

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
November 1, 2022 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

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

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – November 1, 2022

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – December 6, 2022 – Lory Student Center 322/Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm

Chair Doe: Our next meeting on December 6th will be a hybrid meeting, and the in-person portion will be held in the Lory Student Center Room 322. Encouraged those not able to make the in-person part to join by Microsoft Teams.

- b. Call for additional Administrative Leave Task Force members – contact Michael Antolin or Sharon Anderson

Chair Doe: Encouraged members interested in questions around policy of administrative leave, or would like to know more about it, to contact Michael Antolin or Sharon Anderson. Both would be happy to answer your questions about this task force. This task force is endeavoring to understand what administrative leave actually means and where it is codified. The task force is charged with understanding how administrative leave is described, how it is implemented, and what its implications are for faculty and staff.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

- a. Faculty Council Meeting – October 6, 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 – September 30 & October 7, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked members if there was anything to be pulled from the consent agenda for further review.

Hearing none, University Curriculum Committee minutes approved by unanimous consent.

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Election – Graduate Student 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 election of graduate students to Faculty Council standing committees, as seen in the agenda packet.

Chair Doe: Indicated that there was a question in the chat of whether these graduate students are nominated by the Graduate Student Council.

Reising: Confirmed, graduate student nominees are nominated by the Graduate Student Council.

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

Motion approved.

2. Election – Graduate Student Representative to University Policy Review Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move for the nomination of Shelby Davis as the graduate student representative for the University Policy Review Committee. Stated that the University Policy Review Committee is one of the two University committees listed in the Manual.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any discussion about this nomination. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

3. Election – Faculty Representative to University Benefits Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move to nominate John Elder as a faculty representative to the University Benefits Committee.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any discussion regarding this nomination. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

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

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the nominations of the two academic faculty to Faculty Council standing committees as seen in the agenda packet.

Chair Doe: We have Ryan Brooks nominated to the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Sarah Raabis nominated for the Committee on University Programs. Asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

F. PRESIDENT’S REPORT – Interim President Rick Miranda

Interim President Rick Miranda: Will focus most of the presentation today on going through and explaining the draft incremental budget that was presented to the Board of Governors in early October.

President Miranda: Our SPUR campus is up and running with two (2) buildings open, Vida and Terra. The Hydro building is about to open. We will get the keys to Hydro in about a month and will be getting training on how the building works, and then the grand opening will be during the National Western Stock Show in early January.

President Miranda: We are already into our second round of projects from the campus constituencies. There are around eighty (80) letters of intent to submit projects for a second round of funding that is available.

President Miranda: We have a lot of interim leadership at the moment. We are unpausing the search for the new Vice President for Advancement. Kim Tobin left that position late last spring. We decided to unpause this because the Advancement position may be something that the new President will want to be involved in. The search firm and search committee have determined that we can settle on some semifinalists for that position in the late January timeframe, which will be in time for the next President to have some influence there.

President Miranda: The other search we are launching now is for the Vice President for Human Resources. Robyn Fergus left that position last month, and Brett Anderson was appointed as the interim Vice President for Human Resources. We are holding off on the other interim positions for another month. Most of the reasoning for that is due to timing of the Presidential search.

President Miranda: The position description for the President has been posted for about a month. The search committee has met and started scoring candidates over the past two (2) weeks or so and met just today to select a dozen semifinalists which will be interviewed by the search committee. The goal of that is to select two (2) to four (4) finalists to present to the Board of Governors for their consideration in early December.

President Miranda: Asked if there were any questions regarding these items before moving on to the budget presentation.

Sharon Anderson: Wondering whether there will be campus visits by the candidates and whether faculty will have an opportunity to meet them before a final decision.

President Miranda: Not aware if there will be campus visits.

President Miranda: Will move on to the budget presentation. Will focus on the four (4) scenarios presented to the Board of Governors. These four (4) scenarios presented to the Board were decided upon as an exercise for prediction for next year's budget. The scenarios have two (2) variables in play. The first is an increase in the resident undergraduate tuition and the other is the average salary increase for the employees at the institution. We were given instructions to model a rate increase of resident undergraduate rate increase of either 0% or 3% and in the salary modeling, we were asked to model what would happen if we raised salaries on the average of 3% or by 5%.

