

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
December 6, 2022 – 4:00pm – Lory Student Center 322/Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

Chair Doe reminded members of the courtesies to assist us in the hybrid environment. Requested those in the virtual space to use the “raise hand” feature to see the order in which hands are raised. Discussed procedure for discussion. Reminded members that the meeting is fully public.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – December 6, 2022

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – February 7, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm

Chair Doe: Our next Faculty Council meeting will be on February 7, 2023, and we will resume conducting these in the Teams environment. Stated that a vote was taken at the end of last year, with an overwhelming majority requesting to remain virtual. We are trying to respect that vote.

- b. Harry Rosenberg Award

Chair Doe: Nominations for the Harry Rosenberg Award, which is an annual award for service, are now open. Encouraged members to think about who they may want to nominate. We will be providing reminders for this nomination over the next few Faculty Council meetings.

- c. Faculty Volunteers for MURALS 2023 -- [MURALS – Colorado State University \(colostate.edu\)](https://www.colostate.edu/murals)

Chair Doe: Volunteers are needed for MURALS, which is the Multicultural Undergraduate Research, Artistry, and Leadership Symposium. Encouraged members to sign up if they are able and have not done so already.

- d. Faculty Council Special Session for a Brand Presentation – Nancy Deller, Associate Vice President for Marketing – [Special Session date will be announced once confirmed]
 - a. [Recording of Previous Brand Presentation](#)

Chair Doe: We have been asked to hold a session on the branding of the University that is being proposed. It is an extensive presentation, and after the Executive Committee heard this presentation last week, we felt it was too long and important to do within the confines of a regular Faculty Council meeting. We are suggesting or asking about the possibility of a special session. Will turn it over to Nancy Deller, Associate Vice President for Marketing, to explain a little bit about this branding and the reason for talking about this now.

Associate Vice President Nancy Deller: Our intention is to provide a brand refresh that will elevate our reputation in the market and for higher education altogether. We have been working diligently to get these big idea concepts and want to take a pause and walk through the journey with everyone across campus. We are getting feedback as we continue building on this campaign and we are at a point where we have two (2) directions.

Associate Vice President Deller: There are two (2) directions that we think will elevate our reputation and positioning in the market. We are looking to collect as much feedback to get as many people engaged as possible in helping make the decision of the best direction that we would like to move forward with. This is how we would position ourselves in the market, what we say about ourselves, our voice, our actions, and how we present ourselves across the nation. This is what we are hoping to accomplish through the special session.

Chair Doe: Thanked Associate Vice President Deller. Asked that members stay tuned. It is possible we can run a special session on December 13th. Requested that members that feel strongly in either direction speak up at this time.

Melinda Smith: Would like to speak in favor of the special session, given that this branding is something we will need to live with until the next time the branding is revisited. We might want to have a voice in this.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith. Asked if there were any other thoughts. Do not believe this is something that we need to vote on. It is a matter of trying to find a day. We will keep everyone posted.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

a. Faculty Council Meeting – November 1, 2022

Chair Doe: We have minutes from the November 1st Faculty Council meeting. We have received one (1) late correction that was regarding what someone had stated. We will make that correction. Asked if there were additional corrections to be made to these minutes.

Marilee Long: Stated that the name of her department is listed incorrectly. It should be “Journalism and Media Communications” rather than “Technical Communications.”

Chair Doe: Thanked Long. We will make this correction. Asked if there were any other corrections to be made.

Hearing no further corrections, November 1st Faculty Council minutes approved by unanimous consent.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – October 21 & 28, November 4 & 11, 2022

Chair Doe: We have University Curriculum Committee minutes as part of our consent agenda. Asked if there were any items to be pulled for further review or discussion?

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

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Motion regarding Adjustments to Academic Probation Terminology – Committee on Scholastic Standards – Alan Kennan, Chair

Alan Kennan: The motion here is that the terminology for academic probation at CSU be changed and that “academic probation” will be revised to “academic standing” and the associated terms for the first semester in the process will be “academic watch” and the second semester in the process will be “academic dismissal warning.”

Kennan: The Committee on Scholastic Standards got a letter from the exploratory studies group expressing concerns that the terminology of academic probation has some issues associated it from the perspective of a deficit lens as opposed to a potential lens and that a number of our undergraduates have some contact with the criminal justice system, no matter how incidental. For a lot of people, that term was particularly charged and not one that we necessarily wanted to continue using. Stated the California State – Fullerton implemented a similar change to their language. We reached out to some peer institutions as well.

