AGENDA
Faculty Council Meeting
Tuesday, May 5, 2020
3:45 p.m. Gathering; 4:00 Business– Microsoft Teams

May 5, 2020 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. <u>**Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – May 5, 2020 – Microsoft Teams – 3:45pm.**</u>

    A. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

        1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – September 1, 2020 – 4:00 PM – place and format TBD

        2. Graduate Student Council Advising Awards

        3. Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award – Announcement of recipient

        4. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes forthcoming to FC website

    B. **MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

        1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – April 7, 2020 (pp. 3-10)

    C. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

    D. **CONSENT AGENDA**

        1. UCC meeting minutes – April 3 and April 10, 2020 (pp. 11-14)

    E. **ACTION ITEMS**

        1. Election - Faculty Council Standing Committee Nominees - Committee on Faculty Governance (pp. 15-16)

        2. Election - Faculty Nominees for the University Benefits Committee - Committee on Faculty Governance (p. 17)

        3. Faculty Council Resolution to Support Student Demands for Equity and to Share Action and Accountability – Executive Committee (p. 18)

        4. UCC recommended changes to AUCC - New AUCC course category called AUCC 1C – Self, Community, World: Dialogue About Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity (pp. 19-20)

        5. Proposal from the Committee on Faculty Governance to change Section C.2.1.3.1 of the Manual. (pp. 21-22)

5. New Degree: Ph.D. in Music Therapy to be established **effective Fall 2020** in the School of Music, Theatre, and Dance – UCC (pp. 23-24)

F. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Stephanie Clemons

4. Report by Faculty Ombuds, Kathy Rickard, of Types of Concerns and Issues Dealt With (pp. 25-29)

G. DISCUSSION

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
Tuesday, April 7, 2020
4:00 p.m. – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

APRIL 7, 2020 FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

4. **Proposed Faculty Council Agenda – April 7, 2020 – Microsoft Teams - 4:00**

   A.   **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

      1**.**   Tim explains the processes associated with working within Teams.

      2.   Next Faculty Council Meeting – May 5, 2020 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 PM

      3.   Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website – https://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/
           Recently approved Executive Committee meeting minutes will be uploaded to the Faculty Council website when ready.

   B.   **MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

      1.   Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – March 3, 2020 (pp. 3-18)
           These minutes were unanimously approved after a change was made that was requested by John Elder.

Approved by unanimous consent

   C.   **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

   D.   **CONSENT AGENDA**

          UCC meeting minutes – February 14, 21, 28, and March 6, 2020 (pp. 19-40)

Brad Goetz makes the motion to approve the consent agenda. This motion was unanimously approved.

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approve UCC meeting minutes – March 13 (pp. 41-46)

Tim refers members to page 41 of the agenda packet.

Sue Doe moves to divide the question, separating out the miscellaneous request from the rest of the minutes. 748+Jason Bruemmer seconds

All other parts of the UCC minutes of March 13 besides the miscellaneous request are unanimously approved.

Tim explains that this item was pulled as result of interest from the EC. It seemed appropriate to move the miscellaneous request out of the larger minutes so that the rest of the minutes and action associated with them are not delayed.

Sue requests that there be a discussion of the process and substance of this request. Sue asks that Brad Goetz speak to the intentions of the request and that Rick speak to the larger context of the request after Brad.

Brad Goetz speaks to the UCC request. Reports that the UCC was first asked to consider this action in September. Would allow previously approved courses to be delivered in any method as desired. No other curriculum review process would be affected. More and more courses are offered online. We need to acknowledge that. ¼ of courses are currently offered online. This proposal would allow units on campus to be responsive to change. Confusion: it is not to REQUIRE every course to be delivered online. This is not intended to be that kind of proposal. Rough numbers: of about 7000 courses at CSU, 1900 approved to be delivered online.

Rick Miranda requests to speak and has slides to share. Seeks faculty to ratify the movement of courses to online and to approve any approved course to be delivered in whatever modality as desire by the unit. Short term need is imperative. Needed for accreditation. States that this is broader authority than we need for the semester and the summer. The reasons why he asked for this change. We want quality in our course offerings. There are better ways than the pre-approval mechanism that we've been relying on. We need to be more nimble than we have been. We will not move courses online wholesale. This will move at its own pace going forward. Shared governance demands that we work together to create more online options. One possibility for addressing the quality question is through use of Quality Matters (QM), which is a national certifier of online instruction. The approach would be to not just to give a faculty member a laptop but would require faculty working with a course designer. First would establish minimal standards and then follow up to see if working. CoTL and CSU Online could co-develop rubrics to establish expectations for online course delivery. Departments and colleges would offer course after working with instructional designers to reach established QM standards without prior approval by central committees. After taught once, then course would be reviewed and if standards were not achieved then the course would be pulled until shortcomings remedied. This would involve an annual report and professional training. CoTL/TILT/CSU-Online would collaborate on designing training and professional development for faculty teaching online that would be mandatory at the initial stages to support the achievement of high standards. States: He supports the proposal and hopes the FC will also support it.

Karen Barrett: I want to speak in favor of the motion due to it being important to be nimble. Most faculty have at least online resources associated with all courses, so this makes it less nit-picky as to when or how a faculty member chooses to deliver the course. Today it's a rather complex question as to what kind of course any course is any longer This permits as many different possibilities as people might want to offer.

Doug Cloud: I am speaking against the motion. While the argument Rick presented helps me a great deal, the motion seems overly broad and a sweeping change proposed in the middle of a pandemic. Would have no problem

recommending a short-term change, but rather than have a full-scale proposal approved would recommend caution with regard to such a sweeping change. Wonders: Is this even legal? Can a responsibility of a standing committee simply be removed? This seems like the abdication of a major responsibility through their minutes?

Moti: Speaking against the motion. I think we need to be careful about mixing two concerns. For the next year at least, I don't see any need to rush the proposal as it stands.   Would this make it easier for someone to say we want X% of courses to become online. Rick's suggestions are very sensible, but we need to see these in writing. I recommend a narrower version for the next academic year and recommend that we deliberate further for the more open-ended plan.

Sue James: I generally support the proposal but I also hear the concerns. Who is in charge of the accountability piece? This is why it might make sense to pass this as an emergency matter and then address the broader question down the road.

Rick: As I understand it, the online people know about the external vendors such as Quality Matters which are strong monitors of quality.

