

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

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

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
March 5, 2019 – 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences – Room C101

CALL TO ORDER

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – April 2, 2019– Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 – 4:00 p.m. President Frank will also attend the April meeting.

Gallagher announced that the Faculty Council meeting would be held on April 2, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences Building, Room C101. President Frank will also be attending.

2. Upcoming Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award (*presented at May 7, 2019 Faculty Council meeting*). Nomination materials will be emailed *early* March.

Had award for three years now and was funded at the start by Sue Pendell, Previous chair of FC.

3. Election of faculty to Faculty Council Standing Committees and University Disciplinary Panel – Committee on Faculty Governance – April 2, 2019

4. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – January 15 and 22, 2019; February 12, 2019
(<http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/>)

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

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – February 5, 2019

Gallagher asked for any corrections or additions.

Faculty Council approved the FC meeting minutes by unanimous consent. The minutes will be placed on the Faculty Council website.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. None.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC meeting minutes – January 18 and 25, 2019; February 1, 8 and 15, 2019

Brad Goetz moved for approval of the Consent Agenda.

The Consent Agenda was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Election: Faculty Council Chair – Committee on Faculty Governance – Tim Gallagher Nominated

TIMOTHY GALLAGHER Business 2020
Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance

MARGARITA LENK 2020
Nominated from the Floor

Sue Doe, Vice Chair, explained the process and turned over the elections to Don Estep, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance.

Don Estep stated that part of his responsibility as Chair, CoFG is to verify if the nominees are eligible to run.

Don Estep (Chair, CoFG): Are there any nominations from the floor?

Thomas Chermack (SOE): I would like to nominate Margarita Lenk.

Don Estep (Chair, CoFG): We are voting for the Chair of FC. Tim Gallagher and Margarita Lenk are the two candidates.

Ballots were distributed to FC members by Don Estep and Steve Reising, Vice Chair, CoFG.

Estep and Reising gathered all ballots and tallied the votes for each candidate.

Estep announced that Tim Gallagher was re-elected.

Faculty Council approved Timothy Gallagher to serve another term as Chair of Faculty Council starting July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020.

2. Election: Faculty Council Vice Chair – Committee on Faculty Governance – Sue Doe Nominated

SUE DOE Liberal Arts 2020
Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance

Nominated from the Floor 2020

Tim Gallagher, Chair, asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no nominations, the nominations were closed.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Sue Doe to serve another term as Vice Chair of Faculty Council starting July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020.

3. Election: Faculty Council Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Committee on Faculty Governance – Stephanie Clemons Nominated

STEPHANIE CLEMONS Business 2020
Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance

Nominated from the Floor 2020

Tim Gallagher, Chair, asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no nominations, the nominations were closed.

Tim Gallagher, Chair, announced Stephanie Clemons has been elected to serve as the Faculty Representative to the Board of Governors starting July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2021.

4. Elections – Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance

Don Estep, Chair, CoFG, moved that Faculty Council approve the following Standing Committee nominees:

Don Estep asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing none, the nominations were closed.

The below faculty members were unanimously elected to their respective Standing Committees starting July 1, 2019.

COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Term Expires

LISE AUBREY WCNR 2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

COMMITTEE ON SCHOLASTIC STANDARDS

SALLY SUTTON WCNR 2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC AND FINANCIAL PLANNING

THOMAS CHERMACK HHS 2021
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

RUOH-NAN (TERRY) YAN HHS 2021
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

5. Approval of Appeal Chair nominees for Student Conduct Services

Tim Gallagher, Chair, asked Faculty Council to approve the following Appeal Chair nominees:

We had a Student Appeal Chair for a very long time. The Provost and VP for Student Affairs choose the chairs. There are no nominations from the floor.

Faculty Council unanimously approved the Appeal Chair candidates.

BALLOT

March 5, 2019

Appeal Chair Candidates for Student Conduct Services

Jonathan Carlyon CLA Chair	Spring 2019
Murray Oliver CLA Backup Chair	Spring 2019
Kevin Foskin CLA Backup Chair	Spring 2019
Steven Newman Agricultural Sciences Interim Chair	Fall 2020

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

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the proposed revisions.

Three reasons for this. E12.3 and E12.4 especially. What is appropriate service at appropriate rank and title? Different faculty have expectations based on their rank and appointment. Engagement is also noted as an important criterion for promotion consideration.

Gallagher invited discussion.

Dawn DeTienne (Management): Met with several faculty who are worried about things and feels there are significant changes that need to be made. Didn't have enough time to review.

Gallagher: The FC Operating Procedures require the FC to send out the agenda one week ahead.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): In addition, we first submitted this to EC in the fall, which represents all colleges, and we then made changes to reflect their recommendations.

Lisa Langstraat and other CLA faculty have discussed the differentiation and appreciate the changes but also agree that these should be closely scrutinized. Often the kind of work an assistant professor can do as service can be helpful to junior faculty. Perhaps the most compelling thing is that right now we have gender challenges with professors in full positions, and we have disparity between professors of color and white professors. Hence, the faculty doing this service will not represent the faculty as a whole.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large) is also not sure about the rank distinctions being pointed out, and not also due to gender but that we also need a diversity of perspectives and ideas. We need to try to understand that we need a diverse pool representing all areas of the faculty.

Matt Malcolm (Occupational Therapy) agrees that some faculty, even at assistant professor levels, have research intertwined with service. I understand that these are guidelines. They are not requirements. I think that each unit is completely equipped to give their faculty guidelines and it is not necessary to put in the Manual.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): These are suggested guidelines because things were occurring at the local level that were not cognizant of recommended practices. But again, these are guidelines.

March 5, 2019

Dawn DeTienne (Management): I would like to make a motion to move this to a different time—to postpone.

Gallagher: This is a debatable motion and takes a majority vote.

Gallagher: All in favor of postponing, please raise your hand. Vote was 32: 28

The motion to postpone Section E.12 was approved by Faculty Council.

Subject: Faculty Manual Section E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases

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

MOVED, THAT SECTIONS E.12 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overseored~~ Additions Underlined

E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases (*last revised June 21, 2011*~~xxx~~)

All faculty members being considered for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate a level of excellence appropriate to the rank under consideration and consistent with the standards of their discipline, their unit's institutional mission, and the faculty member's individual effort distribution in teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service.

Outreach~~and~~ engagement efforts (as described in Section E.12.4) ~~may~~should be integrated into the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service responsibilities, as appropriate.

Annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of a faculty member's performance are addressed in Sections C.2.5, E.12, and E.14, and the expectations articulated in this section are applicable to those reviews. The basis for annual and periodic comprehensive reviews shall be the set of criteria in place at the beginning of the review period. All faculty member shall provide evidence, consistent with their stated effort distribution, of teaching and advising competence; and/or sustained research and other creative activity; and/or service ~~consistent with their stated effort distribution~~ (see Section E.9.1) for annual and periodic comprehensive reviews, as well as for tenure and promotion. The department code shall establish clearly articulated criteria and standards for evaluation in these areas.

