

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

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

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
May 3, 2022 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

Chair Doe: We have a slight change to the agenda. In conversation with Vice President for Inclusive Excellence Kauline Cipriani, we have elected to move that discussion item to the fall when we will also hear about the climate survey. Thanked Vice President Cipriani.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – May 3, 2022

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – September 6, 2022 – Location TBD – 4:00pm
2. Faculty Council SOURCE stories

Chair Doe: Reminded members that we publish SOURCE stories each month following the Faculty Council meeting. We are hoping that by doing these SOURCE stories that we are able to circulate around campus the work of Faculty Council.

3. Harry Rosenberg Award – Announcement of Winner

Andrew Norton: On behalf of the Faculty Council Executive Committee, would like to announce this year's recipient of the Harry Rosenberg Award. The winner is Brad Goetz. Congratulated Goetz. Goetz is receiving this award for his long record of service on Faculty Council and dedication in serving the University Curriculum Committee and guiding them through difficult and complicated work and making sure that our curriculum remains in alignment with state standards.

Brad Goetz: Thanked Norton. This is an honor and am happy to join the group of previous recipients. Thanked everyone for the award and ongoing support.

4. Poll – Virtual or In-Person meetings for 2022-2023

Chair Doe: We would like to poll interest in the platform for next year's meetings. Discussed the pros and cons of both formats. Noted that the difficulty of the chat has caused some frustration

because it gets lost in the raised hands and other comments. We will be attempting a different method of handling that today.

Sharon Anderson: Asked if there was a third option, where we could occasionally meet in person or virtually depending on the result of the poll.

Chair Doe: Thanked Anderson for the idea. Would like to avoid hybrid, but we could certainly do a mixture of in-person and virtual meetings. Requested vote in chat using Microsoft Forms.

Virtual meeting format approved for 2022-2023.

Chair Doe: Thanked members for the feedback. We will continue to remain virtual and will consider the idea of having one or two meetings in-person. Will discuss this further.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting – April 5, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to these minutes.

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – March 25, April 18, & 15, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any items to be pulled for further discussion from the University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Hearing none, consent agenda approved by unanimous consent.

E. ACTION ITEMS

Chair Doe: Indicated that we will be trying something different today to keep track of what is happening in the chat. We will ask that you use the chat to indicate your request to speak. Requested members indicate whether they are speaking in favor or against so we can balance the conversation. This is what we would do if we were meeting in person.

1. Election – Faculty Representatives to Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Steve Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, would like to move these 40 names for academic faculty nominations for Faculty Council standing committees. These are

twelve standing committees and staffing all committees, except for Executive Committee, which is done separately. Thanked everyone who volunteered to serve three-year terms.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising. Reminded members that no second is needed since this is coming from a standing committee. Asked if there was any discussion around this ballot.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further discussion or questions, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

2. Motion on Transfer Credit Limits – Committee on Teaching and Learning – Shawn Archibeque, Chair

Shawn Archibeque: The Committee on Teaching and Learning would like to move that CSU no longer limit the number of transfer credits from two-year institutions to 64, but rather will enforce the 42 upper-division credits and 30 upper-division and resident requirements to ensure that students have a major proportion of their coursework completed at CSU.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. Asked if there was any discussion around this item.

Brian Butki: Wondering what events or activity led up to this. It seems that 64 credits are standard. Not arguing this, just curious.

Archibeque: This is kind of a legacy policy from when there were 128-credit degree programs. We already have no limits on the number of credits from four-year institutions, so this would bring us in line with our peer institutions as well as our agreements with these institutions.

Archibeque: Prior to this motion, if the students were transferring credits from a two-year institution, they would face the 64-credit limit. The Registrar's Office essentially was going to have to make their best guess at which credits would be best to approve out of whatever number they had. While that may work when a student comes in, if they were to change their major or something, those may no longer be the best credits for the student, and the Registrar's Office would have to go back. That is not consistent with the rest of our policies, so this is just bringing everything in line with our existing policies.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. Asked if there was any further discussion or questions. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

3. Motion Regarding S/U Grading Policy – Committee on Scholastic Standards – Jill Putman, Associated Director for Outreach and Support Programs, CoSS Representative

Jill Putman: Stated that Alan Kennan is here to speak to this motion.

Alan Kennan: The Committee on Scholastic Standards would like to move that for currently enrolled undergraduate students with F grades from Spring 2020, Fall 2020, Spring 2021, and Summer 2021 terms will be automatically changed to U grades with the continued option for students to change U grades back to F grades upon request.

Kennan: These are semesters where S/U grading was already approved and all we are changing is the method of implementing the change from F to U.

Chair Doe: Thanked Kennan. Asked if there was any discussion around this motion.

Doreen Hyatt: Asked: Did this come from a reaction to COVID? Wondering why we would let students who have failed a class not fail a class.

Kennan: Yes, this was a COVID-related policy.

