

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
October 4, 2022 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

Chair Doe: We will be moving at a quick pace today and attempt to finish our meeting by as close to 5:00 p.m. as possible for those that observe Yom Kippur. Thanked those giving reports and presentations who have been willing to cede their time. Interim President Rick Miranda and interim Provost Janice Nerger have yielded their time to allow for discussions. Our two discussion groups have agreed to move with speed while still providing the information we need.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – October 4, 2022

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – November 1, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm

Chair Doe: Our next Faculty Council meeting will be on November 1st and will be over Microsoft Teams. We are contemplating an attempt in December with a hybrid meeting. We will keep everyone posted on that possibility.

Chair Doe: On October 19th from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., there will be a meet and greet at Avogadro’s Number of all the employee councils. Invited members to join. This will be a social function, and the employee councils will be purchasing some food.

Chair Doe: Our discussion item for our November meeting will be the Vice President for Inclusive Excellence Kauline Cipriani as well as Shannon Archibeque-Engle. They will talk about the Vice President for Inclusive Excellence Office and the Campus Climate Survey.

Chair Doe: Have one final announcement from Anders Fremstad.

Anders Fremstad: Thanked Chair Doe. Expressed appreciation to everyone who filled out the AAUP CSU survey on faculty working conditions last spring. We are just releasing those results and they will be emailed soon. Over 460 people responded to the survey. The main issues identified as priorities for the University are compensation, first and foremost, as well as feelings of disrespect, bias and equity, and the need for transparency and accountability from the

University. Encouraged members to read the full report and provide feedback. The AAUP meets the first Thursday of each month at Avogadro's. Provided full link to [survey results](#) in the chat.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting – September 6, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council minutes.

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – August 26, September 2, 9, 16, & 23, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything Faculty Council members should be aware of in these University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Brad Goetz: Indicated that these were ordinary business. Had nothing to note.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any items that members wished to pull for further discussion.

Hearing none, consent agenda approved by unanimous consent.

E. ACTION ITEMS

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

Steve Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the academic faculty nominations to Faculty Council Standing Committees as shown in the agenda packet.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that no second is needed. Asked if there was any discussion around these nominations.

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

Motion approved.

2. Election – Graduate Representatives to Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the election of the graduate and undergraduate student representatives to Faculty Council Standing Committees as seen in the agenda packet.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising. Stated that it is terrific to have this level of participation by graduate students and undergraduate students in our committee structure, and we greatly benefit from their participation. Asked if there was any further discussion or any questions.

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

Motion approved.

3. Proposed Revisions to Section D.2.2 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move that Faculty Council adopt the proposed changes in Section D.2.2 as shown in the agenda packet. The University Policy Review Committee was created and added to the Manual in 2019 as a University Committee. It has members of faculty, administrative professionals, state classified, and students to give input to the University Policy Office. Many of these policies are relevant to faculty. This committee has never been convened. We elected faculty representatives last fall, in 2021, and they are ready to serve. The Vice President for University Operations is on board and agrees with this and is willing to convene the committee. Once started, it should continue similar to other committees.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice President Brendan Hanlon for being willing to step forward and convene this committee. Asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the membership.

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

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

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

Jennifer Martin: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move to amend Section E.2 of the Faculty Manual as presented in the agenda packet. Stated that this amendment does not change any policy, but offers clarifying language around academic appointments, the home of academic appointments, as well as contract renewals.

Chair Doe: Thanked Martin. Asked if there was any discussion from members.

Joseph DiVerdi: Would like to speak in favor of this motion. Believe this is needed language to the Manual and ties up a number of details. Encouraged members to support this motion.

Chair Doe: Thanked DiVerdi. Asked if there was further discussion.

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

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

F. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Committee on Libraries Annual Report 2021-2022

Chair Doe: We have our annual report from the Committee on Libraries. Reminded members that this is not something subject to amendment but will need to be placed into the record. Asked if there were any questions regarding this report.

Hearing none, Committee on Libraries annual report was received and will be placed into record.

2. TILT Annual Report 2021-2022

Chair Doe: Directed members' attention to the annual report from the Institute for Learning and Teaching as seen in the agenda packet. Stated that there is a robust effort in all kinds of efforts and initiatives. Expressed appreciation for them bringing this report to us as a matter of record for Faculty Council. Asked if there were any questions.

Hearing none, annual report for the Institute for Learning and Teaching was received.

3. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Am involved in the Vice President for Undergraduate Affairs search, serving as co-chair alongside Vice Provost Susan James. That search has moved into the semi-finalist stage. There were over 130 impressive applicants, of which 112 were deemed qualified. This has been a massive undertaking by the search committee. Expect we will have campus visits for the finalists very soon.

