Council.

Chair Smith: Thanked Associate Dean Hoseth. Asked if there were any questions or comments.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Would like to speak in favor of this resolution. Believe this is important for the financial sustainability of the entire institution and also for the importance of research.

Vice Provost Susan James: Not a member of Faculty Council but am support of this. Want to point out its connection to the open scholarship initiative that we are all going down in academia. It is required by federal mandates for places that have federal funding and would help fight the control that the for-profit industry has over scholarship and enable more sharing. We will be talking about open scholarship as a University for several years to come as we get ready to comply with these federal mandates.

Reising: Expressed support for this motion as well. Had a question about the third “whereas” statement. It states, “Whereas publishers leverage profits to exert control over key tools for managing the research lifecycle and scholarly communications.” Would like to know what the concern is there.

Associate Dean Hoseth: Would be happy to speak to this. Indicated that peer review would be one example of that kind of tool. There are also the types of institutional programs and similar things that these publishers have in terms of data and records on the research being produced at various institutions. All of that comes together in areas where these publishers have an awful lot of control in not just the publishing of the articles, but the data and the information behind them as well. Not sure if that answers the question.

Reising: Thanked Associate Dean Hoseth. Have one follow-up question. Asked if Associate Dean Hoseth could speak to the statement above the one previously discussed, about confidentiality clauses and non-disclosure agreements. Asked if we have to sign those with publishers such as Elsevier and if this is typical.

Associate Dean Hoseth: Yes, often publishers will try to include those in their contracts, certainly in the first round of negotiations. Their aim behind the scenes is to prevent institutions from speaking with each other about their contract details. In this case, including this item in the resolution is a way of helping support the Libraries’ work in requiring that those contracts and non-disclosure agreements not be included in the final contracts so we can discuss those arrangements with peer institutions and make sure that everyone is on a fair playing field when it comes to the prices that we are paying for our resources.

Chair Smith: Thanked Associate Dean Hoseth. Hearing no other questions or comments, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

Chair Smith: Thanked Associate Dean Hoseth and Dean Estlund for bringing this to our attention. Expressed appreciation for involvement of the Faculty Council Executive Committee. This resolution will be posted to the Faculty Council website.

F. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Provost Marion Underwood

Provost Marion Underwood: Expressed appreciation for the warm welcome in the first few weeks of new role at CSU. Have been looking forward to this meeting and am looking forward to attending next week's Faculty Council meet and greet. Expressed hope that many of you can be there.

Provost Underwood: Throughout career as a faculty member, have always been a strong advocate for shared governance. We all know that healthy shared governance is at the heart of a healthy academic enterprise. Expressed happiness to be back at a university where shared governance is thriving. Was attracted to Colorado State University for the strong culture of shared governance. The AAUP published an article in December titled "Singing the Praises of Shared Governance." The author, Louis Epstein, is an associate professor of music at St. Olaf College and former chair of the Faculty Governance Committee. Epstein wrote that "in a healthy shared governance system, faculty, staff, and administrators, board members, and students accomplish more through collaboration than antagonism. A high degree of faculty engagement is crucial to the system in the show of shared governance, the stars are in the rank-and-file faculty members who show up, deliberate, and vote." Expressed agreement with this statement. Faculty at universities, including at CSU, are stars for many reasons. You seek excellence in your teaching, scholarship and research, mentoring, service and outreach, and the deliberations of this leadership body matter. A strong and engaged faculty council matters, and our highest aspirations for this University cannot be fulfilled without strong collaboration with the faculty.

Provost Underwood: In first month here, have met with many people across the University, including our academic deans, Dean of Libraries, and Dean of the Graduate School. This is an exceptional institution of higher education. Immediate goals have been to absorb information about where CSU excels, the opportunities and challenges we face, and how we can continue to drive meaningful change in a complex world. Have started discussions with the deans about how we can work together to advance the academic enterprise, innovate and plan strategically in light of budget tightening for the fiscal year 2025. The budget is top of mind as Provost. Have dedicated a great deal of time getting familiar with CSU's financial accounting and budgeting system, and the scenarios we face around revenue drivers for the operating budget. Indicated that Vice President Brendan Hanlon will have more to say on the budget when he presents.

Provost Underwood: We have three (3) leadership searches in progress. We are looking for the next Dean of Agricultural Sciences, which is currently filled by Vice President for Engagement and Extension James Pritchett until a new dean is selected. That search is being chaired by Alonso Aguirre, Dean of the Warner College of Natural Resources, and Sue VandeWoude, Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences. The deadline for full consideration is on February 9th. We are also looking for a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs. Interim Vice Provost Tom Siller has announced that he will be retiring at the end of this year. That search committee is chaired by Associate Provost Steve Dandeneau. The deadline for full consideration is February 25th. We are also searching for the next Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Economics professor Elissa Braunstein will be serving as interim dean beginning February 19th. Current Dean Ben Withers has accepted the position of Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Iowa State University. That search will be chaired by the Dean of Libraries Karen Estlund. That committee convened last week and has been given their charge. Links to each of these searches are on the Provost's website, and the link to the Dean of the

College of Liberal Arts will be up soon that will include the search timeline, including the deadline for full consideration. Thanked the chairs and the committees for their service on these important leadership searches. Expressed thanks to those serving in interim roles.