Chair Doe: Can provide some basic outline of the conversations around this. This went on semester after semester during the pandemic period. Initially there were emergency approvals that were done around this, and it eventually got to the point where we did not necessarily want to give U as an option, but there were students who had made the determination that they would use this option. During the semesters where they could, there was a good number of students, as the rationale explains, that did not know about this option and did not activate it. This is part of what this is attempting to remedy. Of the 2,500 students who received an F, 700 of those students are enrolled this spring. The concern is that the students who did not do it because of not understanding that it was an option. Asked if this answered Hyatt's question.

Hyatt: Yes. Just wondered about the automatically changing. Knew students had the option but did not realize this was not communicated to them enough.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any other questions or comments. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

4. Motion Regarding AUCC 1C – AUCC 1C Task Force

Steve Benoit: On behalf of the Faculty Council Ad Hoc Task Force on AUCC category 1C, move the approval of the changes to the description, content criteria, and the student learning outcomes for that category as shown in the agenda packet.

Benoit: The rationale for these changes is primarily to give faculty more freedom in their approaches to implementing 1C courses, as opposed to prescribing that 50% of their assessment would have to come from student dialogue. The goal is to allow faculty to design courses in a way appropriate to their discipline and their content, while still honoring the demands that the students gave us to bring this content into the core.

Ashby Butnor: Am going to give a quick presentation of the proposed changes. In May 2020, the Faculty Council approved the creation of the AUCC 1C category of Self, Community, World, with dialogue about diversity, inclusion and equity. With the creation of this new category and this new student requirement was the elimination of another category of Diversity and Global Awareness, which was category 3E. Faculty Council approved the requirement that student select one course on global awareness from category 3A-3D, so in effect there was a splitting of category 3 with diversity, equity and inclusion moving to 1C and recognizing it as a fundamental competency and have global awareness courses migrating into category 3 of the AUCC and getting that global awareness designation. Noted that there has been an approved three-year extension to the original timeframe.

Butnor: Explained the movement of the courses into the appropriate categories.

Butnor: We have been meeting with faculty and chairs across campus. Showed members various examples of courses being proposed to populate 1C. This category will need to be populated over the next six semesters, supported by funding through the Provost's Office.

Butnor: Returned to the history of this category. In October 2020, Faculty Council approved a shortening of the name to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. In April 2021, there was dialogue-centric language added to 1C, including the 50% of the grade being based on dialogue, dialogue being added to the content criteria and the addition of two dialogue-focused student learning outcomes. That is really where the focus of our recommended changes are.

Butnor: About six months ago, this task force was created to be a faculty-driven committee. It has representatives from five colleges. The charge of the task force was to define the curriculum and pedagogical expectations, which was discussed at the April 22nd special session. We also discussed the implementation process and course development funding and professional development opportunities that would be available.

Butnor: Walked members through the recommended changes as seen in the agenda packet.

Chair Doe: Thanked Butnor and Benoit. Asked members to indicate their wish to speak in the chat and whether they will be speaking for or against this motion to help us provide a balanced back and forth.

Peter Jan van Leeuwen: Had a question about the layout on page 59 of the agenda packet. It seems confusing. Wondering if someone can clarify the layout or why it is presented this way.

Chair Doe: Clarified that the section being referred to appears under "Student Learning Outcomes" with the cross-outs afterwards. Asked: Is that correct?

van Leeuwen: Confirmed. It looks a bit messy or that items are missing. Stated that there is a bullet point a, but no further ones.

Chair Doe: Can understand the confusion. Asked Goetz if he could provide any clarification on how this section appears.

Goetz: Stated that the single bullet point could go away. That a bullet point refers back to the learning outcomes in the state mandated language. It is not necessary here without the rest of the list, and we can work with that if that were something to be changed. Probably was an error as we pulled this all together, but it could be removed. [Parliamentarian indicated offline that a typo can be corrected without a motion or any additional actions.]

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Have a request for clarification. In response to section pointed out by van Leeuwen, believe that is usually considered as a curatorial change and could probably be fixed without a big fuss.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked the task force for their willingness to remove the word “domestic” in the current wording. Would like to also understand how the guidance committee will be shaped and expressed hope that it would be inclusive in its scope. Would also like clarification about if there will be any issues on the side of the institution if we end up providing classes to be taught in a language that is not English. Asked: Is English the only language that the guidance committee will accept, or is the institution okay with courses being developed in any of the other languages? Requested that this question be reflected in the minutes so we don’t have to litigate this question later.

Goetz: Believe the section being referred to here is the underlined area that states that 1C must base the final grade on writing, etc. It does not imply a language, so it does not restrict languages at this point. Sense is that we would have to see a proposal come through the process to establish whether or not it would be suitable for a category in the AUCC. One thing to remember is that the AUCC coursework is available to and required of all students, so that would be part of the decision-making process. Right now, it does not restrict language, but cannot answer for the University’s perspective on that.