Sue J: Won't this require resources?

Rick: Yes it will, if we're going to do it well.

Moira Velasquez: Speaks against the motion. Agrees with points made earlier. The sweeping nature of the proposal is concerning. Monitoring quality is a difficult thing to do centrally. Coming from language teaching and having worked with course designers at both TILT and CSU-Online, she doubts very much very that there will be a time when online will be equivalent to f2f.

Kelly Long: Sits with the UCC every week and wishes to offer insights. What the UCC does is take course and program proposals to make sure they have all the component parts. There seems to be a sense that the UCC has some basis for oversight and quality control but it does not. The authority resides within departments and in faculty culture. Suggests that what is asked by the UCC is procedural so that a course doesn't come through the CIM process twice, once f2f and once for online. We have provided lots of guide sheets to address the learning outcomes coming from the gtPathways. This would not shift regardless of modality of delivery.

Antonio: Speaks against the proposal. It's a too broad and too much of blanket request. Is concerned about the impact of faculty surrendering control of the curriculum through UCC and not having a UCC providing oversight. We cannot be sure that it will not have a big impact down the line. States that it is the mandate of the committee to run that process. Wonders if we are also going to start considering that committees decide what they do and do not want to do. From his perspective, he approves a transitory approval for any form of delivery but not one that extends into the future indefinitely.

Gwen Gorzelsky: States her wish to convey a message from Matt Hickey and the CoTL which would be happy to work with CSU Online and TILT which would look at quality measures once a course is offered while also providing for certain efficiencies. States that Moira is right about instructional designer expertise. Chris LaBelle from CSU-Online would assert that course designers depend on the faculty member's expertise while the course designer's works has to do with the organization of the course and providing engagement approaches so that students can become as successful in online environments as face to face when properly supported.

Jason Bruemmer: UCC was asked to streamline and the process will take up to a year. The pandemic accelerated the process. Jason would offer an amendment "if and only if requested by the instructor" after the first sentence.

Melinda Smith seconds the amendment.

Tim invites comments on the amendment.

Moti: Repeats her understanding of the amendment: The course could be taught in any instructional modality if the instructor requested it.

Tim invites comments on the amendment.

Doug speak against the amendment. I'm not sure I can speak to the implications of the amendment but I want to speak against the amendment because it doesn't speak to the central concern. The amendment doesn't seem to address the concerns about a long and permanent change and the disruption to the deliberative processes that the proposal represents.

Sue J: I also don't support the amendment because it's off point although I support the broader effort to make online approval easier. Instructor request doesn't seem to be the central issue. Even if courses are approved online, that doesn't mean that they must be.

Tim calls the vote and the motion on the amendment is defeated.

Rick speaks to concerns that we would be giving up some quality control already held by the UCC. They are not given nor do they possess the expertise to evaluate quality control.

Blake Naughton: I don't think that flexibility of delivery abdicates responsibility for quality. We have many modalities of delivery. Where is the line drawn in terms of how faculty and departments are able to deliver courses? We have a conflation of issues here. Quality and quality control is generally managed better in online spaces than in face to face ones. States his appreciation for CoTL's role. We must design courses better through something more robust than through a course approval process managed by the UCC.

Sue Doe: Thanks to everyone for this conversation. Speaking to Blakes points: I appreciate what CSU-Online and TILT and an outside vendor like Quality Matters bring to the table in terms of the quality oversight question. But there must be a faculty role here. Shared governance and faculty participation is essential. Faculty must be involved and have a voice. This is why it is heartening to hear of CoTL's interest in serving in that role since it appears that UCC will not and perhaps has not served in a quality control role though many of us thought they did.

Joseph DiVerdi: We are in the 21st century and need to think differently. The change has been articulated by the Provost who has explained why we need this change. But notes that while he speaks in favor of the proposal he also speaks to the importance of approaching this matter deliberately. Joseph proposes an amendment for the proposal to apply only to summer and fall 2020 and then be revisited as a question at a later time when we are not in the middle of a crisis.

Motion is seconded by Steve Reisling.

Brad Conner: Likes this idea but wonders about the timeline given how early course proposals must go forward for spring.

Tim: We can do an amendment to an amendment if you wish to change the timeline.

Brad states his wish to hear discussion before making an amendment to the amendment.

Tim: Invites discussion on the amendment and only the amendment.

Antonio: Speaks in support of the amendment. This approach addresses the urgent need but also allows for the possibility to revise in a timely manner.

Brad Conner formalizes his amendment and moves to amend the amendment to have the provisional period be extended one semester beyond what was proposed. Proposal would be effective Spring 2020-Spring 2021.

Melinda Smith seconds.

Joseph DiVerdi: States his supports for the amendment.

Sue James requests that the entire proposal be posted to the screen. States that some in the chat box are asking for this.

Tim explains the limitations of the technology of Teams. But reads the amendment to the amendment.

Votes are cast and the amendment to the amendment is approved.

Wes Kinney: I've heard mention that the course delivery is under the purview of the instructor and also I've heard in this discussion that it's under the department. I could see a time in the future at the UCA when there is no option to teach a course. There is no existing online platform that can support the kind of teaching that we sometimes do. This is a situation where we feel that we are being forced to teach a class in a manner that is not possible.

Tim: Departments determine if a course is offered a certain semester.

Wes: It seems we could be forced to teach a class in a format that is not possible.

Tim: Rick, what are your thoughts on this?

Rick: The circumstances of this semester are a first. If a department chair can't convince a faculty member to teach a course a certain way, then I guess it can't be offered. It's always a negotiation between chair and faculty members. It's at the unit level.

Tim: The original proposal is in the March 13 minutes. The essence of the proposal is to accept the language of the proposal with the amended language.

Melinda: If we do this time limit, that could mean that if someone developed a course, then in spring of 2021 they may have to go through UCC for approval subsequent to 2021?

Brad: My guess of some version of what Melinda said would be correct in that there would be only agreement to the temporary delivery of courses online.

Tim: In the interest of time, given the many other things on the agenda, are you ready to vote on the amended proposal that's on the floor? We take the original proposal and conclude it with "from UCC from Spring 2020-Spring 2021."

[Entire proposal now reads: "The UCC supports approving the addition of all instructional formats (Face-to-Face, Mixed Face-to-Face, Online/Distance) for all courses previously approved in any format. This would apply to all forthcoming course proposals from Spring 2020 to Spring 2021."]