Chair Doe: Am also involved with the Reaccreditation 3B working group, which is associated with general education, teaching and learning. This group is currently collecting information and we will have a full draft to share by early November with the heads and chairs of the reaccreditation process.

Chair Doe: Have been attending the Council of Deans meetings. Stated that this is codified in the Faculty Manual that the Faculty Council Chair attends these meetings. The Deans report that it is helpful for them to hear what is immediately on the docket for Faculty Council, as well as what is in the works. For those that are committee chairs, requested that they keep her apprised and keep the Deans apprised of issues that may affect them.

Chair Doe: We have task forces that are underway, including a task force on shared governance, a task force on budget 101 to capstone, a task force on administrative leave and faculty impact, a task force on innovative directions, and a task force on non-tenure track faculty and job security.

Chair Doe: The AUCC 1C implementation groups are underway. There are two committees. One is charged with the logistical and fiscal issues around 1C, and they will have a report ready in early November. The second group is charged with assisting departments with their curricular decision-making and help those that wish to be a part of 1C to put forward an effective proposal and to assist those leaving 1C to determine where they will go in the curriculum.

Chair Doe: Reported that she is visiting each of the standing committees this fall. They are all working on important issues and thinking about policies that need to be updated. Stated that the standing committees do the vast majority of the work of Faculty Council and hence are crucial to shared governance. Thanked them for all their work.

4. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Andrew Norton: The Board of Governors will be meeting on campus this Thursday and Friday, October 6th and 7th in the Lory Student Center. All are welcome to attend. The CSU report will be on Thursday beginning at 10:00 a.m., followed by an update on the rural initiative and the agricultural report. Stated that there is always an opportunity to speak to the Board during the public comment session, and that will be first thing on Thursday morning at 9:00 a.m. There will be a list that people can put their name on to get in line to speak.

G. DISCUSSION

1. Faculty Success (ADVANCE) – Jen Dawrs, Faculty Success Program Manager, Ruth Hufbauer & Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Ruth Hufbauer: The ADVANCE program is now called Faculty Success. We introduced the grant last year to Faculty Council. We have a grant from the National Science Foundation focused on gender equity in STEM faculties. What we are doing at CSU is much broader than gender and STEM alone. With Faculty Success, we are mirroring our student success efforts, and the scope of the project is expanding as well with support from the institution.

Vice Provost Susan James: One of the things we kicked off last spring and that is picking up steam this fall is the Task Force on Faculty Workload Equity. This is a collaboration between the Committee on Gender Equity and Faculty Success, as well as Faculty Council. The Committee on Gender Equity (CoGen) has been talking about equity and service workloads, particularly for faculty, for many years.

Vice Provost James: Encouraged members to read the report provided in the slides, which was funded by the National Science Foundation and the ADVANCE program. It was an investment in a research study done in over fifty (50) academic departments over a five (5) year period. The

goal was to provide tools and knowledge to academic leaders on how to create more equity in workload and what equity and workload means.

Vice Provost James: Our objective is to create a sustainable, long-term structure that gives us the tools we need for assessing workload equity in departments and among departments. We do not envision that it will be the same from one department to another or from one college to another. A big part of this is increasing transparency and accountability. We recognize that we have to resolve inequities and shortcomings in how work is assigned, how it is evaluated, and how it is valued and rewarded, especially at annual review and promotion time. This depends on the context of the individual faculty member and the workload itself. Our last objective is a long-term goal in that we recognize that the way our budgets work can sometimes lead to inequities.

Vice Provost James: Our key goals for the near future are to understand the breadth of processes for how workloads are assigned and distributed within each department. We also have no desire to fix what is not broken, so we also want to understand what departments are already doing this well and what best practices we can get from those areas and share them more broadly. We want to dive into this enough to understand what is already happening around campus so that we can work towards more consistency. Have suggested a dashboard in departments for workload distribution to assist with one of our goals of transparency.

Vice Provost James: Some of our strategies include diving into data provided from Institutional Research and the Provost's Office. We plan to survey department heads and faculty about this and then move into focus groups and interviews so that we can get a whole picture. Stated that an anonymous survey will be emailed following this meeting. Stated that this information will be used to inform the direction of the task force in terms of goals and strategies. Once we have reviewed this, we will put together a summary to be shared with Faculty Council, Executive Committee, and the Provost and President.

Chair Doe: Thanked Jen Dawrs, Hufbauer and Vice Provost James. Asked if there were any questions.