Pedros-Gascon: Requested to respond. Understanding is that in this institution, the departments have the capacity of setting a set of expectations of who can enter in some classes. For example, they could create the expectation that a course be specifically catering to heritage speakers of Spanish. Not everyone is a heritage speaker of Spanish, so that would be discriminating, in the sense that it is catering to a specific group with specific needs. Would like to understand if this is something that is going to be considered, or if the feeling is that any person in the whole institution needs to be able to register for 1C, which would then mean that though there is no definition of language, there is a clear understanding that it can only be taught in English.

Chair Doe: Would go on record to say that understanding is that the language here is not to rule out any particular language. If there is a need to discuss this further, heard from Goetz that maybe we would need a different proposal where the membership is able to consider what is being discussed here, or the University Curriculum Committee would. Gave personal opinion: See nothing in the language here that would prevent 1C courses from being offered in any language. This does not seem to rule out that possibility.

Anderson: Requested clarification. Asked: Would regular grades of A, B, C, etc. be used for this class, or could a student opt for an S or a U grade? Wondering if a student has a different view

and that becomes an issue in the discussion, grades can be subjective. Curious about what the grading will look like.

Michelle Foster: Can answer this question. Introduced herself as a member of the task force and the Assistant Dean of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion for the College of Health and Human Sciences. Have been speaking to Matt Hickey about this because we wanted to make sure that as these classes were designed, they are not forcing anybody into a particular opinion. It is supposed to be about dialogue. As long as there is dialogue and expressing yourself in different ways, there is a chance to discover more. It should not be that there is a preference to one opinion over the other. There should be open and welcome opinions to everything.

Moti Gorin: Would like to speak in favor of the motion. There has been a lot of discussion about these details and what we see in front of us is preferable to the draft we had seen before. Thinks it is a good idea to adopt these changes. Would like to also register a general concern about the procedure around this. Stated that this does not have to do with the task force or this particular measure, but rather in May of 2020 we were presented with a vote on whether to get rid of 3E and invent this new competency. If you go back and look at those minutes, you will see that there is zero discussion. This is a major change and there are some significant complications and worries about it. The point is that we as a faculty never had a discussion about how best to accommodate and respond to climate concerns on campus and the student demands on campus. We instead got a top-down suggestion about 1C, and we rubber stamped it. There was no discussion and now we are talking about the details. Just wanted to register that as a concern.

Chair Doe: Thanked Gorin. Stated that there is a bit of difference in opinion about how much discussion occurred prior to that meeting. Not here to make any particular argument about that. Noted that there was no discussion at the Faculty Council meeting, as noted in the record. Asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Silvia Canetto: Requested that anywhere it says “diverse perspectives” be changed to instead say “a diversity of perspectives.” If we call something other than the so-called mainstream “diverse”, it reinforces the mainstream as the ordinary, the natural, the central, and then everything else is exotic and to be explained. Since we are encouraging dialogue, think that we should use the language “a diversity of perspectives” instead.

Chair Doe: Thanked Canetto. Asked: Would you like to make a motion to amend?

Canetto: Move that wherever that language appears, we have “a diversity of perspectives.”

Joseph DiVerdi: Seconded Canetto’s motion.

Chair Doe: Wrote motion into the chat so we have it on record. Noted that Pedros-Gascon indicated it appears thirteen times in this document. Asked if there was any discussion around the motion to amend.

Vice Provost Kelly Long: Pointed out that the language “diverse perspectives” is specified in the student learning outcomes that are part of the state general transfer agreement. We are required

to use those verbatim in any learning outcome articulation for a general transfer agreement course.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost Long. That is very important. Will have to call this motion out of order. We do not have the capacity to change the language that is provided by the state or agreed to by the state. Perhaps there will be another opportunity for faculty where that language is discussed and maybe the change could occur at that time.

Canetto: Asked what would need to be done to change this. Think it is very problematic.

Chair Doe: Unfortunately we cannot do anything to make it happen today, because this is state-mandated language. We can make a note of this and down the road, we could go as faculty to meetings where the language around state requirements occur. This is the opportunity to get involved and to let your representatives get involved to help with this. Those are things that happen at the state level, and am not aware when such a meeting might occur again. Reminded members that we are back to the original motion since this motion to amend has been called out of order.

Mike Antolin: Request for clarification. Know we are back to the original motion, but question about motion to amend. Having searched this document, there are thirteen occurrences of the term “diverse perspectives.” Asked: Does all of this document refer to teaching standards and thus has to follow the state language, or are there particular places where Canetto’s wording would make sense and not change our following state standards?

Chair Doe: That is a good question. The student learning outcomes have to be verbatim, but if there are other locations in the document where we see this language outside of the student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes are driven by the state and they are threaded throughout this document. What we would need to discover is whether there are any other locations outside of these student learning outcomes where those words exist.

Vice Provost Long: Commented in the chat that was part of a General Transfer agreement between all state institutions of higher ed (community college and 4-year), we gather faculty to discuss, debate, and agree upon language for outcomes and content criteria that all institutions agree to implement. This is part of assuring a standard and creating common transfer opportunities for students.