E.12.1 Teaching and Advising (*last revised June 21, 2011*~~xxx~~)

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

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, classroom and/or laboratory instruction;

March 5, 2019

individual tutoring; supervision and instruction of student researchers; clinical teaching; field work supervision and training; preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; service learning; outreach/engagement; and other activities that organize and disseminate knowledge. Faculty members' supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that do not confer any University credit also is considered teaching.

Associated teaching activities include class preparation; grading; laboratory or equipment maintenance; preparation and funding of proposals to improve instruction; attendance at workshops on teaching improvement; and planning of curricula and courses of study; and mentoring colleagues in any of these activities. Outreach/and engagement activities, such as service learning, conducting workshops, seminars, and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes, as specified by the department/unit, are important to CSU as a land-grant institution and should be integrated into teaching efforts, as appropriate (see Section E.12.4). These outreach activities This includes teaching efforts of faculty members with Extension appointments. Examples of engaged teaching include service-learning and conducting workshops, seminars and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes. Other examples can be found in the "Continuum of Engaged Scholarship".

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

Departments shall foster a culture that values and recognizes excellent teaching, and encourages reflective self-assessment. To that end, departmental codes should, within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching should be designed to highlight strengths, identify deficiencies, and improve teaching and learning. Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching shall involve multiple sources of information such as course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; integration of service learning; appropriate course surveys of teaching; letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and evidence of the use of active and/or experiential learning, student learning achievement, professional development related to teaching and learning, and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Anonymous letters or comments shall not be used to evaluate teaching, except with the consent of the instructor or as authorized in a department's code. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., face-to-face and online settings; lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching assignments, in particular

March 5, 2019

the type and level of courses taught. The University provides resources to support the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, such as systems to create and assess teaching portfolios, access to exemplary teaching portfolios, and professional development programs focusing on teaching and learning.

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

E.12.2 Research and Other Creative Activity *(last revised August 12, 2009~~xxx~~)*

Research is the discovery and development of knowledge; other creative activity is original or imaginative accomplishment. Research and other creative activity include, but are not limited to, publications; exhibitions, presentations or performances; copyrighted, patented, or licensed works and inventions; supervision of or assistance with graduate student theses/dissertations and undergraduate research; and the award of funding to support research and other creative activities. Scholarly activities that advance the effectiveness of teaching and education could also be considered research. Scholarly activities with a research/creative artistry component that include reciprocal engagement with external partners (local, state, national, and international) are encouraged and should be considered research and creative activity (see Section E.12.4). Examples include applied research, community-based participatory research, and collaboratively-created new artistic or literary performances. Other examples can be found in the “Continuum of Engaged Scholarship”.

The criteria for evaluating the original or imaginative nature of research and other creative activities should be the generally accepted standards prevailing in the applicable discipline or professional area. Standards for determining quality will vary among disciplines and should be specified by each academic unit. However, evaluations should be based primarily upon the quality of the product as judged by peers. Some measures of quality are the prestige of the journals in which publications appear, reviews of publications in the critical literature, reviews of artistic performance by recognized experts, prizes and other awards for significant professional accomplishment, grants obtained in open competition, and impact and outcome assessments as indicated by adoption of results by clientele. When work is a collaborative effort, every attempt should be made to assess the value of the contribution of the faculty member. Some categories of publication or other accomplishments, such as Extension publications, more properly are regarded as vehicles

March 5, 2019

for teaching or outreach/engagement; however, these may be considered evidence of other creative activity to the extent that new ideas and research are incorporated.

E.12.3 Service *(last revised xxx)*

Service advances the interests of the institution, the community, and the professions and is described below.

E.12.3.1 University Service

In academic institutions the faculty members share in the formulation of University policies and in making and carrying out decisions affecting the educational and scholarly life of the University. University service can occur at the department, college, campus, and system-wide levels, as well as outside of the university system. Faculty are expected to participate in the governance and the common good of their department, the campus, and the advancement of their profession. University service includes but is not limited to contributions to the governance and leadership of the University through participation in the formulation and implementation of department/college/university policies via membership on committees, councils, and advisory groups and participation in administrative activities. University service also includes advising student organizations.

University service is evaluated through timely and effective participation in such activities ~~related to academic matters.~~ The standards for assessing faculty service activities will vary among disciplines and should be specified by each academic unit and incorporated into departmental codes. ~~Senior~~ Faculty members should undertake ~~greater service and engagement~~ roles based upon their experience, but ~~junior~~ all faculty members should be encouraged to participate in activities which contribute new perspectives, develop expertise, and further the mission of the University.

E.12.3.2 Professional Service *(last revised August 12, 2009 xxx)*

Service in local, state, national, or international professional organizations enhances the University's scholarly and academic reputations. Service in professional organizations includes but is not limited to editorial activities for professional publications; service as an officer or committee member of a professional society; participating in or organizing research conferences, workshops or professional meetings; reviewing grant proposals; and service on academic review or accreditation boards. Service rendered in one's professional capacity as a citizen of the community is commendable and may be evaluated as an appropriate faculty activity.

Professional service is evaluated through the amount and quality of participation ~~which~~ and its contribution to the long-term improvement of teaching, scholarship, and the profession.

E.12.3.3 Clinical Service *(new section xxx).* Professional education programs are often dependent upon faculty members with advanced training that devote a considerably fraction of time and effort to these important activities. Attainment of board certification is often an

March 5, 2019

external endorsement of competence granted by a professional organization representing the specialty.

E.12.3.4 Extension Service *(new section xxx)*. Extension is dedicated to serving current and future needs of the population within the state, as well as nationally and internationally, through educational information and programs to address important and emerging community issues using dynamic, science-based educational resources. CSU Extension is highly valued for inclusive, impactful community engagement in support of our land-grant university mission.

E.12.3.5 Other Types of Service *(new section, xxx)*

1. Leaves from the campus without salary for governmental or industrial positions. These leaves can result in long-term benefits to the individual and the campus.
2. Nonstandard service. In some cases, service may be considered “non-standard” or ambiguous with respect to how it should be considered. In the following situations, it may not be clear as to whether the contribution is to research, teaching, or service: (1) directing a field program overseas, which involves administrative service while at the same time contributing to one’s research activities; or (2) administering an exchange program, where the faculty member directs the program while also teaching students in the program. The categorization of such activities may not be evident from the descriptions usually provided by the faculty member. Therefore, the department head, when preparing a faculty member’s case for merit or promotion, should clarify the categorization of the activity under one or more of the headings of research, teaching, and service and should specify the nature of the activity in question.
3. Public service. As faculty members advance through the professorial ranks, they are expected to exhibit an increasing record of service in their dossier of performance. Recognition is given to service that fulfills the public mission of the University, such as involvement in community organizations and service to governmental agencies at the local, state and national level, and to professional associations at the local, national, and international level.