Sybil Sharvelle: Thanked this group for the work they are doing. Think that faculty place their effort in different places, and faculty need to be rewarded and acknowledged for their efforts.

Chair Doe: Think the idea of a dashboard is exciting. Asked if such things have been developed for transparency within units.

Vice Provost James: This has been inspected. We learned this from Adrianna Kezar's visit from a year ago, when she came to talk to us about non-tenure track faculty. She exposed us to these tools and told us about other departments where they had made this work. She also showed us examples of dashboards and worksheets, both of which are included in the toolkit mentioned.

John Slater: Asked: Is the decision to focus on intra-department inequities because of the belief that most of the inequities are there? Wondering why inter-college inequities are being ignored.

Vice Provost James: Did not mean to imply that we would be ignoring that. Meant to imply that we do not think there is a one-size-fits-all solution for all departments. Think we have to look between colleges. That was part of the budget comments, because often budget drives some of the between-unit inequities.

Vice Provost James: Encouraged members too look at the [American Council on Education Toolkit](#) as a starting point for understanding the work we are doing.

Chair Doe: Seeing no other questions or comments, thanked Hufbauer, Dawrs, and Vice Provost James for bringing this to the Faculty Council. Would appreciate additional updates to hear about progress on this project.

2. Accreditation Process Presentation – Laura Jensen, Vice Provost for Planning and Effectiveness

Vice Provost Laura Jensen: Today we are discussing our reaffirmation for reaccreditation. Our last reaccreditation was in 2014, and we are on a ten (10) year cycle. Our next comprehensive evaluation will be in FY24. They will come to our campus in September of 2023, so we are preparing for that visit and preparing our comprehensive evaluation assurance argument.

Vice Provost Jensen: Described timeline for reaccreditation process. In year four (4), we submitted a preliminary assurance argument to assure them that we are following all the criteria. We were found in compliance with no monitoring required. In year five (5), we submitted a quality initiative proposal which focuses on continuous improvement at an institution. We were able to submit our student success initiatives and our plans for increasing retention and graduation rates, as well as eliminating our attainment and equity gaps. In years seven (7) through nine (9), we work on that quality initiative, and this coming January, we will submit a completed report on our progress to date and any changes we have made along the way. In year ten (10), we will have our comprehensive evaluation.

Vice Provost Jensen: We are accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. There are multiple purposes to accreditation and reaccreditation, but basically they focus on this being a mechanism for the institution to be fully transparent in our activities. Previous submissions are available on the Institutional Research website, on the page for accountability and accreditation.

Vice Provost Jensen: The purpose of the accreditation process is twofold, around accountability. This is our assurance of quality and our continuous quality improvement, meaning that we are always looking not only at our academic programs, but also the operations of the institution to make sure that we are improving incrementally wherever we can. The additional purpose of accreditation is to validate the quality of our academic programs at all degree levels. We will be looking at learning outcomes at the course level.

Vice Provost Jensen: The assurance argument will also evaluate the institutions as a whole. We will provide evidence that we have soundness in our governance and our administration adheres to our mission. Other assurance arguments will report on the stability of our finances and the sufficiency of our resources, including our staffing.

Vice Provost Jensen: The guiding values for the Higher Learning Commission are to focus on student learning and that we have education as a public purpose, since we are a public institution. They will look that we educate for a diverse, technologically and globally connected world, and that we have it in our DNA at the institution and a culture of continuous quality improvement. Additional guiding values are that we operate with integrity and transparency and that our governance is for the well-being of the institution. This includes the well-being of each of the three pieces of our land grant mission and that we put our mission at the center of all we do.

Vice Provost Jensen: All of the documentation we submit to the Higher Learning Commission goes through a peer review. Each document will contain evidence how we meet the criterion. We have multiple work groups looking at the criterion.

Vice Provost Jensen: Directed members' attention to the committees and leadership around the reaccreditation process. Interim Provost Neger and interim President Miranda have oversight. The planning team includes herself, Mary Pedersen, and Susan Matthews, who is serving as a Presidential Fellow during this process. The steering committee is comprised of the Executive Leadership Team, and we are gathering their input as we go through the process.

Vice Provost Jensen: We have a variety of work groups. One is around inclusive excellence and ensuring we are weaving our focus on inclusive excellence throughout each of the criterion. We have a team on student success. The Vice President for Research Office has a work team and TILT has a work team and they are leading the assessment of student learning under the direction by our new Director of Assessment, Stephanie Foster. We also have a planning and operations team. We will also be working with the President's Sustainability Commission for evidence around engagement.