Chair Doe: Went through document to provide examples of student learning outcomes and content criteria. These are things that have been approved at the state level.

Norton: Posted links to the [Competencies](#) and [Content Criteria](#) requirements for Guaranteed Transfer in the chat.

Butnor: We had a lot of discussion around this in the task force. Asked: Given that 1C is a CSU category, then can the content criteria be changes just as the dialogue was added? Asked: Why is it the case that we cannot clarify this language in the first bullet?

Chair Doe: Think we have agreed that the transferability of the course has to do with the student learning outcomes. Therefore the content criteria are an invention. Asked Goetz for clarification.

Goetz: Indicated that the one bullet point being referred to by Butnor on page 58 could be changed. That does not make available the changes to the other thirteen in the document. This one bullet point could be changed because the content criteria for category 1C based on the state-mandated language will be accomplished as noted in the note above that the AUCC 1C category is aligned with the following gtPathways categories. So by addressing those categories, the state-mandated language will be met and the words for that one bullet point could be changed. Noted that we have courses in the AUCC that are already referring to that former language. Wanted to clarify the state's language. Indicated where "diverse perspectives" appears. Indicated that we are not recommending a change for this action item.

Steve Benoit: Asked in the chat: Can amendments be made to language that was not part of the additions/strikeouts of the main motion?

Chair Doe: Our Parliamentarian states that amendments can be provided for sections that are also being amended. It is possible we can put Canetto's motion back in order and amend the language in that particular section. Would need a new motion to amend that specific area.

John Slater: Asked in the chat: What is the scale of the problem related to courses potentially not transferring? Asked: In other words, if some of our courses don't transfer, how many students are negatively affected?

Goetz: Sense is that it would not affect the transferability because of the six bullet points listed here. No matter the course, it is going to meet that state-mandated language from GT-AH1, GT-AH2, GT-AH3, GT-SS1, GT-SS2, and GT-SS3. That would be signed off on by someone in every unit prior to the gtPathways declaration of the course.

Vice Provost Long: Commented in the chat that she didn't think it would impact transfer, although in the original implementation, we were directed to use verbatim language.

Chair Doe: Thanked Goetz. Requested members pause to allow chat to clear for new motion. Wrote new motion for Canetto in the chat to ensure it is accurate. Motion should state "Motion to amend the language in the content criteria under Diversity and Global Awareness to say 'explore a diversity of perspectives' instead." Asked Canetto if this captured her motion.

Canetto: Confirmed.

DiVerdi: Second Canetto's new motion.

Chair Doe: Asked for any questions or comments about this motion.

Vice Provost Long: We could present a rationale to the state that "diversity of perspectives" is aiming toward the same end included in the language "diverse perspectives."

Gorin: Asked a question of Vice Provost Long in the chat: Are you speaking about the one instance of “diverse perspectives” or all of them?

Vice Provost Long: Responded to Gorin in the chat. Mean wherever student learning outcomes are specified. Expressed hope that we could explain to anyone from the Colorado Commission on Higher Education that we are capturing the intent of the student learning outcomes with this new language.

Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia: Asked: Do we have the authority to change what was mandated by the state? Not in favor of changing the thirteen possible cases because the language may differ in the different locations. If we are to take that approach, should go one by one.

Chair Doe: Do not think that is the motion. This motion is purely for the one location, because that is the only location that would not have implications for the application of the state-mandated language. The other locations are not being considered.

Antolin: Expressed support for this new language. This is inclusive language that is saying we are open to all perspectives as opposed to just something that may be considered diverse relative to whatever the majority is.

Gorin: Requested clarification. Canetto introduced the motion to change the thirteen instances where it says “diverse perspectives” to now say “a diversity of perspectives.” We then called it out of order because the state-mandated language has to be verbatim. We now have this one instance where we can change it. Asked Vice Provost Long: Wherever student learning outcomes are specified, could we now entertain that motion? Thought comment suggested that this could be changed without threatening any student’s ability to transfer. If that is the case, think Canetto will want to re-introduce original motion. Would like some clarification on this.

Vice Provost Long: Think we would be safest if we leave the language as it is specified by the state where we are listing content criteria or learning outcomes. Am doubtful that most students and people reading on the end will even have awareness of the difference that we are articulating between “diversity of perspectives” and “diverse perspectives.”

Chair Doe: Think we are trying to keep our focus on 1C. If we are going to get into a conversation about every instance in the AUCC core around use of this language, we may not only have a state problem but would also want to think about the implications of such a change. It also lies a bit out of our focus for today’s conversation. Brought members back to motion as it is written and suggested we move ahead unless there are strong objections.

Antolin: Move to call the question.

Motion to call the question approved by a 2/3 vote.

Chair Doe: We now move to vote on the motion to amend as presented by Canetto. Requested members vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion to amend the language in the 1C content criteria under the heading “Diversity” to say “a diversity of perspectives” instead of “diverse perspectives” approved.

Chair Doe: We now move back to the original motion. Asked if there was any other discussion or questions. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion to approve revisions to AUCC 1C category approved.

F. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Provost Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: Thanked everyone for their dedication throughout the semester and academic year. It has been a wonderful year, and wanted to thank everyone for their efforts.

Provost Pedersen: Congratulated our new University Distinguished Professors and University Distinguished Teaching Scholars:

- Debbie Crans, University Distinguished Professor
- Temple Grandin, University Distinguished Professor
- Kathleen Galvin, University Distinguished Professor
- Wes Kenney, University Distinguished Professor
- Susan van den Heever, University Distinguished Professor
- Meena Balgopal, University Distinguished Teaching Scholar

Provost Pedersen: We also have some student Fulbright Scholars. We have Jenna Biedscheid, Keelan Kenny, and Natalie Montecino. They have received grants from the U.S. Department of State and the William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board. We also are learning that some faculty have received them, so we will be reporting on that in the fall.

Provost Pedersen: We have some good news. Our Clark building received state legislature and governor approval for \$38 million for the expansion transformation. This is the first installment of an anticipated three-phase partnership with the state. The total renovation will run about \$120 or \$130 million and we have received an additional \$11 or \$12 million through gifts. Congratulated Dean Ben Withers and the efforts of others for working on this important project and get funding for this needed renovation of Clark. This is a building that is not only home to the College of Liberal Arts and most of its departments, but it serves about 70% of our undergraduate students every year with so many of the core curriculum classes. Seven or eight academic colleges teach courses in Clark, It is the most heavily utilized building on campus, so this is very exciting and long overdue.

Provost Pedersen: Encouraged members to read the [Provost Report Addendum](#) to read more updates from the colleges and other units.

Provost Pedersen: We are in the middle of having candidates on campus for our Dean searches. This includes the Dean for the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Science, as well as the Dean for the Warner College of Natural Resources. We will be finishing these up in the next week or two.

Provost Pedersen: We are having a retreat on our student success initiative on May 20th and will be summarizing that and sending out a newsletter to share what is happening with our student success initiative.

Provost Pedersen: In terms of enrollment, we are looking really good for fall. Currently we have a little over 6,000 students that have confirmed, which is a 6% increase in confirmations from this time last year. Deposits are at 96% of our goal. Congratulated the admissions team and thanked them for all their hard work. We will be spending the summer getting a breakdown of the data and working with colleges and departments to let them know numbers and planning.

Chair Doe: There is a question for Provost Pedersen before we move to the Academic Master Plan presentation.

Mary Van Buren: Glad to hear that Clark is finally going to be renovated. Wondering what the administration is planning to do for the people who work inside Clark building and specifically how our depressed wages will be addressed.

Provost Pedersen: Clarified if the first question was about the relocation during the transition.

Van Buren: No, specifically asking about what the administration is planning to do with regard to the very low wages of those who work in the Clark building.

Provost Pedersen: Thanked Van Buren for the clarification. We are working to address all our faculty and staff across campus, and this is a really important priority. We have been able to put in 3%, and we realize the impact of growing inflation in our area across the nation. This does not really offset the cost of living at all, and we recognize it is much higher than what we have. We are continuing to move forward in our evaluations of all our administrative professional staff as well as our faculty to look at competitiveness. We have detailed breakdowns and are waiting for the AON study for the administrative professionals. We have our data for our faculty. Our goal is to address those that are the lowest paid as soon as we have an approved budget. We will then have an idea of how much we can start to tackle this year and will continue to address it in the years coming forward. We will have a more detailed plan as soon as we know what our budget is. We recognize that this is an important issue and we plan to address it. When we have more information, will share that will all of you.

Chair Doe: We have one follow-up before we move on.

Anders Fremstad: Wondering if there is a plan to raise base pay. Think our non-tenure track faculty colleagues are earning \$15,000 less than average country-wide. Asked: Are we going to be involved in this plan or are we waiting to hear from someone about what will happen? Wondering if we will be engaged in this.

Provost Pedersen: We have done analysis for all the faculty. We have looked at different categories and have evaluated based on the CUPA data where we compare across 61 different R1 institutions. We have equated the total amount that it will take. It will take about \$11.2 million to

bring us up to about 98% of our peers. We have looked at what it will take to get us to 95% or 97%. Noted that this does not include our administrative professionals, since we are still waiting on that data. Have had one meeting with the Deans where this data was shared and stated that we need to come up with a philosophy of where we want to start. Once we have a budget, think it would be a good idea to bring this back to the Deans to have a conversation about the process. We want to make sure we engage all of you in this conversation so everybody is transparent about what the priorities will be and how we will be approaching this.

Fremstad: Commented in the chat with a follow up. Think that we should focus on raising the base pay of our lowest-paid colleagues (and addressing wage compression) rather than some measure of “market competitiveness.”

Gorin: Expressed agreement for Fremstad’s comment in the chat. Would say “prioritize”, though, since market competitiveness matters also.

Provost Pedersen: Expressed appreciation for Fremstad’s and Gorin’s comments in the chat. Believe we are looking at priority for the lowest-paid colleagues/staff.