E.12.3.6 Guidelines for Evaluation of Service in Faculty Performance Reviews *(new section xxx)*

The following guidelines are for faculty, department heads, deans, and other reviewing committee members involved in the preparation and consideration of merit and promotion cases. In order to cultivate a culture of service at CSU, some suggested guidelines are offered here.

An Assistant Professor is expected to provide service at the local level of the department or school; for example, through clinical service in specialized areas of medicine or by serving as an undergraduate adviser, as a member of a graduate admissions committee, or

March 5, 2019

as a member of a faculty search committee. Service at the campus level is relatively rare for Assistant Professors, but, when it occurs, it is most appropriate for the service to be on campus committees that do not have intensive and prolonged time demands.

Assistant Professors in Extension or Clinical service are expected to provide their expertise to teaching at the professional student levels. These faculty, by definition, have high service loads within the clinics and/or within the community.

Associate Professors are expected to serve both their departments and the campus. It is understood, however, that Associate Professors in some departments may need to devote more service to the governance of their departments – whether as department heads or undergraduate/graduate directors. These faculty are thus not as free to perform campus service as faculty in other departments. It will be the job of the department head to explain such situations in sending forward promotion and merit cases.

At the level of Full Professor the expectations increase to include all of the categories mentioned in the lower ranks of the professorate, including the assumption of administrative positions such as department head, directors, or leadership in other research units such as field stations. Periodic service on Faculty Council and its committees is also expected unless the aforementioned positions preclude such service. In addition, faculty at the Full Professor level are expected to serve on University-wide committees when invited. In summary, Full Professors are expected to offer frequent and broadly distributed service to multiple constituencies within the academic community.

The type and level at which service is performed should be commensurate with the rank of the faculty member, with the expectation that, as a faculty member rises in rank, the level at which service is performed is expected to rise. A sustained deficiency in service should be a significant consideration when making decisions regarding merit increases and promotion.

Departments are encouraged to include contract and continuing faculty in service assignments, especially through membership on appropriate departmental committees. Also, contract and continuing faculty are encouraged to participate in service activities when the opportunity arises. Such service shall be acknowledged in the effort distribution and the annual evaluation of the faculty member. In addition, it shall be compensated for by a reduction in other duties and/or supplemental pay. It is understood that a reduction in other duties may need to be averaged over more than just one or two semesters. For example, a continuing service percentage of 5% might be compensated for by a release of one course every fourth semester.

The faculty member is responsible for taking the initiative in seeking service appropriate to their rank. Faculty members, when preparing background material for their promotion or merit case, should provide accurate information about their service record and should indicate any unusually demanding service they performed.

March 5, 2019

The service record will be considered similarly to the teaching and research records in merit and promotion cases. The role of the department head or dean is to evaluate the faculty member's service record. This should include a summary of the work performed and the time demands involved, as well as an assessment of the value of this work, the contribution made by the faculty member, and the effectiveness of the faculty member in performing this work. A simple listing of service activities is not sufficient.

Department heads who are being considered for academic advancement are subject to regular review procedures. Academic leadership is, in itself, a significant academic activity. Therefore, distinguished leadership and effective discharge of administrative duties by a department head shall be considered in evaluating the performance of a department head for a merit increase, accelerated increase, or promotion.

E.12.4 Outreach and Engagement *(new section, xxxx)*

Outreach and engagement are fundamental components of the University's land-grant mission, described as "the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good (*Committee on Institutional Cooperation, 2003*). CSU applies this definition across a spectrum of scholarship-based outreach and engagement activities conducted in all areas of the university's mission: teaching, research, service, and extension (as described in the table "Continuum of Engaged Scholarship").

Outreach involves generating, transmitting, translating, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences, in support of university and unit missions. Faculty who conduct outreach programs generate and apply knowledge to address community needs without necessarily engaging community input. Examples of outreach include technology transfer, presentations at community or stakeholder meetings, advice to industry, presentations to K-12 audiences, and student recruitment.

As an inherent commitment of the university's land-grant mission, outreach may be seen as part of the University's public relations effort and enhances the status of CSU in the community and the state. These activities may also facilitate further and deeper engagement with external partners, as described in the paragraphs to follow.

Engagement is distinguished from outreach as "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (*Carnegie Foundation, 2008*).

March 5, 2019

Engagement increases the effectiveness of university activities in its mission of improving the condition of the greater society and includes a continuum of progressively increasing levels of involvement with external partners and the community (see “Continuum of Engaged Scholarship”). While outreach may be seen as the first step in engaged scholarship, engagement is characterized by the development and maintenance of partnerships that are reciprocal and mutually beneficial and generally addresses challenges facing the University and the communities it serves. In some cases, increasingly effective engagement may include moving the engagement focus from local to regional to national to international communities.

Examples of engagement include community-based participatory research; service-learning; managed learning environments such as museums, libraries and gardens; and work with defined communities such as producer groups, industries and businesses, teachers, and civic-minded non-profit entities.

Distinguishing characteristics of engagement include:

- i. Engagement is scholarly as it co-creates discipline-generated, evidence-based practices and experiences.
- ii. Engagement cuts across the university activities of teaching, research, service, and extension, so that it represents a particular approach to these activities rather than a separate activity.

Due to its embedded and integrative nature, outreach and engagement cannot and should not be evaluated separately. Engagement is not an end in itself, but rather, can be a means for accomplishing, informing and enriching teaching, research and service outcomes. It can bring together effort in these three traditional areas of work in a systematic way and makes more visible the full value of faculty effort.

Where appropriate and consistent with the academic mission of the department, the department code should define outreach/engagement expectations and how those expectations are addressed in the faculty member’s teaching, research, and/or service effort distribution (see Section E.9). The standards for assessing the scholarship of outreach/engagement activities will vary among disciplines and should be specified by each academic unit and incorporated into departmental codes (see Section E.9.1).

Rationale:

1. CoRSAF was tasked with modernizing and defining service roles at the University. Service at all levels which is recognized to play a vital role to the academy. Our original

March 5, 2019

task was additionally to give suggestions for appropriate service at different faculty ranks.

2. Faculty have differing percentages of effort in the various components of teaching and advising, and/or research and scholarly activity, and/or service and extension so a one-size fits all approach is not adequate. These proposed changes make it clear that a faculty member need only provide evidence for those components of effort which make up their workload distribution.
3. The Provost's Council for Engagement, a faculty-driven initiative with representation from all eight colleges and Libraries, helped to clarify and strengthen existing manual language regarding outreach and engagement, defined as a particular approach to teaching, research and service and extension in support of the university's land-grant mission. The creation of a stand-alone section (12.4) for Outreach and Engagement helps to better define and distinguish these entities and how they relate to service.
7. Proposed revisions to Section E.11.1 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments of *the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – CoRSAF*

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the proposed revisions. When this was previously presented to Faculty Council, it was suggested that we add working re: if someone is not renewed, they are informed of their right to appeal. Also, previously there was no mechanism for discussion re: early termination.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): This doesn't have anything to do with non-renewal of contracts. It has to do with early termination.