Tim: invites comments on the proposal as a whole. Hearing no further discussion, Tim invites voting on the proposal as a whole

Amended motion is approved by majority vote.

2. Election - Faculty Council Standing Committees – CoFG (pp. 47-48)

Steve Reising speaks to the ballot.

Tim invites nominations from the floor.

No objections to the nominations so approved by unanimous consent.

3. New Degree: Major in Dance (BFA) to be established **effective Fall 2020** in the School of Music, Theatre, and Dance – UCC (pp. 49-50)
Brad Goetz makes the motion.
The floor is open for discussion of the new program in dance.
Vote is taken.
Motion approved.

4. New Degree: Major in Agricultural Biology, to be established **effective Fall 2020** in the Department of Agricultural Biology (formerly Department of Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management) - UCC (pp. 51-52)

Brad makes the motion.
Tim invites discussion.
Vote called.
Motion is approved.

5. New CIOSU: Center for Human-Carnivore Coexistence – CUP (pp. 53-58)

Ellen Fisher invited to speak. Not present. Mo also not present. Sue makes the motion on behalf of the CUP committee for the approval of a new CIOSU—Human and Carnivores.

Antonio notes the errors (2) in the proposal

Tim assures that he will fix these.

The CIOSU is approved.

F. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Rick thanks the group for a several-semester approval for online. Assures that he will return to the Faculty Council with a proposal

Virus situation will have a budgetary impact in some way though it's unclear how the state budget will be impacted. We may get a negative picture from state appropriations. Enrollment is also down and since both the state budget and enrollment are in question, the situation is not a rosy picture.

Notes that faculty are working hard to do the best they can, given the situation. Student withdrawals are actually down from last year. Academic advisors report that they are reaching out to students who need extra support. Rick is proud of how we've responded. Now we must start thinking about wrapping up this semester and what

finishing well online will mean in this context. Summer session is slated online for both 4-week and 8-week sessions. Field experience courses impacted. Events on campus during second half of summer, such as summer camps, may be possible but we are not optimistic at this time.

2.   Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

The nominations for the Harry Rosenberg are due by April 10 so if you have intention to nominate someone get them in by then. The Executive Committee will evaluate nominations.

I think we had an energetic set of discussions at this meeting. Given the difficulties that we are going through, I have high confidence that the faculty will have a prominent place at the table with regard to dealing with the challenges moving forward**.**

3.   Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Stephanie Clemons

Stephanie reports that the next BoG meeting is May 6-8**.**

4.   Report on Faculty and AP Retirement Plans Changes
           -Teri Suhr, Chief Total Rewards Officer of Human Resources
           -Robyn Fergus, Executive Director of Human Resources

Faculty retirement plans the topic. Presentation is pulled up.

Robyn Fergus addresses the body. Joined by Teri Suhr. They provide slides (available at the end of the minutes and Carol Makela requests in chat that they be posted somewhere very clear) to explain the history of the Optional Retirement Plan in lieu of Colorado PERA.

They have developed a website to show their current project. Go to hrs.colostate.edu to get to the explanation of the project they're undertaking in a three-phase plan. After 1) introductory work that includes a survey of constituents. They will then 2) seek vendors.   Then in Phase 3) they will involve conversion coordination and investment selection. They will engage in actively managed investment line-up with vendor selection and consolidated fund options. This will be a 54 week process.

They are looking forward to moving forward on planned benefits and education that is benchmarked with our peers, offer high caliber choices.

Steve R asks about CU's project. Did they select just one vendor?

Teri: Yes, CU has had a defined contribution plan much longer than CSU. The premise of their decision was made on fees. For our project we are not necessarily seeking a single vendor?

Sue Doe asks if the existing problem is essentially one of having too many options?

Teri: Yes, there are way too many fund options. But it's also just time for a review to get the best plans for employees. Employees need to feel good about the decisions they've made.

Antonio: How do the members of your committee get elected and when was the last time there was an election?

Robyn: Members come from chair roles from major, relevant committees. Essentially determined by expertise and existing established roles in the university on committees. The process was to ask for representation from the committees that add value for this complicated topic.

Antonio: Would like to have faculty more involved in the process.

Robyn: I will defer to Tim but the nomination for roles on existing committees has already been done.

Tim: I had no input into how individuals were chosen.

John Elder: Serves on the university benefits committee. Discusses that plan organizations have changed. This is a very big project. One of his concerns is the selection of the committee. Appointments are made. Currently there's need for a representative from the CLA as well as someone from the NTTF ranks. John recommends a member of the NTTF who is among the most knowledgeable people on this issue. States skepticism about how the committee is constructed. Thanks them though for this huge undertaking.

Tim: Suggests that John bring item before the Faculty Council.

Moti: Asks whether they (INOVEST) have a fiduciary duty that will guide the work with the university.

Teri: Yes, there is fiduciary duty for all who are making recommendations. As decisions are made there will need to be another committee for ongoing investment fund management.

Karen Barrett: couldn't get microphone to unmute. [wished to speak]

Steven Hayne: States that expense ratio on fees is one of the main things we need to pay attention to. Reports that what we pay is 4-5 times what Vanguard's is. Hopes that the committee will address this.

Teri: My sentiments are with you. The price point is also important to us. That investment fund lineup needs to be best of breed. Vanguard might be among those considered.

Cynthia Brown: Better advice from advisors is crucial.

Robin and Teri: Yes, we have to make sure that the education piece is available.

Antonio: Pointing out the benefit of being in front of the computer, refers to the section of the Manual stating that CoFG has responsibility for nominating members of the University Benefits Committee. Asks: Why haven't we been replacing the committee members when there are openings? Why are committee members appointed?

Robyn: The open positions need to be identified by Faculty Council.

Tim: The open seat would need to be elected through Faculty Council and specifically would need to come through the CoFG.

John Elder speaks to the size of the task in front of this group. The committee resisted for 1.5 years in moving forward. Reiterates that we don't have someone from the CLA on the committee. Reiterates that one of the most qualified people on this topic is NTTF.

Tim: States that he will ask the EC to look into these issues.

Robyn Fergus: repeats that the CoNTTF will identify a representative from the NTTF ranks for position.

The meeting is adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES
Due to the closure of CSU's campus during the Covid-19 pandemic, a 'virtual' meeting of the University
Curriculum Committee was held on April 10, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. via Microsoft Teams.
The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.
Minutes
The minutes of April 3, 2020 were approved.