Kennan: After discussion with the committee and checking with the Registrar’s Office to ensure this would not cause any issues in terms of implementation, we suggested replacing the terms as described in the motion. Emphasized that this in no way changes any of the underlying policy. This is just a change in terminology.

Chair Doe: Thanked Kennan for the explanation. We do have a motion on the floor. Asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none, requested a vote by hands in the room and a poll using Microsoft Forms for those virtual.

Motion approved.

2. Proposed Revisions to Student Bereavement Policy – Committee on Teaching and Learning – Shawn Archibeque, Co-Chair & Cayla Bellamy, Co-Chair

Shawn Archibeque: The motion we are presenting is that CSU include the following policy on student bereavement in the academic policies of the General Catalog.

Archibeque: We currently do not have a policy at CSU for student bereavement and because of that lack of guidance, there was potential for students and faculty to become disgruntled and confused about what they should do when there is a need for bereavement leave. This policy was structured to be identical to what the current bereavement policy is for faculty and staff.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. Asked if there were any questions.

Silvia Canetto: This proposal does not have documentation mentioned specifically. Suggested that we include some statement around documentation. Thought that Student Case Management would coordinate the collection of formal documentation around death. Suggested that at a minimum, there should be the full name of the deceased and date of passing, such as a death certificate. Would be interested to hear discussion around this matter and if this is something that was already considered.

Archibeque: We did discuss this when we were putting the motion together. It was noted that there are cultures and instances where adequate documentation may not exist. That is why we chose to work with Student Case Management to manage this process. Students going through this process will be working through Student Case Management. Invited Jennifer Van Norman from Student Case Management to speak to how the process will work.

Jennifer Van Norman: The issue with collecting documentation really came to a head during COVID. Gave examples of instances where students may not be comfortable or able to request death certificates. We used to use obituaries as notification, but now people post on Facebook. Not sure if that is a verified method of documentation. Some countries do not have formal documentation through government entities.

Van Norman: We have found in the last two (2) years with students is that very few abuse the instructor notification process. To document bereavement, we use a bereavement data form that gathers information so that a case manager can see the student's file and whether there is a pattern of requesting bereavement leave or instructor notification that looks abusive. We can track that without forcing someone to get documentation.

Chair Doe: Thanked Van Norman. Asked if there were additional comments or questions.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Asked why the five (5) days are indicated as non-consecutive.

Van Norman: It was brought up by faculty that, as an example, a student could find out about a death and require an immediate day for grief. It is possible that student may not be able to get a

flight back right away, or a service is scheduled for a later date. This would allow the student to have their immediate days for grief, and then more later for a service.

Chair Doe: Commented that this question also came up in Executive Committee when discussing this motion. The question was around why the days needed to be consecutive. Believe that is where the alterations came from.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern that this might facilitate a situation where these days are spread out throughout a semester in a way that does not indicate any clear closure. Expressed concern that the language is rather lax around that. Wondering if these kinds of situations would be addressed by case management. Worried that we may be convoluting the waters.

Van Norman: When we are getting the information from the student and doing the data form, it is specifically to be used for the example just described. Gave an example. If a significant person in the student's life passes, they have a day of immediate grief, and then traveling to Denver for a memorial service. Let's say an that person's birthday is the next month and it brings it all back up again. This could be an example of when those days may be spread out.

Van Norman: From experience doing this for fifteen (15) years and dealing with student crises, this does not usually happen. The student is almost always looking for days for immediate grief and then the services. If a service is happening much later than a death, those kinds of instances are things we know ahead of time and can put in the data form.

Doug Cloud: Have found that students are not particularly inclined to abuse this. Expressed concern because we are headed toward a real problem in terms of attendance and expectations of instructors in that students are very confused about what is and is not a sanctioned or unsanctioned absence. Want to give students the opportunity to grieve but concerned that we are going to be inundated with requests who not only need an absence but expect us to reach out to help them make up the work, recreate the class, and make sure they do not miss anything. It is not feasible for instructors. Wondering what we are doing to communicate to students that they may need to miss classes for something important like bereavement, but they will miss things and there is no way around that. Having difficulty around this with students.