Gallagher: The floor is open to discussion.

Gallagher: All in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

Section E.11.1 was unanimously approved.

Subject: Faculty Manual Section E.11.1 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments

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

MOVED, THAT SECTION E.11 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE AMMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overseored~~ Additions Underlined

E.11 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments

A contract faculty member may appeal a recommendation to the President to terminate their appointment prior to the ending date of the contract. This section of the Manual sets forth the procedures for such an appeal. The University Grievance Officer (UGO) shall be charged with overseeing this appeal process. At the discretion of the UGO, any of the time limits in this section may be extended for reasonable periods. Such extensions shall be reported immediately to all parties concerned.

E.11.1. Initiating the Process

When a Recommendation to the President to terminate a Contract Faculty Appointment prior to the ending date of the contract is sent to the Provost, a copy of this Recommendation shall be provided in writing to the faculty member by the person making the Recommendation (hereinafter referred to as the Recommender). At the same time, the Recommender shall notify the faculty member of their right to appeal this recommendation and refer them to Section E.11 of the Manual. The faculty member then has ten (10) working days to submit to the UGO an Appeal in writing of this Recommendation, along with the Recommendation itself. If an Appeal is submitted within this time frame, then the UGO shall notify the Provost within three (3) working days, and the Recommendation shall not be sent to the President until the conclusion of the Section E.11 process.

[all other content within E.11 remains the same]

Rationale:

1. This suggested addition was made on the floor of faculty council and CoRSAF is recommending that it be adopted. This sentence addition makes certain that the faculty member knows of their rights to appeal termination and where the process for such is outlined.

8. Proposed revisions to Section E.16 Appeal of Early Termination of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the proposed motion. This is a new section to the *Manual*. Since NTTF on contract are not at-will, there needs to be a mechanism for addressing appeals to early termination.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): We are not amending anything, we are adding this new section to the *Manual*.

E.16 was unanimously approved.

Subject: Faculty Manual Section E.16 Appeal of Early Termination of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments

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

MOVED, THAT THIS NEW SECTION E.16 BE ADDED TO THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, AND THE CURRENT E.16 AND E.17 SECTIONS BE RENUMBERED TO E.17 AND E.18:

E.16 Appeal of Early Termination of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments

A tenure-track faculty member may appeal a recommendation to the President to terminate their appointment prior to the ending date of the contract. This section of the Manual sets forth the procedures for such an appeal. The University Grievance Officer (UGO) shall be charged with overseeing this appeal process. At the discretion of the UGO, any of the time limits in this section may be extended for reasonable periods. Such extensions shall be reported immediately to all parties concerned.

E.16.1. Initiating the Process

When a Recommendation to the President to terminate a Tenure-Track Faculty Appointment prior to the ending date of the Appointment is sent to the Provost, a copy of this Recommendation shall be provided in writing to the faculty member by the person making the Recommendation (hereinafter referred to as the Recommender). At the same time, the recommender shall notify the faculty member of their right to appeal this recommendation and refer them to Section E.16 of the Manual. The faculty member then has ten (10) working days to submit to the UGO an Appeal in writing of this Recommendation, along with the Recommendation itself. If an Appeal is submitted within this time frame, then the UGO shall notify the Provost within three (3) working days, and the Recommendation shall not be sent to the President until the conclusion of the Section E.16 process.

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

The Appeal should provide all of the information that the Appeal Committee (see Section E.16.2) will need in order to make its decision whether to support or oppose the Recommendation for termination. This may include relevant documentation and persons that the Appeal Committee may contact for additional supporting information. The relevance of each person should be stated in the Appeal. The Appeal Committee is not required to contact all of the persons listed in the Appeal. The UGO will review the Appeal to make sure that the information included is relevant to the issue of termination. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Appeal to the Appellant for editing before it is acceptable.

March 5, 2019

Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Appeal from the Appellant, the UGO shall forward the Appeal to the Recommender and to the members of the Appeal Committee. The Recommender shall then have ten (10) working days to provide a

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

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

E.16.2 Appeal Committee

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

E.16.3 Report of the Appeal Committee

After the completion of the process described in Section E.16.2, the three members of the Appeal Committee shall meet to discuss the case and to reach a final decision by majority vote whether to support or oppose the Recommendation for the termination of the Appellant.

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

E.16.4 Final Decision by the President

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

Rationale:

1. We are proposing to insert this new section into the Manual. The proposed E.16 above deals with faculty on tenure-track appointments, who are not at-will employees. Thus, the early termination of such an appointment should require more due process than the termination of an at-will employee. This new section creates such due process.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.16.

9. Proposed revisions to Section E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the proposed revisions. These changes bring the *Manual* up-to-date, reflecting new appointment types.

Gallagher: For or against?

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Asking for clarification. On page 74-- letter b referring to one-year appointments. His sense was that an appointment was for two years once you are at year 4. I don't know how that is working or affects the situation.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): We are not proposing any change to the current language included here. That new reappointment comes fairly early. Always has been one-year appointments.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): There is no change. If there are departments that are doing other things, then they have not been understanding the *Manual*. If voted down, the appointment would still be for one year. Faculty are always appointed one year at a time. This has always been the policy.

Doug Cloud (English): The language says one year, it does not say one year at a time. That's where I think the disagreement is.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): Which letter are you talking about?

Doug Cloud (English): E.6.b

Richard Eykholt (UGO): You will notice that there is no change to the language or wording you are describing. If there are departments that are doing other things, then they are violating the *Manual*.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): If you were to vote this down, it still says they cannot exceed an appointment for one year. It might help to restate that it is updating the language but not the policy. We just renamed the appointment types awhile back, but now we are updating this in the *Manual*.

Gallagher: It is time to vote.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.6.

Subject: Faculty Manual Section E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointments and Employment of Faculty

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

MOVED, THAT Section E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointments and Employment of Faculty BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overseored~~ Additions Underlined

E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty (*last revised ~~May 8, 2015~~xxx*)

- a. The conditions and expectations of every appointment shall be confirmed in writing. Any subsequent modifications of the appointment shall also be confirmed in writing after the faculty member and the administrator have mutually determined the new conditions. The faculty member shall receive a copy of these documents.
- b. All faculty members who are on ~~regular full-time or regular part-time appointments and who have not acquired tenure~~ tenure-track appointments, shall be appointed for a period not exceeding one (1) year.
- c. All faculty members on ~~special or temporary~~ continuing or adjunct appointments shall be appointed "at will."
- d. Faculty members on ~~multi-year~~ appointments shall be appointed for periods of ~~one~~ two (2) to five (5) years for research and ~~one (1)~~ two (2) to three (3) years for teaching.
 1. A multi-year contract does not carry any guarantee that the contract will be renewed, even though the duties of the employee may have been discharged satisfactorily.