Consent Agenda
The Consent Agenda was approved.
Please note: **Approved curriculum changes are summarized below. Additional details may be viewed in the**
Curriculum Management (CIM) system by clicking on the hyperlinked course number or program title
below. Once a course proposal is fully approved through the CIM workflow (approved proposal will be
viewable under 'History' box on right side of CIM-Courses screen), the course should be available to be
added to the Class Schedule in ARIES/Banner (contingent on the effective term approved by UCC and
Scheduling deadlines).

Miscellaneous Memo Requests	
Request	**Justification**
Request to Temporarily Stop Admission to Master of Arts in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, Plan A, French Specialization, Interdisciplinary Option (LLAC-LFRZ-MA)	**Our department is reviewing the master's programs in light of our strategic plan developed following our recent program review. We want to take 1-2 years to address the curriculum and decide whether to deactivate or update the programs.**
Request to Temporarily Stop Admission to Master of Arts in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, Plan B, French Specialization, Interdisciplinary Option (LLAC-LFRZ-MA)	
Request to Temporarily Stop Admission to Master of Arts in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, Plan A, French Specialization, Foreign Languages, Literatures and Cultures Option (LLAC-LFRZ-MA)	
Request to Temporarily Stop Admission to Master of Arts in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, Plan B, French Specialization, Foreign Languages, Literatures and Cultures Option (LLAC-LFRZ-MA)	
Request to Temporarily Stop Admission to Master of Arts in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, Plan A, German Specialization, Interdisciplinary Option (LLAC-LGEZ-MA)	
Request to Temporarily Stop Admission to Master of Arts in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, Plan B, German Specialization, Interdisciplinary Option (LLAC-LGEZ-MA)	
Request to Temporarily Stop Admission to Master of Arts in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, Plan A, German Specialization, Foreign Languages, Literatures and Cultures Option (LLAC-LGEZ-MA)	

Request to Temporarily Stop Admission to Master of Arts in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, Plan B, German Specialization, Foreign Languages, Literatures and Cultures Option (LLAC-LGEZ-MA)

Study Abroad Course – Permanent Offering

Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
BUS 469A	**Study Abroad--Ecuador: Community and Cultural Engagement**	**3 cr.; Travel dates: 1/2/21-1/16/21 *(15 days)* Business majors and minors only. Previously offered provisionally as BUS 482B.**	**Spring 2021**

University Curriculum Committee Minutes April 10, 2020
Page 2

Study Abroad Course – 1st Provisional Offering

Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
BUS 482C	**Study Abroad—Tanzania: Business and Cultural Engagement**	**3 cr.; Travel dates: 1/3/21-1/16/21 *(14 days)* Business majors and minors only. UCC-approved 2/15/19 for a 1st offering in SP20, but offering was cancelled.**	**Spring 2021**

New Courses

Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
IDEA 110	**Designing Your University Life**		**Spring 2021**
IDEA 455/ MGT 455	**Designing for Defense**		**Fall 2020**

Major Changes to Courses
AUCC/Guaranteed Transfer (GT) Pathways Resubmission *(GT-AH1)*

Course #	Course Title	GTP Category/Notes	Effective Term
TH 141	**Introduction to Theatre**	**Edits to course description and offering term; removal of 'Required field trips.' Resubmission for AUCC 3B (Arts and Humanities) and GT-AH1 (Arts and Expression)**	**Spring 2021**

New Graduate Degrees

Program Title	Notes	Effective Term
Doctor of Occupational Therapy (O.T.D.)	**Offered Main Campus Face-to-face.** *Included in minutes for informational purposes only. A Special Action memo will be sent from UCC to Faculty Council.*	**Fall 2021**
Ph.D. in Music Therapy	**Offered Main Campus Face-to-face and Online/DCE.** *Included in minutes for informational purposes only. A Special Action memo will be sent from UCC to Faculty Council.*	**Fall 2021**

New Graduate Specialization		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
Master of Sports Management, Plan C, Sport Marketing Specialization	**Offered Main Campus Face-to-face and Online/DCE.**	**Fall 2021**

Major Changes to Existing Programs		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
FINC-MFIN: Master of Finance, Plan C	• **Updates to Program Description and Program Requirements** *(see CIM for all changes).*	**Fall 2020**
ECHE-BS: Major in Early Childhood Education	• **Removal of required course HDFS 320** *(see Course Deactivation under Consent Agenda).* • **Adjustment of elective credits.**	**Fall 2020**
LLAC-LGEZ-BA: Major in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, German Concentration	• **Removal of footnote #1: 'Select from the list of courses in category 3B of the All-University Core Curriculum (AUCC). The 200-level German courses may not be used to fulfill category 3B in this concentration.'** • **Freshman year: replacing 'HIST 101 or HIST 171' with generic AUCC 3D requirement.** • **Junior year: adjustment of number of German elective courses; adjustment of elective credits.**	**Fall 2020**

University Curriculum Committee Minutes
April 10, 2020

DSTF: Certificate in Design Thinking	• Addition of new subtopics in a 'Select from' list. • Addition of IDEA 424/MGT 424, IDEA 450, and IDEA 455/MGT 455 in a 'Select from' list.	Spring 2021

Page 3

Minor Changes to Courses			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
CON 367	**Construction Contracts/Project Administration**	**Edit to prerequisites: CON 351 (may be taken concurrently) or CON 353 (may be taken concurrently).**	**Spring 2021**
CON 492A	**Seminar: Emerging Construction Technologies**	**Edit to prerequisites: CON 351 or CON 353; CON 365 CON 351 and CON 365**	**Spring 2021**
CON 492B	**Seminar: Construction Issues and Trends**	**Edit to prerequisites: CON 351 or CON 353; CON 365 CON 351 and CON 365**	**Spring 2021**
CON 492C	**Seminar: Heavy Civil Project Management**	**Edit to prerequisites: CON 351 or CON 353; CON 365 CON 351 and CON 365**	**Spring 2021**
CON 492D	**Seminar: Commercial Project Management**	**Edit to prerequisites: CON 351 or CON 353; CON 365 CON 351 and CON 365**	**Spring 2021**

CON 492E	Seminar: Residential Project Management	Edit to prerequisites: <u>CON 351 or CON 353;</u> CON 365 <u>CON 351 and</u> CON 365	Spring 2021