Van Norman: These discussions happen with our case managers and students whenever they have requests. We do tell students that we are not able to give them an excused absence. We can verify extenuating circumstances and help them use instructor notification to request considerations from instructors, because the policy is that instructors get to set their attendance requirements and policies in the classroom. Missing class and the consequences are part of the conversations we have with students.

Archibeque: To follow up on Van Norman's comments, this policy does specifically point out that missing coursework may have a negative effect on the student's overall grade and that absence from the class for any reason may be detrimental to their learning.

Van Norman: In our conversations with students, we will discuss those absences and what their options are, whether it be a withdrawal or drop, or a registration appeal or repeat/repair.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for the conversation. Asked if there were any additional comments. Hearing none, requested a vote by hands in the room and by chat for those in the virtual room.

Motion approved.

F. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – Interim President Rick Miranda

Interim President Rick Miranda: Went over a second version of the budget. Stated this is just the Education and General Budget (E&G) budget. This budget does not include the research dollars or auxiliary budget, including University Housing & Dining, parking, etc.

President Miranda: This budget is the incremental budget, so just the difference between this year and what we are expecting next year. We have two (2) sections, revenue and expenses, and then the four (4) scenarios. The scenarios include two (2) variables. Explained the variables and the percentages listed. Stated that a 4% tuition increase is the max based on the governor's budget, which came out a month ago and is just a proposal. The governor's budget is the first official moment in the budget cycle, and the governor put a certain amount of money towards higher education, which we did not know at the October meeting when we last presented the budget. The governor recommended we cap resident undergraduate tuition increases at 4%, which is included in one (1) of the scenarios.

President Miranda: The other variable is compensation figure. The state classified population at the University, through COWINS, has been negotiating a 5% salary increase, and we like to keep the raise increases roughly constant across all three (3) of the employee groups. Our scenarios have either 5% average for everyone across the board, or 3% for faculty and administrative professionals, and 5% for the state classified as they have negotiated.

President Miranda: The revenue side will be affected by the tuition variable, not the salary. We are either expecting \$19.7 million or \$24 million based on the two (2) tuition scenarios. The higher tuition would bring in about \$5 million more dollars. Explained the various lines on the budget sheet. We also have funding from state appropriation funding, incentive funding, special education programs. We also have extra money for the Veterinary school and the Extension service. Explained the Facilities and Administration overhead. Stated that this budget reflects a more conservative approach. When the smoke clears between the tuition and the state appropriations that the governor has proposed, there are either \$31 million or \$36 million new dollars available. Asked if there were questions about the revenue side.

Smith: With the state funding impact, wondering if this is an increase in state investment.

President Miranda: Yes, when you add those two (2) numbers together, it is about a 6.5% increase in the appropriations.

President Miranda: The next section of the budget is us taking the new revenue and subtracting what we think we are going to need to spend in additional financial aid. We have had a policy that if we increase tuition, we increase financial aid to maintain our capacity to serve and give

students scholarships that we want. There is about \$3.9 million in financial aid increases in this budget. Based on the variables, we either have \$27.8 million or \$31.6 million to work with for revenue.

President Miranda: Explained the expenses. With the compensation, it changes depending on the scenario. With the 3% scenario, it will cost the University \$22 million, and the 5% scenario will cost the University \$30.8 million. The other expense lines are the same and do not depend on the various scenarios. We have items like multi-year central investments in strategic initiatives, which are things that the President decides we should do. We also have quality enhancements. The other categories include incentive funding and mandatory costs. Stated that this is a conservative approach, and they are not budgeting for an enrollment increase. One of the exceptions to the tuition-sharing in the incentive line are the increases for tuition in the Veterinary school, as a lot of the tuition they receive goes back to the Veterinary school. Mandatory costs are coming in at about \$3 million, which includes items like the inflation of journals for the Library. Asked if there were any questions about the expense side of things.

Smith: Asked: With the compensation, does that just include the raises?

President Miranda: It also includes the promotion increases, and there is quite a bit of money included to address equity issues around the University. It does not just include the 3% and 5% average raise pool.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked the administration for acknowledging the reality of inflation, even if only for scholarships. Would like to know if for the quality enhancements if the administration is considering, as part of that, the reality of College of Liberal Arts departments having to be 3/2 as part of those quality enhancements.