March 5, 2019

2. Renewal of a multi-year contract does not entitle the individual to further renewals, a tenure-track appointment, or to a decision concerning tenure.

3. Renewal or extension of multi-year contracts may be made at any time during or after the onset of the contract and shall meet the same conditions required for the initial contract as specified in Sections E.2.1.3 and E.2.1.4.

4. If the contract is not renewed ~~and the individual was originally 'at will' and entered into a multi-year contract~~, employment ~~as a senior teaching or special appointment faculty reverts to~~ will be converted to an 'at will' continuing appointment as specified in Sections E.2.1.3 and E.2.1.4.

d. If the department head does not propose to reappoint a ~~non-tenured~~ tenure-track faculty member ~~holding a regular full-time or regular part-time appointment~~, the faculty member shall be informed in writing that the appointment will not be renewed. This must be done by March 1 during the first year of employment, by December 15 during the second year, and at least twelve (12) months before the expiration of the appointment in succeeding years.

e. A ~~non-tenured~~ tenure-track or contract faculty member ~~holding a regular full-time, regular part-time, or multi-year contract~~ may be disciplined or terminated for cause without following the procedures of Section E.15 for tenured faculty. Termination may be appealed by following the procedures in Section E.11 (for contract faculty) or Section E.16 (for tenure-track faculty). ~~Such~~ Other disciplinary actions may be grieved as described in Section K.

f. If a decision made at a higher administrative level will have the effect of altering or reversing a decision made at a departmental level regarding conditions of employment, including reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary, then, before this change can take effect, the department head must be notified in writing of both the proposed change and the reasons for this change, and ~~he or she~~ they must be given the opportunity to submit a written reply.

Rationale: The amendments proposed above assure that E.6 is in compliance with changes in other sections of the Manual approved by Faculty Council.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.6.

10. Proposed revisions to Section E.12.1 Teaching and Advising of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL) spoke to the proposed revisions.

Gallagher states that CoTL requests a change to today's agenda order, and requests discussing Section I.8 first, then the appropriate use of the E.12.1.

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): Now on to E.12.1. The language attempts to make clear that the new tool is not to be used alone. It must be accompanied by multi-factorial approaches.

Gallagher: The motion is on the floor for discussion.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): I have an issue with discarding anonymous comments. If we are taking evaluations from students, we should take all of them, not just the ones where students are willing to sign.

Joseph DiVerdi (Chair, CoSFP): I agree with Antonio. On page 79 it says that anonymous documents will not be used except for when consent is given by the instructor, so this provides the opportunity but not the requirement.

Gallagher: Are you ready to vote on E.12.1? All in favor of approving Section E.12.1, please indicate by saying "aye". The motion was approved.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.12.1.

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

Deletions ~~Overseored~~ Additions Underlined

E.12.1 Teaching and Advising (~~last revised December 1, 2017~~)

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

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

Excellent teachers are characterized by their command of subject matter; logical organization and presentation of course material; ability to help students recognize relationships among fields of knowledge; energy and enthusiasm; availability to help students outside of class; encouragement of curiosity, creativity, and critical thought;

March 5, 2019

engagement of students in the learning process; understanding of how students learn and encouragement of effective learning strategies; use of clear grading criteria; and respectful responses to student questions and ideas.

Departments shall foster a culture that values and recognizes excellent teaching and encourages reflective self-assessment. To that end, departmental codes ~~will~~ must, within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching should be designed to highlight strengths, identify deficiencies, and improve teaching and learning.

Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching must involve substantive review of multiple sources of information such as course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; integration of service learning; summaries of how the instructor used information from student feedback to improve course design or instructional delivery, as well as any evidence of the outcomes of such improvements; letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and evidence of the use of active and/or experiential learning, student learning achievement, professional development related to teaching and learning, and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Importantly, student perceptions of the learning environment are, by definition, not evaluations of teaching effectiveness and cannot be taken as such; they are simply the student perspectives on their experience in a learning environment. Departments must not use student survey responses as a direct or comparative measure of teaching effectiveness nor use student responses or attendant metrics derived from student responses independent of multiple sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness. The use of student survey responses is appropriate only in the context of multifactorial reviews of multiple resources oriented toward an instructor's continuous improvement in fulfilling our teaching mission. Given this, reflection on, and use of, student perceptions can be one part of instructors' formative development because these perceptions can offer insights into the learning environment that only the students can provide. As such, results from student course surveys should be shared with department heads and promotion and tenure committees and considered only in context of a multifactorial review for the purpose of mentoring and evaluating teaching that includes information on courses taught, patterns in student survey responses, and instructors' reflections on such patterns in teaching portfolios that document their accounts of how they have used this and other feedback. Anonymous letters or comments shall not be used to evaluate teaching, except with the consent of the instructor or as authorized in a department's code. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness must take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., face-to-face and online settings; lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching assignments, in the context of the type and level of courses taught. The University provides resources to support the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, such as structures for observing and offering formative feedback on instructors' teaching practices, systems to create and assess teaching portfolios, access to

March 5, 2019

exemplary teaching portfolios, tools to document and evaluate teaching effectiveness, and professional development programs focusing on teaching and learning.

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

Rationale:

The proposed changes to the language incorporate recommendations from the 2015 [UDTS/TILT Task Force Report on Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness](#) and from published evidence on the use and abuse of student feedback in teaching evaluations. The proposed changes in language aim to:

1. Mandate that academic units define teaching effectiveness and the mentoring and evaluation criteria to be used within their codes.
2. Frame the evaluation of teaching effectiveness in units with respect to the department code so that faculty are mentored and evaluated with respect to clearly stated expectations, and not on the basis of inappropriate comparisons to each other.
3. Make clear that student feedback does not constitute an evaluation of teaching effectiveness, but simply student reflections on their experiences in the learning environment in question as the revised course survey tool is designed to capture.
4. Stop the use of student “scores” as the sole or primary basis of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
5. Properly frame the place of student feedback in the mentoring and evaluation of teaching effectiveness; faculty reflections upon student feedback and relevant adjustments made to one’s approach to teaching are certainly germane as part of the reflective professional development in the classroom, and are germane to the ongoing mentoring and evaluation of teaching. Given this, student feedback must be accessible as part of the mentoring and evaluation process as one component of a teaching portfolio or dossier.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.12.1.

11. Proposed revisions to Section I.8 Student Course Survey of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – CoTL*

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL) spoke to the proposed revisions.

Hickey noted the revisions to Section I.8 as described on pages 81-82 in the packet, which speaks to the new tool. No rating of the instructor and away from means, which is where bias occurs. A principle source of the bias is predicated on comparing means which no longer exist in I.8. Adds that the language states that codes must incorporate how faculty are evaluated.

Gallagher: A motion has been made by CoTL. Is there any discussion of this?