Provost Underwood: Have begun to formulate vision for advancing CSU's academic enterprise. It is based on five (5) themes organized around the institutional priorities that President Amy Parsons has put forth. These themes are student success, strengthening our democracy, world-class academic and research programs, institutional competitiveness, and outreach and impact around the state and world. Priorities are shifting daily as we meet with more groups of faculty and hear more feedback about these early priorities. Have shared these priorities around these themes with the Provost Leadership Council. The intent is to continue to develop these early priorities with input from the deans, Vice President Cassandra Moseley, Vice President Blanche Hughes, Faculty Council leadership, and Faculty Council.

Provost Underwood: Each of these themes has several strategies around them. The list of these early priorities is by no means exhaustive. These things are highest on the list based on what has been heard from our academic leadership and faculty and from experiences at other universities in the area of student success. A big initiative is the search for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs. We want to find the best champion that we can for student success. Even though this is a national search, we would welcome strong internal candidates. Would also like to talk to Faculty Council and other academic leaders about considering a possible winter session to allow other opportunities for student success, study abroad, and maybe more time for faculty to prepare their classes for the spring semester. Am also interested in strengthening our summer offerings, as well as working with Vice President Hughes and others to understand how we can better support the transition students coming from community colleges. It is also important that we work together to determine CSU's approach to artificial intelligence and how we will manage shifts and impacts of artificial intelligence, as well as how we will lead and use this technology to build teaching and research guidelines. Know interim Provost Janice Neger hosted Provost's Ethics Colloquiums on this topic. Would like to see us do more in this area.

Provost Underwood: With the theme of strengthening our democracy, interested in doing everything we can do prepare students for a diverse and inclusive democracy to foster understanding of a diversity of identities and preparing students for a global citizenship. It would be good to increase study abroad, international enrollment, and engagement between international and domestic students. Expressed excitement at the breadth of activities being offered in spring around democracy. Would like to work with President Parsons and others to carry this forward to make it part of our institutional fabric at CSU.

Provost Underwood: Under the theme of world class academic and research programs, am excited to collaborate with Vice President Moseley on more research that focuses on interdisciplinary themes. Would like to work with Vice President Moseley on enhancing research space on this campus and possible cluster hires that may help us diversify our faculty and attract great scholars in alignment with themes that are already areas of distinction.

Provost Underwood: Will share more on vision and priorities for moving forward with the academic enterprise. Will continue to formulate these ideas in collaboration with Vice President

Moseley, our academic leadership, Faculty Council, and others across CSU. Am enjoying the conversations with other faculty groups about these priorities so far.

Provost Underwood: Discussing these possible themes for interdisciplinary research initiatives raises the question of where the Academic Master Plan stands as we map out our short and long-term vision for the academic enterprise. Think this Academic Master Plan was conceived and designed very thoughtfully with wisdom and intentionality from academic leaders, faculty, and others at CSU. For next steps, would like us to engage a faculty task force to work on innovation for the undergraduate core curriculum and highlight distinctive academic missions of CSU. Possible themes could be democracy, climate and sustainability, one health, vital longevity, and more. Would like to align these themes with the themes that came out of the Academic Master Plan planning process. The Academic Master Plan has nine (9) themes. That might be too many for an undergraduate core curriculum but would like to work with faculty to determine what some exciting themes may be. There will be more to come on this as we have more conversations with faculty and working to formulate a vision for how we move forward.

Provost Underwood: Provided information on the structure of the Office of the Provost.

Chair Smith: Thanked Provost Underwood. Asked if there were any questions or comments.

Michael Antolin: As we are discussing budget cuts, one of the initiatives that came out of the Council of Chairs and Heads through the Provost's Office were the Provost Faculty Awards both in teaching and research. Am advocating to please keep those, because we do not have that many awards here at the University to recognize our excellence in teaching, artistry, creativity, and research. Would like to make sure this stays in front as a priority.

Provost Underwood: Thanked Antolin. Expressed appreciation for the suggestion. This is a high priority, believe that faculty at CSU are under-recognized with University awards but also with national awards. Think the way we help faculty get more national awards is to have more University awards. Have no interest in cutting funding for awards. Would like for us to have more awards and would like for our faculty to be nominated for more national awards so that you all get the recognition that is richly deserved.

Antolin: Thanked Provost Underwood. Part of the reason we started those awards in the first place was recognizing that our candidates for national awards were not necessarily competitive.