Course Deactivations			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
<u>HDFS 320</u>	**Cognitive and Language Development**	**Not referenced in any programs or courses.**	**Fall 2020**
<u>LGER 250</u>	**German Language, Literature, Culture in Translation**	**AUCC 3B/GT-AH2 course. Not referenced in any programs or courses.** *Curriculum & Catalog Unit will submit a GT Pathways Course Removal form to CCHE.*	**Fall 2020**

Minor Changes to Existing Programs		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
<u>**ANTH-BIOZ-BA: Major in Anthropology, Biological**</u> **Anthropology Concentration**	**Updates to elective lists; replacing a general AUCC 3A requirement Sophomore year with 3 additional general Elective credits.**	**Fall 2020**
<u>**HDFS-ECPZ-BS: Major in Human Development and Family Studies, Early Childhood Professions Concentration**</u>	**Updates to Concentration elective list, including removal of HDFS 320** *(Course Deactivation above)*	**Fall 2020**
<u>**HDFS-HDEZ-BS: Major in Human Development and Family Studies, Human Development and Family Studies Concentration**</u>	**Updates to Concentration elective list, including removal of HDFS 320** *(Course Deactivation above)*	**Fall 2020**
<u>**HDFS-LEPZ-BS: Major in Human Development and Family Studies, Leadership and Entrepreneurial Professions Concentration**</u>	**Updates to Concentration elective list.**	**Fall 2020**
<u>**HDFS-PHPZ-BS: Major in Human Development and Family Studies, Pre-Health Professions Concentration**</u>	**Updates to Concentration elective list, including removal of HDFS 320** *(Course Deactivation above)*	**Fall 2020**
<u>**HDFS-PISZ-BS: Major in Human Development and Family Studies, Prevention and Intervention Sciences Concentration**</u>	**Updates to Concentration elective list.**	**Fall 2020**

Minutes approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 4/17/20.
Brad Goetz, Chair
Shelly Ellerby and Susan Horan, Curriculum & Catalog

BALLOT
Academic Faculty Nominations to Faculty Council Standing Committees
May 5, 2020

COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

		Term Expires
SHANE KANATOUS (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CNS	2023
AZER YALIN (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	COE	2023

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

		Term Expires
SVETLANA OLBINA (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CHHS	2023
MIKE WILKINS (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CAS	2023

COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES

		Term Expires
KELLIE ENNS (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CAS	2023

COMMITTEE ON NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

		Term Expires
PINAR OMUR-OZBEK (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	COE	2023
MARY VAN BUREN (Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)	CLA (TTF member)	2023

COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Term Expires

RICHARD EYKHOLT   CNS   2023
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

MARIE LEGARE   CVMBS   2023
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC AND FINANCIAL PLANNING

Term Expires

DAVID DANDY   COE   2023
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

Term Expires

JOSHUA SCHAEFFER   CVMBS   2023
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

Term Expires

ANIREDDY REDDY   CNS   2023
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

MO SALMAN   CVMBS   2023
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Term Expires

BRAD GOETZ   CAS   2023
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

DOREENE HYATT   CVMBS   2023
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

DIANE MARGOLF   CLA   2023
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)

BALLOT
Academic Faculty Nominations to University Committees
May 5, 2020

UNIVERSITY BENEFITS COMMITTEE
(4-year terms)

		Term Expires
HELEN BAER	Libraries	2024
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
KIMBERLY HENRY	CLA	2024
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
BOLIVAR SENIOR	CHHS	2024
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

DATE: May 7, 2020

TO: Faculty Council Tim Gallagher, Chair

FROM: Executive Committee

SUBJECT: Resolution to Support Student Demands for Equity and to Share Action and Accountability

THE FACULTY COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION REGARDING SUPPORT FOR STUDENT DEMANDS FOR EQUITY AND TO SHARE ACTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY BE ADOPTED BY FACULTY COUNCIL AS FOLLOWS:

Whereas, over the last five years, various student groups have called for actions on campus to promote well-being and learning at CSU;

Whereas, incidents have occurred that reflected bias, insensitivity, and disruptive behaviors, which have not been satisfactorily resolved;

Whereas, the Principles of Community have been adopted (2016) to guide CSU as a community of 'WE' characterized by inclusion, integrity, respect, service, and social justice;

Whereas, dialogue and learning depend on the 'WE' listening to each other, explaining what we know, and admitting what we don't know;

Whereas, CSU has codes and policies that identify rights and responsibilities to guide actions and behaviors and related processes for review, to complain and to grieve (these include, but are not limited to, disruptive behavior, discrimination, harassment, bullying) within the context of state and federal laws

Be it resolved that Faculty Council:

Acknowledges students' concerns;

Challenges the status quo and supports proactive efforts and accountability for continual improvements of the climate at CSU for all;

Calls upon our faculty peers to seek opportunities to learn of and lessen barriers to our and students' learning and well-being;

Collaborates with students, staff, and administrators to assure the Principles of Community become universally integrated into the 'what' and 'who' we are as CSU's community now and into the future

Assures that its annual reporting (Faculty Council and its committees) communicates progress and actions consistent with the Principles of Community and improvement of CSU's climate for all.

April 20, 2020

TO: Timothy Gallagher, Chair
              Executive Committee and Faculty Council

FROM: Brad Goetz, Chair
              University Curriculum Committee

SUBJECT: Revisions to the Colorado State University Academic Core Curriculum (AUCC) (As adopted by
              Faculty Council 12/1/98 and revised by Faculty Council 10/5/04, 10/2/07, and 11/6/18)

The University Curriculum Committee moves that Faculty Council adopt the proposed revisions to the language and requirements of the 'Colorado State University Academic Core Curriculum (AUCC) (As adopted by Faculty Council 12/1/98 and revised by Faculty Council 10/5/04, 10/2/07, and 11/6/18) as follows on the attachment.

PROPOSAL:

Create a new AUCC course category called AUCC 1C – Self, Community, World: Dialogue About Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity.

The creation will place 1C in a prominent position parallel to Intermediate Writing (1A) and Quantitative Reasoning (1B) that reflects its importance as a fundamental skill for success on our campus.
- And –
Require students to select one course focused on Global Awareness from categories AUCC 3A-3D or 1C
-And-
In a staged process, immediately move all current category "AUCC 3E – Diversity and Global Awareness" to fulfill 1C course demand as we form a faculty committee to craft the template for new courses that address both Diversity and Oral Communication SLOs and Content Criteria to fill 1C
-And-
Support departments as they evaluate existing courses and determine best positioning within the AUCC categories.
-And-
Eliminate the current category "AUCC 3E – Diversity and Global Awareness."