Fremstad: Thanked Provost Pedersen in the chat. We look forward to working with the Administration to create a comprehensive plan.

Debora Nunes: Asked in the chat: Are graduate workers (GTAs, GRAs, Ras) included in that study about how much it would require for CSU to match stipends with peer institutions?

Vice Provost Susan James: Responded to Nunes in the chat. Stated that the Graduate School has been leading that analysis.

Provost Pedersen: Introduced Linda Dalton and Linda Nagle.

- a. Academic Master Plan Presentation – Linda Dalton, Linda Nagle, and Andrea Duffy

Linda Nagel: Thanked Provost Pedersen and Faculty Council for giving us time to share a brief update on the Academic Master Plan. Explained the timeline for the Academic Master Plan. This has been a highly engaged process over the past nine months and has included broad engagement across campus. The Academic Master Plan is tightly linked to Courageous Strategic Transformation as well.

Nagel: In Fall of 2021, we focused on the academic direction for CSU. We had an academic forum in October and then departments, colleges, centers, and schools across campus were engaged through a template where we captured a tremendous amount of information, data, and ideas. We also conducted two open forums as part of the Courageous Strategic Transformation open forums. The product of all this effort was a Phase One report, which is available on our [website](#). This report identified academic themes for the University.

Nagel: In Spring of 2022, we focused on demographics and education, research engagement, and particularly with opportunities moving forward. This also included engagement across departments, colleges, and other units across campus. We produced a Phase Two report, and in this report, we identified aspirations for the institution.

Nagel: We are currently in Phase Three, where we are developing the plan. We are refining the aspirations and strategies. We conducted a couple open forums in April, which engaged over 200 people and we captured a lot of great ideas. This summer, we will be changing and focusing on enrollment goals.

Nagel: Some of the academic themes that have emerged as part of this process came directly from academic department and unit input. The labels and definitions of the themes have evolved based on comments from the Advisory Committee and all of the open forums. These themes are interdisciplinary and intended to be collaborative. They also map with Courageous Strategic Transformation, under Innovation Priority 3.3. The Academic Master Plan is really providing the details behind those strengths and those pillars.

Linda Dalton: Will talk about the five aspirations that have come out of the Academic Master Plan process. Will explain how each of these connects to the Courageous Strategic Transformation, because these processes run parallel and are intertwined.

Dalton: This first aspiration speaks to strengthening CSU's recognition and building on the reputation the University already has. In future branding efforts, want the University to get full recognition of its world-class education and particularly as a University that cares about its students, employees, and the community.

Dalton: The next aspiration addresses the seven themes that Nagel discussed.

Dalton: The third aspiration speaks to a diverse array of learners and educators. This speaks not just to the students, but to the entire community and reinforces the first goal in the Courageous Strategic Transformation, people and culture, by stressing the importance of the University community preparing itself to serve a broader array of learners. It is wide-ranging and includes a lot of the curriculum discussions like the one we had today.

Dalton: The fourth aspiration looks at student experiential learning in all of its guises, whether it is through research, creative artistry, various kinds of community engagement. It emphasizes the importance of student success and preparing students for their futures as individuals in society as well as in their careers. This also connects with the Courageous Strategic Transformation goal of impact by explicitly connecting students to the impact of CSU as an academic institution.

Dalton: Finally, underlying all of this, is course indisciplinaryity and collaboration, which across all of the academic programs, research, creative artistry and engagement are critical. The last aspiration addresses the important of having support structures and systems in place to reward this kind of work, especially the kind of innovation that occur at the cross sections between traditional disciplines and fields.

Dalton: The plan report will include a discussion of the process we have been through so that we have documentation of the involvement. It will also include background information that came from both phases of the process on the trends from Phase One and the demographics from Phase Two. The bulk of the plan is the aspirations and strategies at a similar level of detail as the Courageous Strategic Transformation. When we work with our Advisory Committee, we will be developing some priorities out of those. This will lead us to creating the implementation framework where we can go with the priorities. One of the aspects of this plan is assigning leadership responsibilities for each of the strategies. It will also include a schedule of items and what might be able to be started on immediately and which will have to wait. Stated that there is time to still comment through this week through the website.

Nagel: Thanked Dalton. Directed members' attention the website, where all the work we have listed today is posted. It has all the reports, aspirations and the drafts, as well as all the slide presentations we have given throughout the year. As Dalton indicated, we are inviting feedback until May 6th. Encouraged members to go to the website to provide any feedback on any of the themes, aspirations, and processes. Thanked everyone for their attention. We feel this is an exciting opportunity for the University and we are looking forward to seeing this implemented.

Chair Doe: Thanked Nagel and Dalton for being here. We are keenly interested in the Academic Master Plan and appreciate the opportunity to hear about it and be involved as we move forward.