President Miranda: Do not believe there is a special allocation for that. It might occur as part of the compensation piece as an equity initiative, but not sure. We have discussed this, though.

Smith: Curious about how the compensation piece might be more fluid with the new President. They may want to hire new staff.

President Miranda: It is possible and there is a likelihood that this may change. Another reason this may change is that, for those paying attention, we entered the year with a \$5.8 million deficit. In addition to balancing our revenues with our expenses, which ends up being either \$35 million or \$42 million depending on the scenarios, we do some subtraction, and we are either \$3 million, \$6 million, \$11 million, or \$15 million in the hole. If we pay off that \$5.8 million deficit, we will find ourselves either \$9 million, \$12 million, \$17 million, or \$21 million in the hole. This budget will change, because ultimately, the Board wants the bottom line to be zero. Even in the most optimistic scenario, we will have to find \$9 million to balance the budget. This may mean new revenue, which is not out of the question. On the expense side, we may need to find places to cut expenses. Stated that this budget does not impose any budget cuts and the budget reduction line is blank. This budget will certainly change, and the next President will make final decisions in presenting the final budget to the Board of Governors in May.

Mary Van Buren: Would like to know what the Board of Governors reserve is at the current time and what expenditures have been made from some of that money over the last year or so. Asked if this was part of the quality enhancement line or if that money is coming from somewhere else.

President Miranda: The Board of Governors reserve is not part of our base funding. The reserve gets infusions from various resources, namely the CSU Global Campus profits. On an annual basis, typically at the December Board meeting, they make expenditures from the reserves on a one-time basis. We have enjoyed some of that funding for things like the SPUR campus and the medical school cohort. The Board also gave us money for our student success initiative and our rural initiative. The Board makes allocations on an annual basis and spends the reserve while paying attention to what the projections are for new revenues coming in from the CSU Global campus.

Vice President Brendan Hanlon: Last week at the Board meeting, they presented slides, and one (1) of them was an overview of the work reserves reconciliation. For fiscal year 2023, which started on July 1st, there was a balance of \$55.9 million, and their estimate for close of this year is \$31.3 million available.

Van Buren: Asked: Why can't the Board reserves be treated in the same way as research dollars and contribute to the general budget or the base budget for compensation and salary for staff and faculty? There is not absolute knowledge of how much it is going to be, but there is a constant influx.

President Miranda: Would argue strongly that the influx from the profits of CSU Global are far more volatile looking into the future than our research expenditures. Think it might be rather dangerous to base budget based on future profits of the Global campus.

Anders Fremstad: Asked: Is there a record of where these one-time central funds go?

President Miranda: Yes, this is done every December as part of the public Board meetings. There is a public record of that.

Smith: Asked: What is your take on the Board as far as how conservative they are about this budget shortfall? There is carryover, so wondering if this is a possible thing that happens. Curious whether they will ask us to pay the full \$9.2 million shortfall.

President Miranda: If we look at it between February and May and look at last year's deficit of \$5.8 million, and we pay most of it off, could get a little relief. An argument could be made that it is not a deficit, per se, but investment in things like compensation and investment in a resources that you know will pay off in the future. There is a long game and a short game. The short game is paying off the debt, the long game is thinking about what is better for the health of the University. Stated that going back to the reserves and continuing to drain that for base budgets may not tend to the positive. Commented that during the last budget presentation, the deficits ranged between \$21 million and \$40 million rather than the \$9 million and \$21 million now, so we have made a lot of progress in the last two (2) months.

Chair Doe: Thanked President Miranda. Asked if he had any comments about the big announcement this last Friday.

President Miranda: Expressed excitement about Amy Parsons joining us as the next President. Have worked with her for many years while serving as Provost. Parsons was the Vice President for University Operations and CFO. Think one (1) big advantage of her taking the role is that we will not lose momentum. The strategic plan is in place and it is a matter of figuring out where our priorities are and what we should do first and how quickly.

Chair Doe: Commented on some concerns that were voiced to her about her academic background and credentials. Wondering if you can speak to that.

President Miranda: We see this across the country as an emerging trend in higher education Presidents not necessarily being from academics. Provided some examples. This is not unheard of, but is something we have not done before here at CSU. The question is less about academic credentials and more about support of academics, and whether a new President will build an academically-oriented team to run the academic parts of the University. Parsons admitted that this is not part of her background, but acknowledged that her job is to make sure that the academic side in the curriculum and research programs are strong. Stated she is committed to helping us all do that.