Mary Meyer (Natural Sciences): Makes a motion to amend the motion.

Gallagher states that it is very much appreciated when such motions are sent ahead as Mary's was so that Faculty Council can see and review what they are being asked to consider.

Mary Meyer (Natural Sciences) speaks to how the surveys are used. States her appreciation of the new instrument. Likes the mood of the new one but would like to not use if at all for T&P, for awards, and raises. She provides a set of references that address the biases. Online instruction was demonstrated on "fake women" getting worse evaluations than "fake men" when genders were deliberately inverted. Describes a bias toward easier teaching and that student evaluation of teaching leading to grade inflation. Would like to change some specific language as indicated in her amendment.

Stephen Hayne (CoB): seconds Mary Meyer's motion.

Jenny Morse (Chair, CoNTTF): Can we separate the two amendments? The reason why they are addressing the same subject with both, disallowing the survey instrument as an evaluation of teaching.

Gallagher: The parts would be conflicting if we took out one and left the other. The key words are "as well as."

Doug Cloud (English): On the one hand I want to speak to supporting the amendment because it's thrilling. Can an amendment be amended to reflect improved wording to eliminate the first three words "the use of."

Steve Reising (CoE) seconds.

Unanimous support of the amendment to the amendment.

Joseph DiVerdi (Chair, CoSFP): Another question of language - "should" or "must" or "shall" not be used. I propose an amendment to the amendment changing should to shall.

Unanimous support of a second amendment to the amendment.

Stephen Hayne (CoB): I would like to speak in support of this amendment. I am appalled that we would consider adopting such a flawed instrument.

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): The instrument we have is not a student evaluation of teaching. We have been in touch with other institutions. The University of Oregon is not doing what this amendment is proposing to do. They are doing much the same thing we are doing. The opportunity to reflect on student feedback. Phil Stark was the second reference. His own division at Berkeley repositioned not as a single quantitative score but as student feedback. We do not want to use the same-old, same-old. We are not talking about student evaluation of teaching. That is not what this instrument does.

Joe Cannon (CoB): I'm concerned about the amendment. How are we going to figure out what's going on in the classroom. What is going to happen is Impression Management. The students we are hired to teach should have some say. Department chairs will hopefully use a wider portfolio, but eliminating the student voice is a big mistake, as that student is in the classroom every day.

Anne Avery (CVMBS): I would like to support the amendment. I think there is the possibility to collect data using the instrument and collecting data for the next few years.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): I appreciate the changes in the instrument. It is far and above better than the earlier instrument. The amendment we are talking about is dependent on the satisfactory nature of the instrument. Can we discuss fine-tuning the instrument before deciding? While far superior than the previous, can we table the amendment?

Gallagher: Are you asking for a postponement to the amendment? [checks with Parliamentarian] It would be in order to hold off on this amendment until the instrument is discussed.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon seconds.

Gallagher asked for a vote to postpone the amendment.

Postponement of the amendment does not pass.

Gallagher: We are returning to the amendment. We strike the first three words and we changed "should" to "shall". That is the motion on the floor right now.

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): The concern of CoTL is that we make the opposite error of what we are discussing right now. What we are saying now is that we would not ever listen to any student voice. We are not handing a score to a

department head. “WE” are affording the faculty member to hear from students. We need to ask departments to write into their code how to ignore outlier statements from students.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): The feedback can be used as formative feedback but not used for overall evaluation.

Ramaa Vasudevan (Liberal Arts): We should be sure the instrument is appropriate before approving it. There is a student voice reflected in other ways, it will show up and is not being silenced.

Zachary Veishompoyon (Student representative to CoTL): My understanding is that even if the professor wanted to bring it to their evaluation, then this should not be a requirement—would change shall. But mostly creates the opposite problem. I understand that looking at the mean that a teacher is a 2.7 or other mean, but if you don’t use the student survey there is no guarantee that other items won’t be biased. If you have 200-person course you have 200 people who can chime in as opposed to only your T&P committee. Opens you up to more critique by a small number of people. #2) As was mentioned earlier, students are present in the room while your peers and your department chair are not in the room with you. Once or twice in a semester I will see someone observing, so if you get rid of this, you are getting rid of the broadest and deepest evaluation of your teaching on a daily basis. Yes, see if there is bias--keep an eye on this--but don’t deprive yourself of the best tool you have available to you. Not knowing in the first place.

Doug Cloud (English): Calls the question

Gallagher: A 2/3 vote is required to pass. The motion to halt debate and immediately vote on the motion (to amend) passed by the required two-thirds margin.

We are now voting on the amendment proposed by Professor Meyer with the two amendments to that amendment that have been approved.

The amendment did not pass.

Gallagher: Back to discussion of the main motion.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): So this is where we can talk about the motion, right? This feedback is from many people. The specifics of the rating scales. Low, Reasonably high, Unreasonably high. Similarly, enough scale. Biases are built into the scales since language doesn’t seem balanced. The online instructor does not feel that the language is appropriate for online instructors. List of strengths did not include things that would be useful for online instruction. Other features as well do not reflect online instruction.

Doug Cloud (English): Speaks in favor of the new instrument.

Dawn DeTienne (Management): I feel that we want to pass this and it's not what we want but it's better than what we have. I think we should get this right.

Jenny Morse (Chair, CoNTTF): This tool is so much better. We have the ability to tweak this in the future and adjust it in the future and it's such a good tool.

Lisa Langstraat (CLA At-Large): Does the CoTL have a plan to conduct research and is such research a part of the plan?

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): Yes. We will report back at least once a year.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): So is there no possibility of amending this to say "with minor tweaks"? It's just a matter of making this a little bit better.

Gallagher: You have to give a specific motion to amend as in "I want to strike these words or amend these words."

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): I move to amend the survey instrument itself. Would say "low, moderate, or high". For the workload items: "low, challenging, or overwhelming".

Joseph DiVerdi (Chair, CoSFP): Calls the question.

Steve Reising (CoE): Seconds the motion.

The motion carries to call the question.

Gallagher: We will vote on the survey instrument. Approved unanimously.

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): The language attempts to make clear that the new tool is not to be used alone. It must be accompanied by multi-factorial approaches.

A motion is on the floor for discussion.

Gallagher: Are we ready to vote?

I.8 was unanimously approved.

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

Deletions ~~Overseored~~ Additions Underlined

March 5, 2019

I.8 Student Course Survey (~~last revised December 1, 2017~~)

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

Each term, course instructors shall conduct at least one student survey of all the courses they teach through a system administered by the University utilizing the standardized University-wide instrument. The use of any of the optional modules of additional questions or custom questions in addition to the core/common university wide instrument is at the discretion of the instructor. Summaries of quantitative responses (in the form of frequency distributions) for each course surveyed shall be posted at <http://coursesurvey.colostate.edu>. Access to the summaries shall be granted to anyone with a CSU ~~eid~~ eID. Access to digital copies of the survey ~~forms~~ report, which includes student comments, shall be granted only to the course instructor(s) and to individuals explicitly granted access by the instructor(s) or as specified by the department code, ~~and to any~~ In situations where other persons are granted access to the report by the department code, the report should be used only in the context of a comprehensive assessment, by which faculty are provided an opportunity to reflect upon student feedback and include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (see section E.12.1). Costs for conducting and providing access to survey results ~~shall~~ should be shared by the University and the Associated Students of Colorado State University (ASCSU). ASCSU's financial contribution shall not exceed half of the required financial resources to operate this program.