President Miranda: Want to concentrate on the scenario that includes a 3% raise increase for employees. Chose this because it illustrative of the other ones. Described the budget numbers shown on the screen. Stated that this budget is only our educational and general (E&G) budget, and it is independent of the auxiliaries like housing, dining, parking. It is also independent of our research funding. The E&G budget funds the education and general operations of the University.

President Miranda: Described the differences between last year and our projections for next year. This budget shows what is possible with the assumptions of a 3% resident undergraduate tuition increase, which would total around a \$23.5 million increase in our revenue. Explained the areas where tuition would increase. We have more non-residents than residents this year, which we hope and predict will persist into next year and increase the non-resident mix and give us a few more dollars as well. We are not budgeting for any increase in enrollment. Despite having a very large incoming freshman class, we have correspondingly smaller sophomore, junior, and senior classes. There would also be an increase to graduate tuition, as well as the Veterinary Medicine program increasing their tuition slightly.

President Miranda: We also have two (2) main elements of our budget, both in tuition and state appropriations. Directed members' attention to the budget lines that indicate predictions for state appropriations, which a little more than \$5 million coming in our fee for service and our specialty education program buckets. We also had a great year with grant funding, so the E&G budget gets the benefit of some indirect costs that come from increased grant activity. When you add the estimates of additional tuition collections, the state appropriations, and the indirect cost recovery, we have about \$23.5 million. Asked if there were questions about these projections.

President Miranda: Hearing none, will move on. The next section of our incremental budget has to do with our financial aid projections. We are projecting an increase in the financial aid budget of about \$4.3 million. Showed that there are four (4) components of that. We are predicting to collect \$4.3 million from resident undergraduates if we raise tuition, so we would take 20% of that and devote it to financial aid. The Financial Aid Office has told us that in order to honor the new and renewal awards that we would give it will cost another \$2.7 million. We have a small number of scholarships that are not denominated in dollars, as they are indicated by full or half tuition. We also have the waivers for GTAs, where we pay tuition on their behalf.

President Miranda: Explained that all of this leads to a new revenue of around \$19 million. Now the question is how we will spend this money. In the presentation we made to the Board of Governors, there was about \$1.6 million dedicated to multi-year central investments and strategic initiatives. These are items decided by the President as top priorities of the institution. At the moment we have \$1.6 million in there, and these cover items like the rural initiative, the student success initiative. There is also some budgeting for diversity initiatives and some money for health and safety initiatives.

President Miranda: We also have items called quality enhancements. These are things that arrive in the budget process more from below than from above. These are things like additional faculty lines or cases for retention packages made by departments. The wish list is at about \$4 million.

President Miranda: The largest number on the board is the faculty and staff compensation number. This is at around \$23 million, with the scenario of 3%. Each percentage costs about \$5 million, which totals \$15 million. Then there are some money in there for promotions and benefits for our graduate students. We have budgeted a number of dollars in there for addressing equity issues among faculty and staff as well. We have attempted to be generous on the expense side, as well as in other categories of compensation. There is some money towards academic incentive funding, which we sometimes call tuition sharing.

President Miranda: The final line on this document is \$3.4 million, which covers things like bond payments, previous mortgages, new facilities and buildings coming online. We are also anticipating almost \$1 million for additional insurance. We are also anticipating an increase in the utility bills, as well as inflation regarding maintaining our journal subscriptions.

President Miranda: What we presented to the Board of Governors in early October added up to about \$33 million, which is significantly more than the \$19 million we had the new revenue for. We are short to the tune of about \$14.8 million. At the last budget presentation at Faculty Council, we indicated that we inherited a \$5.8 million deficit from last year. In the structural E&G budget, we managed to pay with one-time funds last year from a variety of sources.

President Miranda: Stated that we have a shortfall now in early October, but we don't have to submit a balanced budget to the Board until they approve it at their May meeting. We have about six (6) months to tweak the budget. The governor just released the governor's budget today for the state of Colorado. Believe he was more generous in that budget in a variety of ways, so our state appropriations may look better. It was also proposed that tuition be capped at 4% for state institutions in Colorado, so that might give us a little bit of additional flexibility in raising

tutions as well. The other side of the equation is that we might have to tighten our belts on the expense side, which will be part of the discussions over the next six (6) months. Will look at how close we can get with the scenario of a 3% tuition increase and 3% salary raise as the more favorable budget. We will have to see the information provided by the governor's office and how the budget discussions develop with the legislature over the course of the legislative session.