Mary Van Buren: Welcomed Provost Underwood. Last year, the legislature amended a bill to allow five-year contracts for non-tenure track faculty. Last November, Faculty Council approved language to make a change to Section E.6 of the Faculty Manual. However, the Board of Governors has not seen this revision. Would like to know what obstacles there are to allowing non-tenure track faculty to have five-year contracts in what is a tenuous job situation.

Provost Underwood: Understanding is that it may have initially been an issue of timing, that the suggestion for the five-year contract might have come close to a deadline for a Board of Governors meeting last fall. Believe it has been reviewed by the Office of General Counsel and they are taking it under consideration. Would like to see the option of five-year contracts.

Understanding is that the length of any contract is always at the discretion of the dean, in part because the dean understands the budgetary environment and what resources they have. Would like our deans to have the option of a five-year contract. Asked if Chair Smith could provide more background.

Chair Smith: In our meeting with President Parsons and the Faculty Council officers, we brought up the question about the status of Section E.6. It was certainly a fast process in which this was considered and approved by Faculty Council prior to going to the Board of Governors. There is also the consideration of whether it is a policy that CSU wants to adopt. That decision lies with the President. During the meeting, President Parsons indicated that she would take this under consideration and would get to us. Will continue to follow up on this.

Craig Partridge: Would like to follow up on Antolin's comments. Am currently on the U.S. President's National Medal of Science Committee and have served on some similar national level awards committees in the past. Confirmed the notion that CSU does not have a very organized or thoughtful way of ensuring our faculty get national recognition. University awards are only a training ground for award writers and do not materially move the needle. You need to have a coherent plan for how to get people recognition outside the University at multiple levels. Would be happy to help create a process across the University to make that easier to train people.

Provost Underwood: Thanked Partridge. Think that is a fantastic idea. Would benefit from your expertise and would like to create a culture where people understand that a lot of the way awards work are by self-nominations.

Pedros-Gascon: Had a comment regarding this discussion. In some cultures, self-nomination does not work well. It may work well for some people, but culturally, there is also something that holds many people back from that situation.

Pedros-Gascon: Would also like to know if there is any follow-up from the Office of the Provost with regards to their request of 2-2 teaching loads affecting the College of Liberal Arts, among others, and some departments.

Provost Underwood: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Had received email about this and reached out to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts to work with him. Will invite him to work with the relevant department heads on a strategy for getting to a teaching load that is equitable and appropriate for the disciplines. Do not see determining teaching loads as the job of the Provost because the Provost is not located locally in the department and is not well-positioned to understand the demands of different courses. However, a Provost can absolutely help and work with the deans and the heads. Have had multiple conversations with the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and those conversations are ongoing. Would like to hear more before responding to the email. Teaching loads matter a great deal and teaching loads rightly vary across the university. Different disciplines have different needs and different demands. Care very deeply about this concern and will work closely with the dean to develop a strategy. This also must be within available resources. Wish that we had the funding to immediately solve the problem, but we can still think creatively and innovatively about how to work toward more equitable teaching loads.

Sue Doe: Would like to go back to Van Buren's comments regarding Section E.6 and the language around contracts. It is worth mentioning that the legislation only removes the legal obstacle to offering contracts and this has been the case since 2012. The legal obstacle was removed for up to three (3) years and then it was subsequently changed in 2023 to remove the obstacle for a contract to be up to five (5) years. It does not obligate the University to offer a contract. The legislation simply removes the obstacle. Question is what the challenge could possibly be when we are not obligating the University to this. Think this is something worth pushing a bit more because of our substantial number of non-tenure track faculty that we do have and the importance of the idea of increased stability in their working lives.

Provost Underwood: Thanked Doe. Would like our chairs and deans to have every tool at their disposal to retain talent. There may be times that a person wish they could offer a five-year contract but feel they cannot due to budgetary uncertainties. We cannot compel anyone to do that. Would like our chairs and deans to have it as an option, but it is ultimately the President's decision.

Chair Smith: Thanked Provost Underwood. Asked if there were any additional questions or comments.

Van Buren: Today we learned that eleven (11) faculty members in PLACE, which is the program for helping teach international students English, were let go, effective at the end of the semester. The situation is such that they will have four (4) full-time positions as opposed to half-time positions that these eleven (11) people will be competing for. If we want to have a more international student body and have students who can actually succeed in our classes, wondering what the vision is for making that happen, given that we are going to lose six (6) or seven (7) people.

Provost Underwood: From discussions with Vice Provost Kathleen Fairfax, it was discussed that the current model is not financially sustainable given the number of students we were able to attract to the PLACE program. This decision was necessary to move towards something that was more financially sustainable. Asked if Vice Provost Fairfax could speak to this.