Provost Pedersen: Encouraged everyone to go read the plan. The team has been careful to show every connection to our Courageous Strategic Transformation. Assured that this is a foundational plan and an integral part of our Courageous Strategic Transformation. Prioritization will be an important part of this and decide which pieces we will do first. This includes compensation for our faculty and staff and recognition for them, which we know will be a high priority. Thanked Nagel and Dalton for their leadership on this.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Went to look at the Academic Master Plan feedback. Stated that it is requiring the name and complete affiliation of the people providing feedback. Usually, this kind of feedback is anonymous. This one is not, and it may not facilitate the engagement of people who feel critically of the Academic Master Plan but may not want to be singled out as the ones who are complaining about it. Wondering why this information is being required for feedback.

Dalton: Asked if Pam Jackson could speak to this, as she set up the comment. Can probably explain how this works.

Pam Jackson: Indicated that Pedros-Gascon is right, we usually have them set up where they are optional to submit. Not sure why this one was set up this way. Believe we asked the web team to set it up, and often this is the format they use. Can have that taken off. Especially for something like this, we allow comment without that information for exactly the reasons stated by Pedros-Gascon. We will go in and have that changed.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if the deadline for submitting could be extended. Requested that an email be sent letting people know that that information is no longer being required, and have this extended a week so that people who chose not to submit for that reason can have the chance to do so if they wish.

Jackson: Yes, we can do that.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions or comments, thanked Dalton and Nagel for being here to present the Academic Master Plan.

G. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: This is our last Faculty Council meeting of the year. Wanted to thank Norton for serving as Vice Chair and Melinda Smith for serving as our Board of Governors Representative. Smith will be moving into the Vice Chair position, and Norton will be moving to the Board of Governors Representative position. Wanted to also thank Amy Barkley for her steadfast and exceptional work on behalf of Faculty Council. Wanted to also thank Lola Fehr who has been in our meetings serving as Parliamentarian and is such an important role.

Chair Doe: To connect the Academic Master Plan and Courageous Strategic Transformation, think faculty are always eager to be involved at all levels and stages of such important guiding visions. Know we will all be eager to see how this all plays out. Know that we seek meaningful involvement and trust that we will have this in the future. Called for this in the SOURCE story in the “5 Minutes with Sue Doe” piece that was published.

Chair Doe: Have been working with a variety of people on a committee called the Retention and Recruitment of Minoritized Faculty and Staff Committee. It was a piece of the former Commission on Diversity. When that group was disbanded, this committee decided to continue meeting. Happy to report that some progress has been made there and more attention will be paid in the future to the importance of that question and that issue. Retaining and recruiting faculty and staff who are representing a diverse population is a matter of key importance. It is not just about getting people here, but about supporting them once they are here as well and finding ways to do that is so important. Asked members who have thoughts about that to feel free to reach out and would be happy to take them forward.

Chair Doe: The surveys for our University Grievance Officer and our President have been more or less completed at this point and reports are being drawn up. Expressed hope that we will be able to share with the Faculty Council a high-level report on what these surveys showed. The Faculty Council Executive Committee is hoping to meet with President and is scheduled to meet with the University Grievance Officer to give feedback to both parties about what faculty are saying and how those entities might consider responding.

Chair Doe: We are working diligently to figure out the status of a committee called the University Policy Review Committee. This is a committee that represents all of the employee

groups and has a role in reviewing policies as they come across. We are hoping to figure out how to get that committee going properly and be utilized in meaningful ways.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

No report at this time.

H. DISCUSSION

1. Office of Inclusive Excellence Updates – Kauline Cipriani, Vice President for Inclusive Excellence

Discussion item postponed until Fall 2022 meeting.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for a wonderful year. Expressed appreciation for everyone’s participation and involvement. Wished members a good rest of the semester and a good summer.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

- Sue Doe, Chair
- Andrew Norton, Vice Chair
- Melinda Smith, BOG Representative
- Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING
2021-2022

Chair: Sue Doe

Vice-Chair: Andrew Norton

Executive Assistant: Amy Barkley

BOG Representative: Melinda Smith

Professional Registered Parliamentarian: Lola Fehr

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Dawn Thilmany (substituting for Stephan Kroll, on sabbatical Spring 2022)	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2022
Jennifer Martin	Animal Sciences	2024
Jane Stewart	Agricultural Biology	2024
Kelly Curl	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2022
<u>Jim Ippolito</u>	Soil and Crop Sciences	2023
Steve Fonte (substituting for Marco Costanigro, on sabbatical 2021-2022)	College-at-Large	2023
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2022
Andrew Norton	College-at-Large	2023

Health and Human Sciences

Ruoh-Nan (Terry) Yan	Design and Merchandising	2024
Raoul Reiser	Health and Exercise Science	2022
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2022
Lisa Daunhauer	Human Development and Family Studies	2023
Erin Arneson	Construction Management	2023
Aaron Eakman	Occupational Therapy	2023
Sharon Anderson	School of Education	2024
Shannon Hughes	School of Social Work	2022
Brian Butki	College-at-Large	2024