President Miranda: We will not be sending a new version of this to the Board of Governors for their December meeting. We will take into account the new information from the governor and any other new information we have about any of our expenses or additional revenues. We will see if we can get closer to a balanced budget depending on the scenarios we choose. We will likely still show the Board several scenarios so there will be a collection of possibilities for the Board to consider. We are investigating all the avenues to turn the dials we need to turn in order both to accomplish our mission here but also to stay inside our revenues.

President Miranda: Asked if there were any questions about the budget or other items for discussion.

Joseph DiVerdi: In the spirit of shared governance, wondering how faculty can participate in the budget process to weigh in on the values.

President Miranda: Will be making a presentation to the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning next month. Discussed this with the chair, James Graham, a few days ago and we are working on the exact date for a visit. This will be a chance to sit down with Faculty Council representatives and leaderships on that committee to roll up our sleeves and go into the next level of detail on some of these things.

Anders Fremstad: Most of our revenue looks like it is from increased tuition. Looking at the numbers from Institutional Research, 66% of our resident instruction course credit hours are now taught by non-tenure track faculty, according to data from Spring 2022. Most of these faculty are not paid enough to live in Fort Collins. Wondering what fraction of the raises will be directed toward this section of our faculty.

President Miranda: We have tended to distribute funds for an overall salary exercise across the board. This does not mean that the equity investments will be across the board. We have two (2) priorities there. The first priority is for our lowest-paid employees and the others is for people who work in units that are low-paid relative to peer institutions. When we get around to distributing the funds, we will pay more attention to those two (2) populations. Our protocols for the salary exercise have not been determined yet. Last year, we had a 3% raise across the board. The Board of Governors likely wants us to have a more merit-based and equity-based process than what was exercised last year. We will work toward developing a process for this, which will be part of the job over the next six (6) months.

Fremstad: Believe faculty would like to be involved as those protocols are drafted.

President Miranda: Expressed agreement.

Mary Van Buren: When we are talking about resources and what is flowing in and out, wondering if there are areas that you would consider cutting back on in order to provide more resources for salaries, which are low among many units, not just non-tenure track faculty and certain departments.

President Miranda: We would always be open to trimming in a healthy way. Directed members' attention to the budget shown on the screen. There is a line called budget reductions. If we do budget reductions, either across the board or in selected units, that would appear as a negative number and would reduce our expenses, freeing up money to go into categories above as positive expenses. At the moment, we have not done enough analysis of where we might do budget reductions. It does not necessarily have to be done across the board, but we could do it in selected units if we decide.

Chair Doe: Continuing the theme of in the spirit of shared governance, wondering if the President's Office would be congenial to the idea of faculty involvement in the defining of equity and who might most benefit from equity efforts.

President Miranda: Would be happy to. This will be one of the topics we will ask for consultation on when we meet with the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. If other voices want to communicate with our office or have open forums on this issue, that would be fine as well.

Doug Cloud: Wondering if there is a long-term strategy to address the inflationary pressure and the rising cost of living. With the \$23 million for staff compensation, wondering if the conversation might benefit from breaking that out and looking at how much a 3% increase would look like for continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty or those making less than \$100,000 versus what a 3% raise would look like at the top levels. Wondering if you can speak to the long-term strategy because this seems unsustainable. We are looking at a number that is a 3% raise but is essentially a 5% pay cut if inflation remains where it has been.

President Miranda: Our primary sources of revenue have been tuition and state appropriations. With state appropriations, we have very little control, and the state also does constrain the largest parts of our tuition increases. The thing we have been trying to change, which has been under our control, is the change to have more non-resident students here, which has changed the mix and provided more resources without a lot more stress on the institution as far as instructional load goes. The Board of Governors asked this same question in early October. The challenge now is to brainstorm ways in which we could generate new resources and what this looks like. This is something we are working on and will continue to work on.

Chair Doe: Stated that Mary-Ann Kokoska from the Department of Art and Art History commented in the chat that the College of Liberal Arts has notable equity issues and cannot raise funds to rectify this.

Chair Doe: Doreene Hyatt asked in the chat if the cost to the University is higher to offer retirement incentives again versus salary increases.

President Miranda: Do not believe there is a plan this year to offer another round of retirement incentives.

Van Buren: Wanted to also follow up on Cloud's comments. Believe what he was saying was differential increases depending on pay. In other words, the people who are paid least get a higher percentage increase than those that are paid most. Stated this was done at her previous institution. Wondering if this is a possibility.