Vice Provost Kathleen Fairfax: The commitment to teaching the amount of English as a second or foreign language that is needed by our students is still there. We averaged thirty (30) students a semester in the program, and we cannot keep eleven (11) faculty employed to teach thirty (30) students. We have kept faculty since the closure of INTO with half-time appointments, with the hope that we could make more people full-time. It was difficult to move a lot of people from full-time to half-time and this arrangement is not seen as ideal for the faculty members or for the program to have a lot of part-time faculty. This is restructuring and right-sizing to have the number of faculty we need to teach all the students we have and to give them full-time. Would prefer to give them contracts rather than continuing appointments and have it be a long-term and stable environment for our faculty.

Pedros-Gascon: Commented that the Department of English had decided to disengage from these faculty and left them in a non-academic unit situation and had predicted this outcome of what we are watching happen right now. The reality is that the English department should have retained

those faculty within the faculty boundaries, within the faculty protections. It is sad, but it means that people should take it seriously when we are raising concerns about these kinds of situations.

Vice Provost Fairfax: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Clarified that the faculty were hired through the English Department, and not by the Office of International Programs. We work closely with the English Department and the College of Liberal Arts for this restructuring, and these faculty were appointed by the English Department, not by International Programs.

Pedros-Gascon: They were not integrated into the discussion channels and representation channels of the English department. They are appointed by the English department but were disregarded by them. Had expressed concern about this situation and am sorry that time has confirmed this concern.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were additional questions or comments. Hearing none, thanked Provost Underwood.

a. Introduction of Vice President for Research Cassandra Moseley

Provost Underwood: Would like to welcome Vice President for Research, Cassandra Moseley, who started recently and is already doing amazing things.

Vice President Cassandra Moseley: Expressed appreciation for the warm welcome and collaboration. Am in a learning phase and appreciate those that have reached out. In the coming weeks, months, and years, the Office of Research and Faculty Council will be working closely together. Thanked everyone again for the collaboration and welcome.

Provost Underwood: Expressed excitement to see where Vice President Moseley and that team will take the already amazing research enterprise at CSU to the next level.

G. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. University Grievance Officer Annual Report – Richard Eykholt,
University Grievance Officer

Chair Smith: Reminded members that reports are only received and no edits are accepted. Asked if there were any questions regarding the University Grievance Officer report.

Norton: Asked Eykholt what big changes were being seen from year to year. Asked: How is 2023 different from 2022 or 2021?

Richard Eykholt: There are probably three (3) big changes. Am seeing more grievances recently from high level people in the administration. Think part of that has to do with people losing positions and with new administrators coming in who have new views and change things. The grievance process is not set up well to deal with grievances at very high levels in the administration. The process still applies, but it is a different environment.

Eykholt: We are also seeing more grievances in general. The numbers have grown substantially in the last couple years. Have the feeling that we went through the pandemic and people put in a huge amount of effort, went above and beyond, and they did not feel they received the appreciation for that.

Eykholt: We are also seeing an uptick in disciplinary action. We have had more Section E.15 cases than we have had in years. Think that comes from a number of things. Think it comes from budget restrictions and some departments are certainly taking a closer look at the faculty they have been carrying. Think part of this has also come from faculty being used to being at home more and not at the University. We are also seeing changes due to administrative changes and overall, this has led to more discipline problems.

Norton: The report states that a number of people started the grievance procedures and after getting partway through, elected to not continue even though it was deemed grievable. Asked Eykholt for some insight into those decisions.

Eykholt: The people that reach out are looking for options and information, not to pursue grievances. It has always been the case that the majority does not pursue grievances. Will sometimes help to resolve conflicts. We determine whether something is grievable or not and try to resolve conflicts. In some cases, need to figure out how to address at-will employees being afraid to pursue grievances because of possible consequences and how to make them comfortable. Waiting for the administrative turnover to settle down before pursuing those discussions. This is a problem, in particular, for administrative professionals, who are often afraid to pursue grievances because they are at-will.

Eykholt: There are also some cases where someone has to weigh the time and effort and pain of going through a grievance process versus what they might get out of that process. There are times when someone might win a grievance, but it is a small victory and a big investment. However, grievances are going up and more people are choosing to pursue them. Think the statistics of winning and losing are not changing.

Norton: Thanked Eykholt for the response.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any other questions or discussion about this report. Hearing none, emphasized how much Faculty Council appreciates Eykholt's service in this position. Expressed appreciation having the University Grievance Officer and the commitment to that office.

2. Salary/Compensation Equity Report – Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning – Gamze Cavdar, Chair

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any discussion related to this report.

Partridge: Noted that there was a topic not raised in this report and wondered if the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning was considering it. As we do more interdisciplinary courses, am seeing inequities in compensation, particularly for graduate teaching assistants. Also noticed we have the new supplemental pay policy in place and thanked the University Policy Review

Committee for taking comments into account about making the supplemental pay policy less likely to reinforce pay inequities. Think we still have other areas to work on, particularly related to graduate teaching assistants who may come from different departments and collaborate on a course that is interdisciplinary.