Timeframe:
Spring 2020 through Spring 2022

Rationale

CSU Climate Surveys, student petitions and demands, changing demographics among our student population, faculty expression of concern about how to navigate racially based or diversity related tensions in classroom contexts, and awareness of developmental stages that influence students in periods of significant life transition as they enter the university system all call for us to develop a set of courses that explicitly develop both skills of critical analysis of race/diversity related issues and inequities and skills to engage constructively in dialogue to learn.

Moving these courses to a prominent position in the AUCC and encouraging that they be taken early in a student's career will build a foundation that will be useful in every other CSU course as students continue forward.

Our university intends to prepare students for active engagement in their own societies and the world. Toward that end, we seek to require one course from the 1C category, focused predominantly on the US, while also requiring that students select at least one course from any other category in AUCC Category 3 that focus on global issues.

Our current 3E course offerings are largely global in focus and are not addressing the needs articulated by students. Even students who are not part of groups that crafted a petition or set of demands indicate that classroom climate needs to be improved. The content of many current 3E courses is not addressing the desired critical analysis of race, class, gender, sexuality, or the political, social and historical contexts contributing to inequities – and importantly, are not providing students' guidance in how to address these challenging issues and diverse perspectives about them through classroom based dialogue.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 31, 2020

TO: Tim Gallagher, Chair
            Executive Committee and Faculty Council

FROM: Steven Reising, Chair
            Committee on Faculty Governance

SUBJECT: Proposed revision to Section C.2.1.3.1 of the *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND
            ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*

The Committee on Faculty Governance moves Faculty Council adopt the following amendment:

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

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

C.2.1.3.1 Elected Members *(last revised ~~May 2, 2007~~ <u>May 5, 2020</u>)*

Each academic department and the Libraries shall elect one (1) representative. An additional number of representatives, equal approximately to ~~one-third (1/3) of the number of representatives elected from the departments and the Libraries~~ <u>45% of the number of academic departments and the Libraries</u>, shall be elected at large by and from the colleges and the Libraries as required to achieve, as nearly as practical, membership proportional to the number of ~~regular~~ full-time, ~~regular~~ part-time, and transitional <u>tenure track and tenured</u> faculty members in the colleges and Libraries.

All faculty representatives to the Faculty Council shall hold ~~regular~~ full-time, ~~regular~~ part-time, or transitional <u>tenure track or tenured</u> appointments and shall not hold an administrative appointment of more than half-time (0.5) at the level of assistant/associate dean or above. A faculty representative to the Faculty Council who becomes ineligible shall cease to hold this position.

<u>Rationale:</u>

The reasons for this change are:

1. The language needs to be clarified to eliminate the present ambiguity of what number is meant by "the number of representatives elected by the departments and the Libraries" by changing it to "the number of academic departments and the Libraries."

2. The primary goal of the changes is to maintain approximately equal proportional representation by representatives on Faculty Council of the faculty members in their units while keeping the total number of representatives in the neighborhood of 80 people, reflecting the historical range in size (72-81) of Faculty Council.

3. The proposed language removes ambiguity, and the proposed percentage (45%) achieves reasonably equitable proportional representation, while also approximately maintaining the current size of Faculty Council. Using a smaller percentage leads to much larger variation in proportional representation. Using a larger percentage would reduce variation in proportional representation, but only by fractions of individuals.

4. The proposed change will not affect the representation of any College or the Libraries at this time.

May 26, 2020

TO: Timothy Gallagher, Chair
             Executive Committee and Faculty Council

FROM: Brad Goetz, Chair
             University Curriculum Committee

SUBJECT: New Degree: Ph.D. in Music Therapy

The University Curriculum Committee moves Faculty Council adopt the following:

> **A new Ph.D. in Music Therapy, to be established effective Fall 2021** in the School of Music, Theatre, and Dance.

According to the request submitted:

Description:

The Ph.D. in Music Therapy emphasizes clinical practice, research, and higher education teaching to prepare future music therapy clinicians and educators. Students gain knowledge in evidence-based practice and the neuroscience of music and contextualize it based on a variety of clinical populations. Conduct research, draw from a breadth and depth of knowledge of clinical practice in teaching music therapy, use advanced methods of music therapy, and articulate and defend a personal philosophy, approach, and/or theory of music therapy. Graduates are equipped to work as advanced clinicians and/or as music therapy educators. Students enter the PhD program with a master's degree and board certification (or international equivalent) in music therapy.

Program Catalog Copy:

The Ph.D. in Music Therapy emphasizes clinical practice, research, and higher education teaching to prepare future music therapy clinicians and educators. Students gain knowledge in evidence-based practice and the neuroscience of music and contextualize it based on a variety of clinical populations. Graduates are equipped to work as advanced clinicians and/or as music therapy educators. Students enter the PhD program with a master's degree and board certification (or international equivalent) in music therapy. The program is offered on campus or online.

Rationale:

In proposing the Ph.D. program, the School of Music, Theatre, and Dance intends to focus on the study of music perception and production as it applies to music therapy treatment. Historically, the field of music therapy was solely based in social sciences; however, current findings in music neuroscience have increased the understanding of the impact of music on the brain. In particular, research performed at CSU and across the world has demonstrated that music and rhythm can have a direct and profound impact on human functioning in rehabilitation and habilitation. CSU has pioneered the development of techniques that apply music stimuli to motor, cognitive, and speech functioning, with results that have gained endorsement from the World Federation of Neurologic Rehabilitation.

The CSU faculty is uniquely suited to develop a Ph.D. focused in music therapy and neuroscience. The current faculty has collaborations with colleagues in human development, music education, early childhood, psychology, gerontology, communication studies, and occupational therapy. CSU's program is already well situated for a

Ph.D. program, with internationally known faculty and a fully functioning research center. The Ph.D. students and an online equivalency program would make CSU music therapy one of the largest programs in the US. With CSU's international recognition in music therapy, there is no other university with the resources for this Ph.D. program.