President Miranda: There is nothing preventing us to considering schemes like that. We could consider that and would be happy to try to model what that looks like. We could distribute funds on a dollar basis rather than a percentage basis.

Chair Doe: The faculty are trying to understand the vocabulary of budget. Our task force on budget is attempting to identify the language that we need to understand budget. One of the terms often used is auxiliary. As we understand it, the auxiliary parts of campus pay their own way or generate their own revenue. Believe some of these are like parking, housing and dining. One of the other auxiliary areas is Athletics. Wondered if you can speak to where this exists in the budget, because it comes up fairly frequently and in our effort to understand more fully, how does Athletics figure into all of this and where it appears.

President Miranda: Yes, several areas of the University are completely auxiliary and get no money from the education in general budget. The prototype example is parking, where we are statutorily mandated to separate the parking and we are not allowed to subsidize parking in either direction. They are not allowed to make a profit and give that to the University. We have other parts of the University that do not have the statutory restrictions, but we tend not to commingle the funds. Then there are units in the University that have a hybrid nature to them, and we have some revenue from the education and general budget and some revenue from self-generated monies that they charge. Athletics is one of the hybrid examples. They get some funds and they generate a lot of money on their own by selling tickets and food in the stadium. Other hybrid units include marketing and communications, where they have E&G funds to do all the marketing for the University, but also have capabilities and an operation to do both internal and external marketing. There is also conference services, student affairs, both which have a modest E&G budget and most of their revenue comes from housing and dining. The student fees support the Lory Student Center. There is quite a bit of variety in our auxiliary units, and we monitor those because that revenue tends to be more volatile.

DiVerdi: Had a question about parking as an auxiliary. Stated that by statute, it is required to cash neutral and pay for itself. Think it makes sense for faculty to participate in the governance of that because it impacts the faculty so greatly on a daily basis.

President Miranda: Expressed agreement. Would hope that the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning to have regular presentations from units that they are interested in understanding more about.

DiVerdi: In time with the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning, we did not have a mechanism to have people come through. Would be good if we could arrange that and have a more systematic way of doing that.

President Miranda: Would be happy to help figure out a way to do that.

Silvia Canetto: Would like to follow up on comments about Athletics. Would like to be reminded about what goes into Athletics in terms of budget. It was stated that Athletics is a hybrid model with some revenues coming from the University and some from outside. I am wondering how many revenues going to Athletics come from the general budget. It was also stated that the administration is open to trimming in a healthy way. I wonder about trimming Athletics. Given the football team's repeated game losses, athletics is failing spectacularly. Any other unit that was failing so egregiously would be targeted for trimming. Wondering whether discussion about the Athletic budget has been reopened.

President Miranda: Stated that Athletic Director Joe Parker comes annually to present the Athletics budget. Expressed disagreement that Athletics is failing. We do not have a great record in football but stated that participation in homecoming and Ag Day was spectacular. Ag Day is an enormous industry partnership with agricultural producers and stakeholders from around the state. If you look at the overall record of the athletics teams in the Mountain West, we do very well. Our track and field has regularly done well, the students in the programs generally have a better retention and graduation rate than the regular rest of the student body. Reiterated disagreement that the program is failing. The program is doing what we have asked it to do and we are generally pleased with the results. It is expensive. They generate a lot of their own revenue as well to try to make ends meet. Understand that not everyone in the University is as big a fan of a Division One athletics program. Personal opinion is that it is not a failing program. We do look at their budget on an annual basis. They have not had a student fee increase for about ten (10) years, so they are managing their budgets fairly well.

Canetto: Should have been more precise and stated that the football program is an egregious failure and should be considered for healthy trimming.

President Miranda: When we say failure, wondering what the metric for that is. If your metric is wins or losses, then yes, but if your metric is student success and whether the revenue is fairly stable and sufficient, or whether the revenue from football is able to support some of the non-revenue sports and whether they are able to pay a large fraction of the scholarships they award. The answer you get there is much different than if your metric is whether they beat Boise State last Saturday.

Chair Doe: Stated personal thoughts. There are many ways to measure athletic program success that go beyond a win-loss record. If we can show a valuable educational experience that our student athletes are getting, that is an important component.

Chair Doe: There is a question in the chat about whether equity salary budgeting is something that the task force on faculty workload equity is working on.

President Miranda: Not sure of the charge to that particular task force. Am not the authority on that.