Gamze Cavdar: Thanked Partridge. Am not aware of any issues regarding the graduate teaching assistants, but would like to talk so we know more.

Partridge: Happy to exchange notes about where the stress points are and whether the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning would like to consider this.

Chair Smith: Think the committee is continuing to address these issues. Believe they will be producing additional reports about salary and compensation, so that could be a consideration for any future reports.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions or comments, thanked Cavdar for the report.

3. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: The first update is on communications. There was an email from Faculty Council leadership that was sent to the University community on February 1st. Noted that this came from the Office of the Provost, but future ones will come from Faculty Council directly. We will have future email communication later in the semester.

Chair Smith: The Faculty Council meet and greets are open to all faculty, staff, students, and anyone who wants to come. The first meet and greet is on February 14th from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.. Provost Underwood will be in attendance. These are intended to be informal ways of connecting among our community and to be able to talk in-person about concerns, issues, and other topics. Snacks will be provided. We will have two (2) more this semester, on March 21st and April 25th.

Chair Smith: The redesign for the Faculty Council website will hopefully be completed and live by the end of February. We will likely send out an email announcement regarding that.

Chair Smith: We will be sending our first Spring Faculty Council newsletter in April. Asked members to keep an eye out for those newsletters. Their intention is to provide a deeper level of updates, particularly about the actions of standing committees.

Chair Smith: We also have some Faculty Manual updates. We have already discussed Section E.6, so will not discuss that further at this time. Section K and Section J were approved at the November Faculty Council meeting but were not forwarded to the Board of Governors in December due to time constraints. They are going to be viewed and received by the Board of Governors at their February meeting. Expressed thanks to everyone who put all the effort into those revisions.

Chair Smith: There are a few Manual revisions upcoming. Section F.3.7 has to do with administrative leave. There was a task force created by former Faculty Council Chair Sue Doe, chaired by Mike Antolin, to tackle the opaqueness around administrative leave and the lack of articulation about it in the Manual. Happy to say there has been great advancement with this and how it can be articulated in the Manual. We hope to see that at our March meeting.

Chair Smith: Have an update on the Clark Revitalization project. It appears there has been a resolution for the most part with the December group that has already been relocated and the March group being split between Howes and mobile offices on Meridian, and the May group will be entirely solved by mobile offices on Meridian.

Chair Smith: We have some ongoing task force activities. The task force on interdisciplinary undergraduate degrees, co-chaired by Shawn Bingham, director of the Honors program, and Sarah Badding, will provide a report hopefully by May or early fall. Had a conversation with Bingham and he requested that if faculty are aware of any great interdisciplinary programs at other universities that they send that information forward. They are attempting to gather data on successful interdisciplinary programs. Encouraged members to contact Bingham or Badding if you have information. We are also forming a new task force, co-chaired by Lumina Albert and Jimena Breton. There is a call for volunteers to serve on this task force, which will be around the Principles of Community and thinking about how we operationalize them and live that framework out. There is another new task force likely to be formed on standalone certificates. Will keep everyone updated on that one.

Chair Smith: So far this spring, there have been two (2) Cabinet trainings, as well as a Cabinet retreat coming up next week. The first training was a presentation from Mark Cavanaugh on Colorado higher education landscape. A key takeaway from that was that it is recognized that 85% of top jobs will require a bachelor's degree in Colorado. Think that is interesting information, particularly with respect to how the governor is currently thinking about how he wants to fund higher education in the state. Right now, the governor has allocated a 3% increase in the revenues to higher education. The other presentation was from the Office of Support and Safety Assessment. Many have heard about the Tell Someone program, and Kacie Thielman is the person to contact for requests for Hide and Fight trainings. Something we might want to think about for next fall is having a training just for Faculty Council members and a special session that focuses on this. Indicated that there is also an active assailant video available on the police website. Encouraged members to reach out to that office if they are interested in these kinds of trainings.

Chair Smith: Hearing no questions or comments, concluded report.

4. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: The Board of Governors meeting later this week is in Pueblo. This February, much like last February, will cover the same topic, which is the budget. There are a lot of balls in the air right now. The Joint Budget Committee has not decided what they will recommend or approve for funding the governor's requests. We all received the email from President Parsons, and we will see a presentation from Vice President Brendan Hanlon about what the 2% to 6%

reallocations look like. Will talk to the Board of Governors about this and what it really means for faculty and staff in terms of retention, recruitment, equity, and morale. Will do this in a positive way and try to represent everyone as best as possible. Directed member's attention to the [Joint Budget Committee recording](#) where Chancellor Tony Frank gave remarks.