Today, over 80 colleges and universities in the United States offer undergraduate and graduate degree programs in music therapy. Of those academic institutions, only Temple University offers a Ph.D. in music therapy, with a specific focus in psychotherapy. Six other doctoral programs offer a Ph.D. in music education with emphasis on training in music therapy. Two additional programs offer Ph.D. in creative arts therapy, one with limited residency program (Lesley University; where students must attend for three weeks each summer). There are no universities offering a Ph.D. in Music Therapy with a focus in the neurosciences and no programs with an online offering similar to our proposed program. A degree program with an emphasis in the sciences that has online and resident options would be attractive given media attention on the effect of music on the brain and current research priorities of AMTA.

The CSU Ph.D. in Music Therapy will also impact the profession by providing an opportunity for doctoral education in individuals who wish to pursue a Ph.D. but have no local programs. At present, there are not enough individuals with a Ph.D. to fill available academic positions in music therapy. In 2018, there were 14 open Ph.D. level positions, of which four resulted in failed searches and five hired PhDs (one ABD, two new, and two from other universities). The rest of the positions hired master's-level individuals for these positions. In 2019, there are already 20 position announcements. Without qualified individuals filling Ph.D. positions, the profession will continue to lag in research and innovation. CSU is regularly contacted by Master's-level faculty who are interested in pursuing a Ph.D. due to job requirements to complete their education. Furthermore, this program would allow us to pursue new interdisciplinary research initiatives and partnerships across campus. We hope that we can expand our offerings and prepare future generations of educators and researchers that will advance the field of music therapy.

The request was reviewed and approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 4/10/2020.

Attachment

Gallagher,Tim

From: Rickard,Kathryn
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 4:31 PM
To: Gallagher,Tim
Subject: Ombuds Issues Summary

Dear Tim,

We appreciate your interest in the Ombuds office and your request for information on the types of issues we have handled as Ombuds over the past year. Kathy and I are able to share some information with you in this regard. As you are aware, the University Ombuds position was vacated in May 2018 (though Kathy continued in the Faculty Ombuds position) and I began serving as general University Ombuds on January 27, 2020.

Currently, we are using a common tracking system that the former university Ombuds instituted in January 2016. We are working to launch a new record management system this summer which will allow for a more robust report in the years ahead. We both believe the current system does not adequately represent our needs. While we currently can show the number of visitors and types of concerns, the current system fails to accurately reflect the amount of time that goes into each case. For instance, one visitor may result in a large number of follow-up appointments, facilitated conversations and mediations, collateral contacts with colleagues/Deans/Department Heads, and email/phone call correspondence, etc., and we currently have no tracking system for these contacts.

With that being said, we are happy to share information that we currently have. Kathy has been tracking data from January, 2016 to present. During her initial 16 months, she worked with 88 cases. Recently, Kathy worked with faculty cases during 2018/2019 (108) and also fielded a number (over 60) of non-faculty staff and admin pro cases during the general Ombuds vacancy. Her observations, along with my own general observations since January 27th, reflect the types of issues we describe below.

At the end of this fiscal year, Kathy and I will run a report on University and Faculty Ombuds cases (FY20) and will prepare a summary that can be shared with Faculty Council in late Fall 2020. We are committed to continuing to provide this type of summary information at the end of each fiscal year. Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.
Kind regards,
Melissa and Kathy

The following information is representative of the types of issues we have handled since the inception of the Faculty Ombuds role beginning January 2016 and including this past year. Given the lengthy vacancy of the University Ombuds role, the information is most representative of the work of the Faculty Ombuds.

In general, as measured through numbers of visits, diversity of faculty appearing at the office, and range of activities toward resolution that occurred, the Ombuds office appears to have been a valuable resource for faculty. As is the case in many institutions, numerous visitor concerns involved interactions with others in the work setting. For most visitors to the office, issues surrounded interpersonal disputes, or matters related to evaluation, respect or treatment by others. These exchanges involved those to whom the faculty member reports, as well as peers

with whom they regularly interact. Visitors associated with each of the colleges across Colorado State University, and within many varied departments, relayed such concerns. Bystanders' reports of poor treatment received by colleagues occurred in 7% of cases. This is consistent with reports through other universities, as are the collective accounts suggesting that respect and treatment were often lacking in interactions and processes. Career progression was often cited as a reason for seeking services at the office. Faculty recounted situations wherein they operated with insufficient and inconsistent feedback, and lack of clear expectations and criteria to measure themselves against. In this regard, there were several instances in which departmental code was in revision, unclear or nonexistent around criteria for progression. Other specific complaints regarding safety, services, varying forms of harassment, and temporary disability were raised. The office has provided feedback to supervisors and leaders at various levels regarding faculty concerns.

Description of Services Provided: When a visitor contacts the Faculty Ombuds office, the first step typically is to have an in-person, initial consultation to listen to the individual's concern, discuss options, refer to relevant policies and procedures, and plan next steps. At times, this allows the visitor to consider options and determine actions for themselves. Typically, there is a need for follow-up visits to clarify goals and options and determine if there is a role for the Ombuds to play going forward. With the visitor's permission, other offices or the visitor's department may be contacted to obtain more information or relay the person's concern in a neutral, objective way. The Ombuds often meets with other parties involved in the situation and engages in mediation and facilitated conversation or other appropriate intervention to resolve the visitor's concerns. When indicated, a referral to other offices or resources is provided (such as the Office of Equal Opportunity, University Grievance Officer, Human Resources, or the Employee Assistance Program for personal support).

Categories of Assistance Provided by the Faculty Ombuds (1/2016-1/2018; n=98 cases)
> #Individual Consultations ranged from 1-6 individual meetings with the visitor per case
> # Cases also involving Mediation/Facilitation meetings   35
> # Cases also involving Department/Unit consultations   27
> #Cases in which referrals(s) were made   25
> #Cases where contacted one or more additional person(s)/offices(s)   18
> #Cases where visitor was encouraged to refer others to Ombuds   12

The Categories and Sub-categories coded for faculty concerns: (144 concerns coded). In keeping with the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) Principles and Standards, no individuals' names, related documents, or detailed records are maintained on any individuals, contacts, cases or issues presented to the Ombuds. The following data are presented in aggregate form to identify possible patterns or trends that may eventually point to issues that need to be addressed within a broader context. The rubric used to categorize issues of concern is the Uniform Reporting Categories of the International Ombudsman Association. These nine broad categories are listed below, along with subcategories of issues *(Sub-categories in italics, and listed in descending order of occurrence for visitors to this office). It should be noted that one visitor may have noted concerns in more than one category.*