Pedros-Gascon: On the one side, there is a common understanding that one (1) of the benefits of going for an internal candidate is that the person already knows the culture and place. One of the negative sides to this is that this individual may be entrenched in the toxic and problematic issues of the institution and may not be able or willing to address those problems.

Van Buren: Think there are many people across the University that are concerned about Parsons' lack of academic background. She has experience as a lawyer and administrator and entrepreneur. Many of us are not thrilled about further private and public partnerships that may go awry or not foster the most important aspects of academics. Wondering about her commitment to shared governance, as an example. Stated that Parsons' cover letter barely mentioned faculty. Expressed concern about this.

KuoRay Mao: Have heard from colleagues and while they appreciated Parsons' connection to CSU, they expressed concerns that they would prefer to have a President that comes from the academic side of the governance structure. They also mentioned that other institutions that have hired CEOs as their Presidents have seen faculty turnover. In addition to this, some faculty questioned whether this new precedent can maintain a sense of independence from the Chancellor, specifically in the sense of shared governance and given the institutional location of CSU-Fort Collins, within the full CSU System. Lastly, despite the search committee's role in the process, the consensus from colleagues was around transparency and avenues to provide feedback. The avenue to provide feedback at this point is really just a link on the website, and anyone who wants to give feedback is putting their name out there and will have their email address shown. There are faculty that hope that the feedback process can also be improved.

Alexandra Bernasek: Wanted to mention that Parsons was appointed as the Vice President for University Operations without a search, as well as the Vice Chancellor without a search. Wondering if this is the best candidate from higher education leaders that applied for this position.

President Miranda: Will reiterate that the search process was a robust one. Expressed agreement that it was a closed search, not an open process, but there were thirty-one (31) community members on the search committee. We held nine (9) open forums on campus to gain input. That input was distilled and created the questions that were asked of all the candidates throughout the process. The search committee selected twelve (12) candidates to interview, and then selected three (3) of those to go forward. The Board of Governors selected Parsons. Do not believe it was an unusual process. The Board of Governors worked hard to get as much input as possible and had a big search committee to make sure that we had a lot of input in the process as it proceeded. In the end, the Board of Governors makes the decision.

Smith: The perception of this national search resulting in the hiring of a person with no academic experience makes us take a step back and ask how we did a national search and it did not result in someone who actually has major academic jobs.

Smith: Second comment is about the process with respect to the hiring authority of the Board of Governors. Curious as to why there were Board of Governors members on the search committee. Usually, within the academic setting, we always have a separation between the hiring authority and the search committee. Wondering if President Miranda could speak to this.

President Miranda: Believe the way they set it up, there were three (3) or four (4) Board of Governors members on the search committee.

Smith: This would be like having the Dean on the search committee. The chair is not on the search committee. This looks like a different process.

Rob Mitchell: Thanked President Miranda for attending and for the transparency around some of your decision-making around budgets. Cannot speak for everyone but feel Parsons' selection is positive as a potential President for CSU, particularly on the strategy side and dealing with a dynamic and changing landscape in higher education. Asked President Miranda: To what extent do you see Parsons as being able to innovate, try new things, and be strategic with all the work we have done with the Courageous Strategic Transformation to move us forward and put us in a position in the higher education space that enables us to be successful in the future? Right now, we are talking about deficits. We want to get into a position where we have surplus.

President Miranda: Understand that Parsons is an extremely intelligent and creative person. Believe she is willing to roll up her sleeves and look to solve problems in unique ways and to be entrepreneurial. Provided examples of past innovations, including Todos Santos, the Commitment to Campus activities, and launching the SPUR campus. Think she has great experience in some of the dimensions just mentioned by Mitchell.

Sybil Sharvelle: Echoed concerns about lack of academic experience. Have heard this concern a lot from colleagues across the University. Would like to be more specific about why this creates concern for faculty. Someone that has not had this experience doesn't necessarily know what it is like to balance teaching, research, and engagement activities, doesn't understand what it takes to publish a peer-reviewed paper and work with and mentor students. They do not know what it takes to write a research grant and execute that grant with faculty and collaborators. Wondering how Parsons will get up to speed on understanding all these things so that she can better accommodate the needs of faculty.