Chair Doe: Thanked President Miranda. Hearing no further questions or discussion, thanks President Miranda for being here.

G. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Interim Provost Janice Nerger

Interim Provost Janice Nerger was unable to attend – no formal report at this time.

Vice Provost Susan James: No formal updates today. Encouraged members that are wanting updates on the searches to reach out. Encouraged members to apply for the Director of TILT position and watch for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs candidates to be on campus before and after Fall Break.

Vice Provost James: Wanted to speak to the equity workload task force that was mentioned. We are not focused on salary equity, although we have groups in Institutional Research, Human Resources, and Office of Equal Opportunity are focused on salary equity. There is some overlap between those, but we are not far enough along to speak to that yet. We will be sure to keep Faculty Council updated on that work.

H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: We have two (2) different surveys coming up that members should be familiar with. The first is the Presidential survey and the other is the University Grievance Officer survey. Stated that we are going to move forward with a Presidential survey. The idea of the Presidential survey is to give feedback to the Board of Governors about faculty perceptions of how the President is doing. In years past, we had a survey of about seven (7) or eight (8) questions with one (1) question provided by the President's Office. We have engaged Institutional Research to distribute the survey and do the quantitative analysis, and the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences (IRISS) to do the analysis of the open-ended questions. We believe this survey has create a more robust instrument that offers genuine feedback to the President's Office. We have a similar approach for the survey for the University Grievance Officer.

Chair Doe: Our task forces are well underway. We have task forces related to contracts and job security for continuing, contract and adjunct faculty, to administrative leave, budget task force, an innovation task force, and a shared governance task force. Expressed thanks to all the members of those task forces, many of which are led by members of the Executive Committee.

Chair Doe: At the request of some faculty members, a few department chairs and other interested parties, have undertaken a project that involves analyzing compensation information from the publicly available compensation study through Institutional Research. We are trying to understand how many faculty in particular, and employees in general, are making less than

\$35,000 a year, oftentimes working less than 50%. We are organizing the data to show the stratification of salaries to examine whether it is possible to offer some subsidization for parking for our lowest-paid faculty and employees. Our hope is to have something to share at our next Faculty Council meeting.

Full Chair's Report

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton
 - a. Listening Session Overview
 - b. Presidential Search Listening Session Feedback Report

Andrew Norton: At our last Board of Governors meeting, we had a presentation from our AAUP organization presenting the survey on faculty working conditions. Expressed thanks to Fremstad, Gretchen O'Dell, and Van Buren for the impactful presentation. This was during the public comment period of the Board, which was at the start of the meeting. That report supported a lot of productive discussions moving forward.

Norton: We spent a little time working on the strategic plan for the System, which we anticipate finishing by the end of the year. We also had routine reports from the audit department and from financial advisors about debt capacity.

Norton: In the revised agenda for this meeting, there are readouts and thematic summaries from the listening sessions for the Presidential search. We did eight (8) listening sessions. Worked with Jimena Sagas from the Libraries and suggested that we have the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences (IRISS) to create a thematic summary. There is a copy in the agenda packet, and this is posted on the Presidential Search website as well. We are posting this because the feedback from those listening sessions did inform in a significant way the position description for the President as well as the rubric that we used to evaluate the candidates.

I. DISCUSSION

1. Vice President for Inclusive Excellence Office Updates and Climate Survey – Kauline Cipriani, Vice President for Inclusive Excellence & Shannon Archibeque-Engle, Associate Vice President for Inclusive Excellence.
 - a. Link to [Climate Survey Results](#)
 - b. [Presentation on Results of 2021 Climate Survey](#)
 - i. Passcode: %Tm\$E#7@

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice President Kauline Cipriani and Associate Vice President Shannon Archibeque-Engle for being here. Eager to hear presentation.

Vice President Kauline Cipriani: Thanked Chair Doe. The Office for Inclusive Excellence was formally known as the Office for Diversity. Our name has changed, but our mission, vision, and priorities have not.

Vice President Cipriani: Inclusive excellence is a term coined by the American Association of Colleges and Universities. It is described as their guiding principle for access, student success, and high-quality learning. Inclusive excellence goes beyond diversity and inclusion work. It requires understanding that getting diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice is critical for our success as an institution. It is an active process, not a passive process. This includes addressing inequities and driving sustained institutional change.

Vice President Cipriani: We have many initiatives hosted by the Office of Inclusive Excellence. All of these initiatives have been worked on at CSU for the past few years. We also have a lot of student diversity programs and services. Showed slides that presented leadership of the Office of Inclusive Excellence.