H. DISCUSSION

1. University Ombuds Presentation – Melissa Emerson and Matthew Ricke

Melissa Emerson: The Office of Ombuds serves all CSU employees and we do so confidentially and voluntarily. We assist employees who are managing or needing help managing conflicts or concerns in the workspace. The keyword that is important here is voluntary. We want employees to access services because they want to, not because they are mandated. Our offices are located in General Services building on the third floor. This is intentional, so people have anonymity when accessing services.

Matthew Ricke: Our practice as organizational ombuds is underpinned by the professional standards of the International Ombuds Association. As your University Ombuds, we are a fully confidential resource. We do not share information without explicit permission from our visitors. We are also an impartial resource, so we do not advocate for any one person who is having a concern or conflict, but we do advocate for fair and equitable processes throughout. We are an informal resource, so we are separate from any formal University grievance processes. We work with an individual as a thought partner to generate ideas and solutions to their concerns and explore options in a confidential space. We are also independent of any other University office. We do not have responsible employee mandates and do not have reporting lines to Human Resources, Office of Equal Opportunity, or any other formal University grievance office.

Ricke: We see a myriad of concerns in our office. Most notable are the supervisory-employee relationships, or what we call evaluative relationships, as well as peer and collegial relationships. These tend to be spaces where we see a lot of conflict. That can emerge for a number of reasons, including communication difficulties, concerns around performance appraisal, and the climate of a department or organization at large.

Ricke: The ombuds are here first and foremost to listen and provide a safe space for people to come in and explore their concerns and options. We facilitate communication among employees, answer questions, share policies, and make appropriate resource referrals. We also informally mediate disputes and facilitate dialogue among people in conflict to help them work toward a resolution. We offer coaching to prepare for difficult conversations. We identify trends and systematic problems so we can signal boost those concerns to the highest level of the organization possible to effectuate positive change without compromising the confidentiality of our visitors.

Emerson: Provided data on demographics of visitors. Often, we may have a one-on-one consultation, but it requires follow-up with other entities across the University. Indicated that employees may be on campus, as well as across Colorado, the United States, or abroad. We are

assisting employees wherever they may be located. Noted that nearly half of our visitors reached out within the first three (3) months of experiencing a conflict or concern, so that lets us know that people know our office is a resource and are not waiting for things to escalate before reaching out.

Emerson: This past year, we facilitated twenty (20) workshops where we explored conflict management, conflict behaviors, and tools for departments and colleges. That does generate a lot of business because people are meeting with us to learn some conflict tools and then set up a follow-up meeting about issues they have going on. Over the past three (3) fiscal years, we have seen an increase in our number of visitors and an increase in the number of concerns being reported. Over the past fiscal year, 51% of our visitors were administrative professionals, 29% were faculty, and 16% were state classified. Would like to see our numbers increase for state classified. Think there are some hurdles that some of our state classified employees experience in trying to access the ombuds just based on scheduling, so that is something we will be intentional about in the next year and doing some marketing and outreach to our state classified staff.

Emerson: Provided more data on visitors over the last fiscal year.

Chair Smith: Thanked Emerson and Ricke for the presentation. Asked if there were any questions.

Chair Smith: Hearing none, thanked Emerson and Ricke again and expressed appreciation for them being there to provide faculty with this resource.

2. Budget Update – Brendan Hanlon, Vice President for University Operations

Vice President Brendan Hanlon: Will be presenting this to the Board of Governors later this week. Am providing a sneak peek to the third version of the budget.

Vice President Hanlon: This version has three (3) scenarios. It is important to note that the governor's budget proposal is the only thing that we know as part of the three (3) scenarios. The other ones are best guesses and using past practices and historic information to inform. The first scenario is the governor's budget proposal, which is just north of 3% in state appropriation, as well as a 2% increase in resident undergraduate, which is a cap that has been placed. The second scenario doubles the governor's proposal, again informed by past practice. We think this is within the realm of possibility and where we are focused. The third scenario is a response from leaders of higher education across the state to the governor's budget proposal around the limitation of the 2% tuition increase. We are sensitive to the cost that students bear on our campuses, but in order to effectuate that, we need to see an 11% increase in state appropriations to allow for that to happen financially.

Vice President Hanlon: Explained some of the numbers. Noted that this is still being worked on and we are refining all the scenarios, so this is not the last version. We are still working through this actively.

Partridge: There are roughly two (2) different numbers in differential tuition shown in the document. One is roughly double the other. Wondering what caused that shift.

Vice President Hanlon: Thanked Partridge for catching that. We increase differential tuition by the tuition rate increases. You see 2% increases in the first and third scenarios, and then a higher amount in the middle scenario.