Vice Provost Jensen: Each of these work groups will be visiting the employee councils to discuss the process bit to gather input. They will also be visiting ASCSU and holding some open forums to gather more feedback and input around other types of evidence. Stated that many of the past Faculty Council agendas and minutes will be used as evidence for continuous improvement. We will draft the final assurance argument next summer and submit to the Higher Learning Commission in July. It will be reviewed, and then we will have our campus visits on September 18 and 19, 2023. At that point, our team of reviewers will likely be meeting with membership of Faculty Council as well as other groups on campus. We will make sure everyone is kept abreast of that timeline and calendar.

Vice Provost Jensen: We will be engaging further to make sure we are gathering input. On the [accreditation website](#), leadership for the teams are listed, as well as the criterion and our previous assurance argument and any responses we have received from the Higher Learning Commission.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost Jensen. Asked if there were any questions from members. Asked if examples could be provided on things that are reported on for continuous improvement.

Vice Provost Jensen: Provided example of student learning assessment from last accreditation cycle. We were honest that we had some room for improvement there. We had tried a few things that did not work, which we indicated in the document. We did the same thing with our student

success initiatives. There were certain strategies or tactics that were tried and did not end up moving the needle. We reassessed our strategies and changed things as we went along. It is meant to be a mechanism where the institution is transparent about what we are doing, and the truth is, while we strive to be successful, there are things that we try that are new, and we are trying it in the context of our campus. Sometimes it does not work, and we discuss why, and we move on from that. Another example would be the AUCC and how the institution was responding to the hate speech and incidents of bias on campus. These are not things we are proud of as happening on campus, but we did mention them and discussed in detail the steps we were taking to address the concerns.

Chair Doe: Find it heartening that there is room for addressing these things and not providing a picture that maybe is not the whole picture. Asked if there were additional questions.

DiVerdi: Requested clarification around site visit in September 2023. Asked: What is the nature of this campus visit? Wondering what the purpose is for visiting campus.

Vice Provost Jensen: Think the purpose is twofold. The first is to make sure that what we submitted in the document is actually occurring on campus and to make sure that it reflects the general sentiment of campus. Think it is also important that they come to see campus and get a sense of the culture. Especially with our leadership changes, they can make sure we have continuity and focusing on every aspect of our mission. As they review the assurance argument, they will be taking notes on any questions and issues that they would like to follow up on.

DiVerdi: Asked: How long will they be on campus and how big of a group is expected?

Vice Provost Jensen: They will only be on campus for a couple days. The team comes and they split up and do things in parallel.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was anticipation of increased scrutiny because of leadership changes.

Vice Provost Jensen: Think there may be questions of why leadership changes have occurred, but as long as we are continuing to focus on our mission, do not believe that will be an issue. Institutions undergo leadership changes continually, and the timeline for this assurance argument is over the course of ten (10) years, during which time CSU has been stable despite weathering a pandemic and leadership changes. We are continuing to focus on the things that matter in our land grant mission and as long as we are up front and they can see everything we are doing, believe it will be just fine.

Mary Van Buren: Wondering how this will trickle down to the department level. Asked: What are our departments' roles going to look like in this process?

Vice Provost Jensen: In writing our assurance argument, we are looking for evidence that has already occurred. It is up to these work teams and to the people that are working closely with them to gather the evidence that will be included in the writing done by these work groups. These will then be compiled by herself, Pedersen, and Matthews next spring, and then handed to Creative Services for the final touches. In terms of the actual visit, they will want to come out

Health and Human Sciences

Ruoh-Nan (Terry) Yan	Design and Merchandising	2024
<u>Jennifer Richards</u>	Health and Exercise Science	2025
TBD	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2022
<u>Lisa Daunhauer</u> (excused)	Human Development and Family Studies	2023
Erin Arneson	Construction Management	2024
Aaron Eakman	Occupational Therapy	2023
Sharon Anderson	School of Education	2024
Elizabeth Kiehne	School of Social Work	2025
Brian Butki	College-at-Large	2024

Business

Bill Rankin	Accounting	2023
John Hoxmeier	Computer Information Systems	2024
Bharadwaj Kannan	Finance and Real Estate	2025
Rob Mitchell	Management	2024
Elizabeth Webb	Marketing	2023

Engineering

Peter Jan van Leeuwen	Atmospheric Science	2024
Ashok Prasad	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2025
<u>Hussam Mahmoud</u>	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2024
Steven Reising	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2025
Kirk McGilvray	Mechanical Engineering	2023
<u>Thomas Bradley</u>	Systems Engineering	2023
Sybil Sharvelle	College-at-Large	2023