The Committee on Teaching and Learning is responsible for making recommendations regarding the survey instrument and its use, as well as additional forms of evidence to be used in assessing teaching effectiveness. Changes to the Student Course Survey shall be approved by Faculty Council.

Rationale:

These changes respond to the charge to CoTL from the Faculty Council Executive Committee to propose changes to the student course survey.

- The proposed language reframes the course survey report to end the reporting of item means, replacing this with the appropriate use of frequency distributions.
- The routing of the course survey report and the appropriate use of the course survey in the context of the mentoring and evaluation of teaching is clarified.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section I.8.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Budget. Draft budget presented to the Board at the February meeting. No changes from previous versions and none since then. Main elements-- increase in state appropriations with no increase to in-state tuition. Seen as offsetting elements.

Salary and compensation: Put in request for more than a 4% salary increase to faculty--expectation of about 4% average; faculty and staff. The actual amount budgeted is higher than that but we've reserved about a half-percent for equity and promotions, so the remaining is down to about 4%. We have a skewed situation in faculty evaluations (which should be correlated with salary increases, statistically); it's not symmetric at all, it's about 50/50 with meets and with exceeds expectations, with a few people in the two categories below meets and a few in the one category above meets. If you're in the middle of the evaluation scale, with 'meets expectations', it is therefore difficult to give a salary raise in the middle of the raise scale (e.g. 4% if that ends up being the average). It's sort of a public relations problem....

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Any update on salary raises in Boulder for NTTF?

Miranda: Boulder has floated the idea to increase salaries for NTTF. Our budget and Boulder's budget looks quite different.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Has been sitting in on the search for the Dean's position for CHHS. The President's Committee on culture is continuing its work. There will be more things to come from this. I also want to let you know that I have talked to multiple people, department heads, individual NTTF, and CoNTTF in terms of the code changes that are going on across campus. Gallagher is attempting to assist with these efforts.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

The Board representative was not present today, due to her obligations as a member of the Presidential Search Committee, so no report was received; however, Lenk emailed the following summary of the February 6-8, 2019 Board meeting:

CSU System Board of Governor's Meeting in Pueblo, CO February 6-8, 2019

Respectfully submitted by Prof. Margarita Maria Lenk, CSU- Fort Collins Faculty Representative

CSU System received a clean, unqualified audit opinion from Clifton Larson Allen, external auditors.

CSU Treasury Fund Update: performing very well (\$5.7 million income). Federal nonoperating grants and contracts has \$1.6 million shortfall (less PELL enrollments, and less students attending who are PELL eligible).

CSU system budget update: \$17-18 million incremental funds request made to the state for next year. New expenses include multi-year central investments in strategic initiatives (\$3.1 mill), increases in faculty and staff compensation (\$19 million); academic incentive funding (\$2.7 mill); increases in mandatory costs (\$5.2 million); and quality enhancements (\$ 2.5 mill). 1% RUG increase = \$94 per year for student chare; 1% NRUG increase = \$273 per year. 1% RUG and NRUG increase =\$1.5 million, and \$1.3 million, respectively. Utilities and Insurance costs are expected to go up (August). Planned internal investments and strategic initiatives. The 4.5% salary/benefit increase is due to equity pay adjustments, and to keep salaries competitive. This 4.5% includes the lower line of \$19 million for new compensation, which has base components, promotions and new titles, new benefits, and state authorized faculty increases. The average faculty member can hope to get an increase of 4-4.5%, which is in the response to the market conditions in Fort Collins. However, there are CSU functional areas, such as business and financial services and human resources, which have high turnover and stress because we are not paying a market wage. Dave Ryan is hiring 5-6 replacement people right now. Whenever salaries increase, the benefit rate to add to the base salary for State Classified is 42%, and for Faculty and AP is 28%. Also, next year there is a .25% increase to PERA obligation, and that is probably going up to .5% the following year. The planned reallocation pool is much smaller (\$2.7 million). Past practices are being revisited (start, stop, keep) for improved algorithm changes. Reallocation (internal) amounts to about 33% of the cost changes across campus. In the past 3 years, 147 positions have been reallocated across campus.

My insights: As colleges continue to grow in enrollments, so are college operations office overhead costs. Some of these general overhead cost allocations might motivate some departments to kill programs that are either leading in their fields, and/or are contributing margin towards covering the central college overhead. Discussions within each college should ensure to make sure that the optimal programmatic decisions are

March 5, 2019

made. I suggest that specific mission/strategy metrics be used at the department level as well as the college level (e.g., # students, increases in student retention and engagement, etc.) may be useful additions to these decision processes.

CSU Pueblo is exploring the possibility of becoming the first U.S. university completely solar powered.

Tip from CSU Global Soft skills, technical skills, and industry knowledge are the three primary hiring buckets. Investments in these areas may be useful for increasing enrollments and placements. Middle skill jobs no longer have undergraduate degree requirements at Apple, Google, Bank of America, Penguin Random House, Whole Foods, and Starbucks. Sub-baccalaureate certifications, industry training certifications, professional licenses training, internship training, and apprenticeship trainings are rising. Recent success at CSU Global (Q2 2019 incremental income >\$ 3 million) is based on retention and more programming after initial degree or certificate, much more dependent on re-enrollment and keeping them engaged, and less on recruiting new students.

Western Stock Show 2019, Amy Parsons report: 3rd highest attendance ever, over 700 at the CSU Day rodeo, 17 different outreach groups served by CSU students, Ag Adventure involved 25 CSU upward bound students. CSU highlights community engagement, reaching out also to 16 schools in Denver area. CSU stands down for 2020 stock show as construction kicks into gear.

Todos Santos Campus of CSU: has plenty of new projects utilizing its capacity over the next year as CSU Pueblo and CSU Fort Collins faculty are busy developing programming.

4. Annual Report of the University Grievance Officer for 2019

Annual Report of the University Grievance Officer for 2018

One duty of the UGO is to oversee the disciplinary process for tenured faculty, as described in Section E.15 of the Manual. During calendar year 2108, this process was never initiated.