Vice President Hanlon: Explained the new expenses, which are multi-year central investments and strategic investments, as well as graduate assistant fees, student success, and rural initiative funds. We also have funds for technology investments as well in this category. This is something we are working on refining as part of our deliberative process. We have a few other cost-drivers that we manage in this line-item, including faculty and staff compensation. Indicated that state classified staff who have the COWINS agreement have a cost-of-living increase of 3%, as well as step increases, with a total of 6.5% for COWINS. Emphasized that this depends on how many years of service you have within the classification. The other increase is 1% for administrative professionals, faculty, and graduate assistants. We also have some costs set aside for benefit cost increases and we have a placeholder in for market adjustments as well. It is early in the process for that calibration to happen, so no final decisions have been made on that.

Vice President Hanlon: Will answer a question regarding the 2%, 4%, and 6% reduction levels and why we do not consider suspending that and bringing down that number preemptively. We have talked continuously about compensation being important and a high priority for the University. We are trying to do all we can to maintain that allocation and remain as competitive as possible, even though it is not at as high a level as we would like to see. We are trying to keep that in for as long as we can. Compensation and benefits remain the single largest category in this incremental budget.

Vice President Hanlon: You will notice that it does not balance our total resources relative to our total expenses. This is why we started a conversation around the reductions to bring our expenses and revenues into alignment. In the third scenario, it is the least stressed scenario where we are a lot closer to balancing. We do not have immediate feedback from the legislature, and won't until March, so that is why we wanted to start this conversation early and create ideas across campus and have an opportunity to focus on strategic application of those reductions rather than across the board.

DiVerdi: Had a question about the mandatory costs. Asked: What is the biggest component in that line?

Vice President Hanlon: Believe the single largest component is our bond payment. Believe that is about \$5 million for the Veterinary Teaching Hospital and the first installment of that investment.

John Hoxmeier: Asked if there had been any discussion about offering early retirement as a cost-savings measure.

Vice President Hanlon: There is not a plan for that program to be reactivated. Welcomed any thoughts. It did create some challenges both in the number of people who left the institution and losing a lot of institutional knowledge, but then making sure that positions were held vacant for longer periods of time. In our recent experience, it caused a bit of disruption relative to the savings it created.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed that it is ludicrous to call this raise a “merit” raise. We have to undergo annual evaluations and only get a 1% increase. Second comment is about the deductions, which indicate that something bad has been done by previous administrators of this institution. It is hard to understand a situation where the economy is working, and we are in a situation where we need to reduce our budget.

Vice President Hanlon: One of the things we have heard regarding the 1% is that if it is going to be at that level of compensation that it be considered a cost-of-living versus a merit increase. The feedback given here about it being a lower amount relative to the increment of performance is something we have been told and we are asking that question as part of our due diligence.

Vice President Hanlon: With regard to the 2%, 4%, and 6% reductions, it is our hope and goal that we are asking for more than we will need and that we can take a lower amount based on what we are seeing in these different scenarios. Understand this has been a stressful conversation on campus and there are many people working through this right now. Our goal is to be able to calibrate and we did not want to surprise campus at the last minute and go through a shorter, less thoughtful process. Expressed appreciation for the effort going into this already.

Partridge: One of the things that gets said a lot when you talk to experts on university budgets is that the largest growth over the past fifteen (15) to twenty (20) years has been administrative salaries, including senior university personnel. We also know that the Chancellor’s office has dramatically expanded since the separation a few years ago. Have two questions. The first is how much of our money is being directed to the Chancellor’s office and whether we need to be looking at that. The second question is whether we need to look at our administrative structure and whether we can get rid of or reduce some of the six-figure salaries as part of this process.

Vice President Hanlon: There are elements of this budget in the base that do support the Systems office, so we do provide support overarching to the System already as part of the base. This was done years ago. We have been having conversations with the System office about things like the medical school and other elements that are a direct beneficiary of our campus. We are in conversations about what that could look like, but in terms of a direct share of what they are doing. We have costs that are identified. Have routine conversations with Henry Sobanet about what those ideas and possibilities are so that there is an open dialogue when it comes to those costs.

Vice President Hanlon: In terms of administrative costs, what we did this year is make sure that we were trying to be as expansive as possible. One of the things we have heard is that we have been limited in terms of what we can and cannot produce in terms of reduction ideas and we have tried to remove some of those constraints and tell leadership that they have the ability to propose different ideas and concepts. Some of those people may be looking at their management

structures in their own division and what those impacts might be. Have talked to own team about what we need to preserve life, safety, the core institution's mission. Each of us in leadership roles are providing that kind of value-based guidance as people come up with ideas. We have had some conversations about where we can find some administrative savings across the institution.

Van Buren: Asked: Are we still subsidizing Spur, and if so, at what cost?

Vice President Hanlon: The System office has Spur in its budget. Believe the budget for the 2023-2024 fiscal year is about \$15 million, and that is paid out of the Strategic Investment Fund that the System holds. That said, we do provide staff at Spur and faculty who provide different courses and programs, and those costs are reimbursed through that allocation of \$15 million. The accounting is challenging, but we do attribute those costs to Spur and then we get reimbursement from the System office.