- Evaluative Relationships: (52 concerns raised)
Defined as concerns, issues, questions or inquiries arising between people in evaluative relationships (dean/department chair-faculty member, peer review groups-faculty member)
(Respect/Treatment, Performance Appraisal/Grading, Departmental Climate, Supervisory Effectiveness, Assignments and Schedules, Consultation, Equity of Treatment, Bullying and Mobbing, Disability, Reputation, Communication, Feedback, Priorities, Values, Beliefs, Trust/Integrity, Diversity-related, Retaliation)

- Peer and Colleague Relationships: (30 concerns raised)

Defined as concerns, issues, questions or inquiries involving colleagues or peers who do not have supervisory-employee relationship (faculty members with a department or conflict involving members of a faculty group)

(Respect/Treatment, Communication, Bullying and Mobbing, Priorities, Values, Beliefs, Reputation, Sexual Harassment, Trust/Integrity, Diversity Related)

- Career Progression and Development: (23 concerns raised)

Defined as concerns, issues, questions or inquiries about terminations, non-reappointment, tenure denial, annual reviews, added responsibilities, nature of changes in assignments

(Tenure/Position Security/Ambiguity, Career Progression, Career Development/Coaching/Mentoring, Involuntary Transfer/Change of Assignment, Position Elimination, Rotation and Duration of Assignment, Termination/Non-Renewal)

- Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance (12 concerns raised)

Defined as concerns, issues, questions or inquiries that could create legal risk for the organization or its members if not addressed

(Harassment, Privacy and Security of Information, Sexual Harassment, Disability Temporary or Permanent, Reasonable Accommodation, Business and Financial Practices, Intellectual Property Rights)

- Organizational, Strategic and Mission related: (8 concerns raised)

Defined as concerns, issues or questions that relate to an organization's mission, goals, objective and/or initiatives

(Leadership and Management, Organizational Climate, Communication, Interdepartmental/Interorganizational Work/Territory, Priority Setting and/or Funding, Strategic and Mission-Related/Strategic and Technical Management, Use of Positional Power/Authority)

- Compensation and Benefits: (7 concerns raised)

Defined as concerns, issues, questions or inquiries about the equity, appropriateness of employee compensation, benefits and other benefit programs.

(Compensation, Benefits, Retirement and Pension)

- Services, Administrative Issues: (6 concerns raised)

Defined as concerns, issues, questions or inquiries about services or administrative offices

(Administrative Decisions and Interpretation/Application of Rules)

- Values, Ethics and Standards (4 concerns raised)

Defined as concerns, issues, questions or inquiries about fairness of organizational values, ethics and/or standards, the application of related policies and/or procedures, or the need for creation or revision of policies, and/or standards

(Standards of Conduct, Policies and Procedures Not Covered in Other Broad Categories, Scientific Conduct/Integrity, Values and Culture)

Safety, Health and Physical Environment (2 concerns raised)

Defined as concerns, issues, questions or inquiries about safety and health, and related infrastructure

(Safety, Work Related Stress and Work-Life Balance)

Quick view of issues reported:
     <u>Top Issues Reported Across all Faculty (below 10% not reported below)</u>
     Evaluative relationships: (36% of issues)
     Peer and colleague relationships: (21% of issues)
     Career progression and development: (16% of issues)

<u>What the Ombuds heard-CSU-Specific concerns</u>: The following are specific, de-identified concerns shared by CSU faculty. Categories are collapsed, so that concerns may be conveyed while protecting individuals' identities.

<u>Evaluative relationships</u>-
     Most common concerns: performance appraisals/ratings; descriptive or summative reviews with little or no direction or criteria specified for determining progress; changing culture of the department, leaving individuals feeling misaligned with department priorities; lack of structured feedback on regular basis, lack of clarity on processes for expressing concerns; supervisors unwillingness or inability to respond to inquiries in a helpful manner; perceived lack of transparency in decision making; poor climate in department; lack of supervisor effectiveness (chair/administrator); poor mentoring.

<u>Peer and Colleague Relationships</u>-
     Most common concerns: poor treatment and unprofessional behaviors; disrespect, discounting, shunning, and harassment; cases of bullying or mobbing; lack of trust; poor communication; poor cooperation; bystander observation of peers being treated poorly by others; concern about diversity related discrimination and prejudice

<u>Career Progression and Development</u>-
     Most common concerns: lack of parity in evaluation toward promotion; additions to job responsibilities; unclear criteria for evaluation in code or in practice within departments; sudden termination; salary inequity

<u>Legal, Regulatory, Financial and Compliance</u>-
     Most common concerns: hostile work environment; harassment; bullying or mobbing; research misconduct

<u>*Safety, Health and Physical Environment</u>-
     Most common concerns: professional treatment leading to work stress; individuals not adequately trained in safety protocol; sick buildings and slow university response; conditions and safety of work areas, unclear institutional response or intervention to protect faculty from students perceived as being potentially dangerous or out of control
     *We believe that there may be a current uptick in these cases related to concerns of CSU essential employees and others since the Covid-related changes at CSU

<u>Services/Administrative Issues</u>-
     Most common concerns: preferential treatment by supervisors (department chairs) toward friends; perception that valued faculty (international or national visibility, with grants, high department or

university contributors) engage in inappropriate behavior with no meaningful consequences; looking the other way when misconduct or harassment occurs; administrators delaying response to issues raised; concerns that processes involved in response to complaints were laboriously slow, and that information was often inaccessible during the process; lack of clarity in how worker's compensation and medical leave are handled, and privacy relating to these issues

Organizational, Strategic and Mission Related-

Most common concerns: negative departmental or organizational/work group climates; concern about over-emphasis on research productivity, discounting diverse meaningful contributions

Values, Ethics and Standards-

Most common concerns: lack of attention to ethics code; lack of response to complaints of research misconduct; lack of accountability of department chairs for decisions; concerns over being perceived as sexually harassing

Compensation-

Most common concerns: benefits, often centering on medical/family leave, disability, perception of unfair application of policies, equivalent pay for work

Kathy

Kathryn M. Rickard, Ph.D.
Faculty Ombuds
316 General Services Building
1251 S. Mason St.
Fort Collins, CO 80523-6006

Department of Psychology
211 Behavioral Sciences Building
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1876