Vice President Cipriani: We often get the question of what success looks like and what getting inclusive excellence work right looks like. Having done this for a couple decades now, the clear metrics that we should be working towards would be the elimination of achievement gaps and opportunity gaps where they exist on campus based on identity. A third thing to consider is whether or not our reward system matches our values. We talk about how important inclusive excellence is and how important diversity, equity, and inclusion is to us, but when we look at how we reward individuals and units and fund these units and individuals on campus, we need to look at whether it matches the stated values we have about the importance of diversity, equity, inclusion and justice.

Associate Vice President Shannon Archibeque-Engle: Want to begin presentation on the climate survey by thanking everyone involved. We had partnerships with Institutional Research, the Inclusive Excellence staff, the Vice Presidents and Deans, and everyone who responded to the survey.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: Indicated that the survey is put together by a committee. Thanked the members of that committee, which is comprised of representation from around the campus to make sure we are answering the needs of the University.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: The purpose of the survey is to assess the current employee climate. This time, the comparison between 2018 and 2021 was the priority. We had never done that kind of longitudinal comparison. Want to also emphasize that we focus on disaggregating the data so that we can roll up into the demographic groups that we have always used in our analysis of the climate survey and that are required to the federal government and other areas. We wanted to make sure that we can disaggregate things to be more respectful and honor how people identify for themselves. We do have crosstabs in the reports by gender, racialized and minoritized status, and employee type. Stated that continuing, contract and adjunct faculty are not rolled into faculty in general based on feedback from Faculty Council and others.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: College and division-level reports are posted and have been posted on our website since spring. Department and unit-level reports can be requested through Lee Tyson and Heather Novak.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: The climate survey is a tool and is meant to be a decision-making tool to inform our policies, our practices toward inclusive excellence. It is important that we triangulate this information against other pieces of information we have, including information around students access, equity gaps, even the report coming out from the AAUP. We wanted to provide an overall picture of employment experiences and perceptions. We want to further see issue and commitment to institutional accountability. Believe that is easier this time with the 2018-2021 comparison reports that are available for each division and college. We want to have questions as part of this that we can directly take action on and that we can create discussion with within individual units and colleges. We also want to provide a benchmark for longitudinal data collection and comparison.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: Explained the organizational themes. These include work culture, respect, favoritism, leadership accountability, climate overall, and communications. We want low percentage agreement rates with regards to favoritism, and we want high leadership accountability. Communications was a new section we added since communications was important through COVID and as we are coming out of COVID. We heard from constituents that how communications happened were important to how they were experiencing the climate in their area. We also had demographic questions, which we expanded to include more questions regarding race and gender identity. These questions help inform the work by the disaggregated race ethnicity committee on intersectionality. That report is forthcoming. We also added a question on identifying a person with a disability and a question about identifying in the LGBTQIA+ community.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: The survey is administered via Qualtrics and takes about fifteen (15) minutes. It is available in Spanish and English, and we have both a web-based and hard paper copy. We collect these results, and no identifiers are reported. We keep this confidential.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: Described the response rates as seen in the agenda packet. Stated that we are down in every factor, as seen in the results. Provided some examples and explained the data seen in the packet.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: Reminded members that this is a tool to help us make value-based, evidence-informed decisions. We now have this data and the question is what we are going to do about it from there. Explained the multicultural organizational development model. It has a commitment to creating an inclusive organization that values the contributions and talents of all members. There is also a commitment to eliminate all forms of exclusion, discrimination, and follows through on broader social and environmental responsibilities. We are still using this model in the Office of Inclusive Excellence.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: Happy to take questions.

Gregg Griffenhagen: Am wondering about the percentage agreements, not sure what that means. Other question is around workshops that are mentioned from the survey. It states that workshops will be happening four (4) to six (6) months prior to the next survey. Wondering if this data

should be analyzed based on previous patterns and disseminated within a few months versus two (2) years.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: The next survey will be launched in the fall of 2024, and the survey results for this past survey were disseminated in the spring of 2022. This is similar to how we have rolled it out before. We would love to get the report out quicker, but we need more bodies to get that done. Encouraged Griffenhagen and members to visit the website for more information on methodology. We have a video there about how we did the analysis. The average percent agreement is “strongly agreed” and “agreed”, and that is how we chose to shorten the presentation into a bite-sized way for consumption here.