Another duty of the UGO is to manage the grievance process, as described in Section K of the Manual. During calendar year 2018, the UGO dealt with 20 cases from 24 faculty members and 11 cases from 12 administrative professionals. The distribution of the 20 cases from faculty members by college is as follows:

Business	7
Health & Human Sci.	4
Liberal Arts	6
Vet. Med. & Biom. Sci.	3

The distribution of the 11 cases from administrative professionals is as follows:

March 5, 2019

Continuing Education	1
Engineering	1
Health & Human Sci.	1
Housing & Dining	1
Natural Resources	1
Natural Sciences	1
Student Services	1
TILT	1
Vet. Med. & Biom. Sci.	1
Vice Pres. for Research	2

Before summarizing these cases, it is important to note that, if a case is ruled not to be grievable, then it cannot be pursued through the grievance process. However, the UGO can choose to hold off on making this determination in order to have discussions with the persons involved and even to allow the case to proceed to formal mediation. On the other hand, a case cannot proceed to a formal hearing unless it is ruled to be grievable.

For the 11 cases involving administrative professionals, three cases involved termination. Since administrative professionals are at-will employees, these cases were not grievable.

One case involved an employee being placed on administrative leave, which later led to an intent to terminate the employee. While termination of an administrative professional is not grievable, there were some unusual aspects to this case. As a result, the UGO got involved in discussions with the persons involved, and these discussions are still underway.

Two cases involved letters of expectations that the employees found to be unreasonable. However, letters of expectation are not punitive, so they are not grievable.

One case involved an annual evaluation. After an initial discussion, the employee decided not to pursue the matter through Section K.

One case involved a change in the job description and the conditions of employment for the employee. For this case, the conflict was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

One case involved a denial of a promotion. For this case, the UGO got involved in discussions with the persons involved. It turned out that the supervisor who denied the promotion was preparing to retire, so the employee decided to wait until next year and apply again for the promotion.

In the remaining two cases, the employees felt that they were being treated unfairly by their supervisors. The UGO referred them to the bullying policy as the appropriate avenue to pursue. In both cases, the employees decided not to pursue the matters through Section K.

None of these 11 cases led to formal mediation or a formal hearing.

There were two cases from the previous year involving administrative professionals that were not completed that year, because they were put on hold while an OEO investigation was conducted. In both cases, OEO did not find evidence of wrongdoing by the supervisor, so the matters were not pursued through Section K.

For the 20 cases involving faculty members, 12 involved tenured faculty, 1 involved a tenure-track faculty member, and 7 involved non-tenure-track faculty members.

For the 7 cases involving non-tenure-track faculty members, one case involved a disagreement over the terms in a new appointment letter, one case involved a disagreement over employment expectations, and one case involved a delay in receiving payment. For each of these cases, the conflict was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

One case involved unfair treatment and claims that policies in the Manual were not being followed. For this case, the conflict was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

One case involved an annual evaluation and alleged bullying by the supervisor. With regard to the latter allegation, the UGO referred the employee to the bullying policy. However, the employee decided not to pursue either matter and to resign instead.

One case involved an employee not being allowed to continue to do extra work and receive overtime pay. This case was not grievable.

For the remaining case, the employee sent an email message to the UGO, but decided not to meet with the UGO, so the issue is not known. The 1 case involving a tenure-track faculty member involved termination for cause based on behavioral issues. This case was resolved through discussion between the UGO and the persons involved, and the faculty member decided to resign.

For the 12 cases involving tenured faculty members, one case involved a loss of research lab space, one case involved a change in research lab space, and one case involved a diversion of funds from a program. In each of these three cases, the faculty member decided not to pursue the matter through Section K.

Two cases involved the denial of promotion to full professor. In one case, the faculty member decided not to pursue the matter through Section K. In the other case, the faculty member filed a grievance against the Provost that resulted in a formal hearing. The hearing committee found in favor of the Provost, and this finding was upheld by the President.

March 5, 2019

In two of the cases, the employees felt that they were being treated unfairly by their supervisors. The UGO referred them to the bullying policy as the appropriate avenue to pursue. In both cases, the employees decided not to pursue the matters through Section K.

In one case, several faculty members felt that they were being bullied by the department head and that a hostile work environment had been created. This case was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved, and it ended with a decision to replace the department head.

One case involved an annual evaluation and a claim that the faculty member was being treated unfairly by their supervisor. In this case, the UGO spent considerable time in discussions with the persons involved. In the end, the faculty member decided to resign.

One case involved a letter of reprimand. This case was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved, and the letter of reprimand was withdrawn.

One case involved a claim of academic interference by the supervisor, and this case was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

One case involved a claim of academic interference by an office on campus. The UGO attempted to resolve this case through discussions between the persons involved, but the faculty member then decided to quit pursuing the matter through Section K.

Of the 20 cases involving faculty members, none led to formal mediation, but one led to a formal hearing. In that hearing, the hearing committee found for the supervisor, and the President upheld that decision. There was one case from the previous year involving a non-tenure-track faculty member that was not completed that year, because it was put on hold while an OEO investigation was conducted. OEO did not find evidence of wrongdoing by the supervisor. This case involved the early termination of a teaching contract for cause. After the completion of the OEO investigation, this case was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved, and the faculty member was allowed to remain employed for the duration of their contract and resign after the contract ended.

Submitted by: Richard Eykholt,
University Grievance Officer

Gallagher: Anyone who has questions or comments about the Grievance Officer's report are welcome to contact him.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): The question was specifically about two cases that involved letters of expectation were found unreasonable. If an administrator changes the terms for a person, that person has no capacity for challenging. What would be the process?

Gallagher: I cannot respond to your question directly. Gallagher encouraged Pedros-Gascon to contact Richard Eykholt.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon expressed that this report should go out to all faculty.

Gallagher feels there would be no problem to distribute this report to all faculty.

DISCUSSION

1. None.

Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 5:38 p.m.

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

March 5, 2019

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

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

Liberal Arts

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

Natural Resources

<u>Monique Rocca</u>	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2020
David Koons	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2021
Chad Hoffman	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2020
Bill Sanford	Geosciences	2020
Alan Bright (substituting for Tara Teel)	HDNR in Warner College	2020

Natural Sciences

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

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

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

University Libraries

Linda Meyer	Libraries	2019
--------------------	-----------	------

Ex Officio Voting Members

Timothy Gallagher	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2018
Sue Doe	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2018
<u>Margarita Lenk</u> (excused)	BOG Faculty Representative	2018
Don Estep, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2019
Todd Donovan, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2017
Jerry Magloughlin, Chair	Committee on Libraries	2019
Jenny Morse, Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Marie Legare, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty	2018
Donald Samelson, Chair	Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education	2019
Karen Barrett, Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2019
Joseph DiVerdi, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2019
Matt Hickey, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2019
Mo Salman, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2018
Bradley Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2018
<u>Susan (Suellen) Melzer</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
<u>Denise Apodaca</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
Christine Pawliuk	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Ashley Harvey (substituting for Patty Stutz-Tanenbaum)	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Daniel Baker	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Leslie Stone-Roy	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
<u>Mary Van Buren</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Steve Benoit	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Natalie Ooi	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019

Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members

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