Chair Smith: Asked: Speaking of Spur, are we subsidizing Todos Santos?

Vice President Hanlon: Believe that is also a System office cost. Believe it is itemized in their operating budget. Can follow up on this, will need to check.

Chair Smith: Think it is important for awareness that when COWINS negotiates for state classified, all other units in Colorado get that. If you are another unit with state employees, they get additional funds for this increase, but CSU does not. Asked if this was correct.

Vice President Hanlon: Correct. Other state agencies with state classified employees receive a dollar-for-dollar support for any of the COWINS agreements as part of their budget. That is not the case for higher education. Noted that this is on the System's radar. Gave credit to Jim Abraham, chair of the Classified Personnel Council. Abraham is aware of this and has brought it up with the COWINS representatives here on campus to say that the record needs to be set straight because people assume we get an allocation when we do not.

Vice President Hanlon: Will be going over the full version of this on February 14th in the budget open forum.

Chair Smith: Thanked Vice President Hanlon for the transparency in the budget process and discussion around the issues we are facing.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further discussion, called the meeting adjourned.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:08 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

Chair: Melinda Smith

Vice-Chair: Joseph DiVerdi

Executive Assistant: Amy Barkley

BOG Representative: Andrew Norton

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
<u>Jennifer Richards</u>	Health and Exercise Science	2025
Susan Baker	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2026
Blake Naughton	Human Development and Family Studies	2026
<u>Erin Arneson</u>	Construction Management	2024
Aaron Eakman	Occupational Therapy	2026
Sharon Anderson	School of Education	2024
Elizabeth Kiehne	School of Social Work	2025
Brian Butki	College-at-Large	2024
Business		
Nate Nguyen	Accounting	2026
John Hoxmeier	Computer Information Systems	2024
<u>Bharadwaj Kannan</u>	Finance and Real Estate	2025
Rob Mitchell	Management	2024
Jonathan Zhang	Marketing	2026
Engineering		
Peter Jan van Leeuwen	Atmospheric Science	2024
<u>Ashok Prasad</u>	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2025
<u>Hussam Mahmoud</u>	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
<u>Marius Lehene</u>	Art & Art History	2025
(substituting for Mary-Ann Kokoska, Spring 2024)		
Mark Saunders	Communication Studies	2025
<u>Ramaa Vasudevan</u>	Economics	2024
(substituting for Anders Fremstad, on sabbatical 2023-2024)		
<u>Genesea Carter</u>	English	2026
<u>Maricela DeMirjyn</u>	Ethnic Studies	2025
John Slater	Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	2025
Tracy Brady	History	2026
Marilee Long	Journalism and Media Communication	2025
Madeline Harvey	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2025
<u>Eirik Harris</u>	Philosophy	2026
Marni Berg	Political Science	2024
<u>Laura Raynolds</u>	Sociology	2025
James Fielder	College-at-Large	2026
(substituting for Alexandra Bernasek, Spring 2024)		
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2025
Emily Morgan	College-at-Large	2026
<u>Lisa Langstraat</u>	College-at-Large	2024
Allison Goar	College-at-Large	2024
<u>Abigail Shupe</u>	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
<u>Chad Hoffman</u>	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2024
<u>Joel Berger</u>	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		
<u>Olve Peersen</u>	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
<u>Shari Lanning</u>	Clinical Sciences	2025
Del Leary	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2026
<u>Tony Schountz</u>	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
Katriana Popichak	College-at-Large	2025
Fiona Hollinshead	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Doreene Hyatt</u>	College-at-Large	2024
Tara Nordgren	College-at-Large	2025
RoxAnn Karkoff-Schwiezer	College-at-Large	2026
Dan Regan	College-at-Large	2026
<u>Zaid Abdo</u>	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Brian Geiss</u>	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 Griffenhagen, Chair	Committee on Information Technology	2024
<u>Shane Kanatous, Chair</u>	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2024
<u>Jerry Magloughlin, Chair</u>	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
<u>Alan Kennan, Chair</u>	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
<u>Tian Wang, Co-Chair</u>	Committee on University Programs	2024
Brad Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2024
<u>Karen Thorsett-Hill</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2026
<u>Thomas Conway</u>	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

<u>Jennifer Reinke</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Anna Ferri	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
(substituting for Scott Wiebensohn, Spring 2024)		

Ex Officio Non-Voting Members

Amy Parsons	President
Rico Munn	Chief of Staff
Marion Underwood	Provost/Executive Vice President
Derek Dictson	Vice President for Advancement
James Pritchett	Vice President for Engagement & Extension
Kevin MacLennan	Interim 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
Cassandra Moseley	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
Janice Nerger	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