Cloud: Wondering if you can talk about the difference between the terms eliminating achievement gaps as stated in the mission slide and the other term labeled equal outcomes. Suspect these are different things. Other question is around statements of using this as a tool. Looking at the percentages, wondering how we get the qualitative results in order to make decisions.

Vice President Cipriani: An example of an achievement gap would be majority students graduating in a timely manner and minority students taking longer. Opportunity gaps would be looking at things like promotion and tenure, such as majority faculty getting promotions in a faster timeframe as compared to underrepresented faculty. Not familiar with the use of the term equal outcomes in the context of diversity, equity, and inclusion work.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: With the qualitative results, we have done focus group work in the past, which are available on our website. We have a resource gap right now and it costs money from our office to do the qualitative work, more so than it takes to do the quantitative work. Would like to get back to this.

Jennifer Martin: Thanked Vice President Cipriani and Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle for presenting the material. Think this is important for providing opportunities to hold ourselves accountable to making change. Knowing that the departmental and unit conversations are forthcoming, want to offer gratitude and the role this office plays in making sure we do not let this data exist in silence and that we use it as an opportunity to improve our climate on campus.

Sybil Sharvelle: There were some questions around action items. Think it is important that we think about if there might be ways for those that struggle to put these kinds of data into action items and what kind of support there might be for departments and colleges to do that. Wondering if there are best practices or guidance moving forward for some actions moving forward.

Associate Vice President Archibeque-Engle: We do offer workshops for faculty. We have done it with various departments throughout the institution, specifically on multicultural organizational development. A practice that we can utilize, and that we have utilized in the past, are diversity strategic plans informed by equity gaps and informed by the results from the climate survey and the multicultural organizational development model. This model is pragmatic and helps guide

Jim Ippolito	Soil and Crop Sciences	2023
<u>Marco Costanigro</u>	College-at-Large	2023
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2023
Andrew Norton	College-at-Large	2023
Health and Human Sciences		
Ruoh-Nan (Terry) Yan	Design and Merchandising	2024
Jennifer Richards	Health and Exercise Science	2025
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2025
Lisa Daunhauer	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
<u>John Hoxmeier</u>	Computer Information Systems	2024
Bharadwaj Kannan	Finance and Real Estate	2025
Rob Mitchell	Management	2024
<u>Elizabeth Webb</u>	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
<u>Kirk McGilvray</u>	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
Marilee Long	Journalism and Technical Communication	2025
Madeline Harvey	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2025
Andre Archie	Philosophy	2025
Marni Berg	Political Science	2024

TBD	Sociology	2022
Ajean Ryan	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Antonio Pedros-Gascon</u> (sabbatical Fall 2022)	College-at-Large	2025
Emily Morgan	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Lisa Langstraat</u>	College-at-Large	2024
Erica LaFehr (substituted for Allison Goar, Fall 2022)	College-at-Large	2024
<u>Abigail Shupe</u>	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
Mike Antolin	Biology	2024
Rob Paton	Chemistry	2023
TBD	Computer Science	2022
Emily Hardegree-Ullman	Physics	2024
Silvia Canetto	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
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2023
<u>Tony Schountz</u>	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
Katriana Popichak	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Fiona Hollinshead</u>	College-at-Large	2025
Doreene Hyatt	College-at-Large	2024
<u>Tara Nordgren</u>	College-at-Large	2025
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2023
John Rosecrance	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Zaid Abdo</u>	College-at-Large	2025
Brian Geiss	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
Gregg Griffenhagen, 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
Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2023
Brad Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2023
Ryan Brooks	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
Brett Anderson	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

Jenelle Beavers

Blanche M. Hughes

TBD

Greg Luft**Brendan Hanlon**

James Pritchett

Beth Walker

David McLean

Lise Youngblade

Sonia Kreidenweis**Ben Withers**

Karen Estlund

Simon Tavener

Susan VandeWoude

A. Alonso Aguirre

Justin Schwendeman-Curtis

(substituting for Matt Klein, Chair Administrative Professional Council)

Vice President for Research

Vice President for Strategy

Vice President for Student Affairs

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs

Interim Vice President for University Marketing &
Communications

Vice President for University Operations

Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences

Dean, College of Business

Dean, College of Engineering

Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences

Interim Dean, Graduate School

Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Dean, Libraries

Interim Dean, College of Natural Sciences

Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources

Administrative Professional Council