Liberal Arts

Mary Van Buren	Anthropology & Geography	2023
Mary-Ann Kokoska	Art & Art History	2025
Mark Saunders	Communication Studies	2025
Anders Fremstad	Economics	2024
Doug Cloud	English	2023
(substituting for Tony Becker, on sabbatical Fall 2022)		
Maricela DeMirjyn	Ethnic Studies	2025
John Slater	Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	2025
Jared Orsi	History	2023
<u>Michael Humphrey</u>	Journalism and Technical Communication	2023
Madeline Harvey	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2025
<u>Andre Archie</u> (excused)	Philosophy	2025
Marni Berg	Political Science	2024
TBD	Sociology	2022

Ajean Ryan

Ajean Ryan	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Antonio Pedros-Gascon</u>	College-at-Large	2025
(sabbatical Fall 2022)		

<u>Emily Morgan</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Lisa Langstraat</u>	College-at-Large	2024
<u>Erica LaFehr</u> (substituted for Allison Goar, Fall 2022)	College-at-Large	2024
Abigail Shupe	College-at-Large	2024
<u>John Carlo Pierce</u>	College-at-Large	2024

Natural Resources

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

Natural Sciences

Olve Peersen	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	2025
<u>Mike Antolin</u> (excused)	Biology	2024
<u>Rob Paton</u>	Chemistry	2023
TBD	Computer Science	2022
Emily Hardegree-Ullman	Physics	2024
<u>Silvia Canetto</u>	Psychology	2025
Ander Wilson	Statistics	2025
<u>Yongcheng Zhou</u>	Mathematics	2023
<u>Alan Van Orden</u>	College-at-Large	2023
Joseph DiVerdi	College-at-Large	2025
James Liu	College-at-Large	2023

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Rao Veermachaneni	Biomedical Sciences	2025
Shari Lanning	Clinical Sciences	2025
<u>Elizabeth Ryan</u>	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2023
<u>Tony Schountz</u>	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
Katriana Popichak	College-at-Large	2025
Fiona Hollinshead	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Doreene Hyatt</u>	College-at-Large	2024
Tara Nordgren	College-at-Large	2025
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2023
<u>John Rosecrance</u>	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Sheryl Magzaman</u> (on sabbatical 2022-2023)	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Brian Geiss</u>	College-at-Large	2025

University Libraries

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

Ex Officio Voting Members

Sue Doe	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2023
Melinda Smith	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2023
Andrew Norton	BOG Faculty Representative	2023
Steve Reising, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2023
TBD, Chair	Committee on Information Technology	2023
Shane Kanatous, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2023
Jerry Magloughlin, Chair	Committee on Libraries	2023
Jenny Morse, Co-Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
Olivia Arnold, Co-Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
Jennifer Martin, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty	2023
William Sanford, Chair	Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education	2023
Alan Kennan, Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2023
James Graham, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2023
Shawn Archibeque, Co-Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2023
Cayla Bellamy, Co-Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2023
TBD, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2023
Brad Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2023
TBD	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Pinar Omur-Ozbek	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
Thomas Conway	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
Sean Bryan	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Ann Hess	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Jennifer Reinke	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Scott Weibensohn	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025

Ex Officio Non-Voting Members

Rick Miranda	Interim President
Albert Bimper	Interim Chief of Staff
Jan Nerger	Interim Provost
Karen Dunbar	Co-Interim Vice President for Advancement
Rudy Garcia	Co-Interim Vice President for Advancement
Kathay Rennels	Interim Vice President for Engagement & Extension
TBD	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
TBD	Vice President for Equity, Equal Opportunity & Title IX
Susan James	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
TBD	Interim Vice President for Human Resources
Kauline Cipriani	Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
Brandon Bernier	Vice President for Information Technology
Kathleen Fairfax	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Laura Jensen	Vice Provost for Planning and Effectiveness
Alan Rudolph	Vice President for Research
Jenelle Beavers	Vice President for Strategy
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
TBD	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs

Greg Luft	Interim Vice President for University Marketing & Communications
Brendan Hanlon	Vice President for University Operations
James Pritchett	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
David McLean	Dean, College of Engineering
Lise Youngblade	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Sonia Kreidenweis	Interim Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Karen Estlund	Dean, Libraries
Simon Tavener	Interim Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Susan VandeWoude	Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
A. Alonso Aguirre	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Justin Schwendeman-Curtis	Administrative Professional Council
(substituting for Sarah Olson, APC Chair)	