Business

Bill Rankin	Accounting	2023
<u>John Hoxmeier</u>	Computer Information Systems	2024
<u>John Elder</u>	Finance and Real Estate	2022
Rob Mitchell	Management	2024
<u>Jonathan Zhang</u>	Marketing	2023

Engineering

Peter Jan van Leeuwen	Atmospheric Science	2024
Margarita Herrera-Alonso	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2022
<u>Hussam Mahmoud</u>	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2024
Ali Pezeshki	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2022
Kirk McGilvray	Mechanical Engineering	2023
<u>Thomas Bradley</u>	Systems Engineering	2023
<u>Sybil Sharvelle</u>	College-at-Large	2023
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2022
<u>J. Rockey Luo</u>	College-at-Large	2022

Liberal Arts

Mary Van Buren	Anthropology & Geography	2023
Jason Bernagozzi	Art	2022
Morgan Johnson	Communication Studies	2022
Anders Fremstad	Economics	2024
Tony Becker	English	2023
Albert Bimper	Ethnic Studies	2022
Maria Del Mar Lopez-Cabrales	Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	2022
Jared Orsi	History	2023
<u>Michael Humphrey</u>	Journalism and Technical Communication	2023
Wes Kenney	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2022
Moti Gorin	Philosophy	2022
Marni Berg	Political Science	2024
Tara Opsal	Sociology	2022
<u>Ajean Ryan</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2023

(on sabbatical Spring 2022)

Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2023
Emily Morgan	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Lisa Langstraat</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2024
Allison Goar	College-at-Large	2024
Abigail Shupe	College-at-Large	2024
John Carlo Pierce	College-at-Large	2024

Natural Resources

Randall Boone	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2023
Chad Hoffman	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2024
<u>Yoichiro Kanno</u>	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2024
William Sanford	Geosciences	2023
Alan Bright	Human Dimensions of Natural Resources	2023

Natural Sciences

Olve Peersen	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	2022
Mike Antolin	Biology	2024
Rob Paton	Chemistry	2023
Ross McConnell	Computer Science	2022
Emily Hardegree-Ullman	Physics	2024
Silvia Canetto	Psychology	2022
Ann Hess	Statistics	2022

(substituting for Mary Meyer, on sabbatical 2021-2022)

<u>Yongcheng Zhou</u>	Mathematics	2023
Alan Van Orden	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Anton Betten</u>	College-at-Large	2022
Brad Conner	College-at-Large	2022
James Liu	College-at-Large	2023

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

DN Rao Veeramachaneni	Biomedical Sciences	2022
<u>Kevin Haussler</u>	Clinical Sciences	2022
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2023
Tony Schountz	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
<u>Candace Mathiason</u>	College-at-Large	2022
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2023
Doreene Hyatt	College-at-Large	2022
<u>Christianne Magee</u>	College-at-Large	2022
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2023
John Rosecrance	College-at-Large	2023
Sheryl Magzaman	College-at-Large	2023

University Libraries

Linda Meyer	Libraries	2022
--------------------	-----------	------

Ex Officio Voting Members

Sue Doe	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2022
Andrew Norton	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2022
Melinda Smith	BOG Faculty Representative	2022
Steven Reising , Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2022
<u>Shane Kanatous</u> , Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2022
<u>Jerry Magloughlin</u> , Chair	Committee on Libraries	2022
Jenny Morse , Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Marie Legare , Chair	Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty	2022
Melinda Smith , Chair	Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education	2022
Alan Kennan , Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2022
<u>James Graham</u> , Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2022
Shawn Archibeque , Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2022
Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia , Chair	Committee on University Programs	2022
Brad Goetz , Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2022
<u>Susan (Suellen) Melzer</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
Christine Pawliuk	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Leann Kaiser	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
<u>Jamie Neilson</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
<u>Leslie Stone-Roy</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Mary Van Buren	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
Steve Benoit	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Sean Bryan	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Pinar Omur-Ozbek	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023

Ex Officio Non-Voting Members

Joyce McConnell	President
Ann Claycomb	Chief of Staff
Mary Pedersen	Provost/Executive Vice President
Blake Naughton	Vice President for Engagement & Extension
Yolanda Bevill	Interim Vice President for Enrollment and Access
Diana Prieto	Vice President for Equity, Equal Opportunity & Title IX
Susan James	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Kauline Cipriani	Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
Brandon Bernier	Vice President for Information Technology
Kathleen Fairfax	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Alan Rudolph	Vice President for Research
Jenelle Beavers	Vice President for Strategy
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Kelly Long	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
TBD	Vice President for University Advancement
Yolanda Bevill	Vice President for University Communications
Lynn Johnson	Vice President for University Operations
James Pritchett	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences

Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
David McLean	Dean, College of Engineering
Lise Youngblade	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Mary Stromberger	Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Karen Estlund	Dean, Libraries
Jan Nerger	Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Colin Clay	Interim Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
John Hayes	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Justin Schwendeman-Curtis	Administrative Professional Council
(substituting for Sarah Olson, Chair)	