President Miranda: Think that will be part of all our roles in onboarding the new President. Will be helping her understand these things, but you all will too. The expectation is that she would come to Faculty Council on a regular basis to hear concerns and interface intimately with the Provost's Office, who is charged with the leadership of the academic part of the institution. We will need to ensure that the academic side is kept front and center in thinking about how to move the institution forward.

Fremstad: The academic mission is obviously important to everyone here. When thinking about the investment in the academic mission of this University, when we are looking at things in terms of innovation, like the SPUR campus or Todos Santos, wondering if these are things that help us balance our budget and where our priorities are. In the letter from the incoming President, there was no mention about that sort of budget work. The biggest source of revenue we have is tuition from students. Feel this is something our candidates should be speaking to.

President Miranda: Interviewed the three (3) final candidates and Parsons did a great job expressing her ability to appreciate exactly what was just mentioned. Believe she gets this on a deep level. She wants to keep student access at the forefront of the University life, which includes all of us in our activities. Her work as the Vice President for University Operations had her involved in the building of new facilities, including the Computer Science building, the Biology building. Parsons does have her hands in many things on the academic side, but admittedly not everything. Provided personal example of moving to various positions in the University and learning along the way.

Ajean Ryan: Apologized for some of the heat that President Miranda is taking, but there is obviously a lot of concern. Expressed that there is a certain persistence of CSU culture that is prioritized in leadership. If we are talking about moving forward and creating a new branding, wondering how this is embracing the idea of diversity and equity. Wondering how is this embracing the idea of the new and the different and bringing people to campus who might be challenging but working within a framework that allows us to grow and change and not maintain the status quo. We hear that we want faculty from different backgrounds but do not understand how we can maintain that while continuing in a nepotistic vein.

President Miranda: It is true that Parsons has higher education experience at CSU. We are looking at whether she can be an innovative leader that can take us in new directions. Believe that can happen, especially if our community works together and gives her the space to figure things out and work with her about what direction we think the University will go. Believe Parsons will listen.

Stephan Kroll: Have two (2) things that are related. The first is that there are frequently two (2) ways of becoming a President. The first method is to follow the path President Miranda has, by working up from a chair, to Provost, and then to President. The second way is through hiring a big name individual, such as a senator or business leader. Do not know Parsons but believe she does not fit into the second category either.

Kroll: Second question is regarding her role as a CEO of a beauty company. Asked: What does it mean to have a CEO who has a very different mindset than we have in academia? Not sure it is that easy to switch the mindset. That kind of CEO is interested in making profits, and that is not the same as in academic areas.

President Miranda: Stated that the same budget presented today was the presided over by Parsons while serving as the Vice President for University Operations. Parsons has recent experience in being an entrepreneur but has sixteen (16) years with us at CSU in a variety of leadership positions. Feel confident that Parsons will be able to look at this budget and understand each figure.

Kroll: Expressed agreement, does not feel that is the concern. Parsons will understand the budget better than most. The concern is that the budget is a side issue to what the University's mission actually is, whereas with a CEO, the budget is everything.

President Miranda: The budget is a tool for sending resources to where your priorities are. With this particular budget, the biggest priority is compensation. That is how we are making a statement when we display a budget like this. Understanding the numbers is not the issue, it is understanding why we are investing in certain areas instead of others. Parsons was a part of those conversations for the better part of a decade on this campus.

Bernasek: Have three (3) comments. The first is how we give feedback in a closed search. We are giving feedback right now, but wondering how we are able to give feedback prior to a decision being made. The second is that we are given assurances that Parsons will be successful, but we are being told that we will need to support her. Do not believe we had this conversation with former President Joyce McConnell, so stating that Parsons will need our support seems to undermine your position. Thirdly, in terms of diversity, a question was asked about commitment to diversity and inclusion. Do not believe that was answered.

Chair Doe: There is a link available on the Presidential Search website. Know many have indicated they are not comfortable giving their responses in that environment. Believe Faculty Council has the opportunity to provide feedback such as what we are hearing right now. We could do our own survey and batch that information together to present to the Board of Governors so they understand what people are saying. Would be an anonymous survey. Have heard from the System office that any feedback provided through their link would be presented unadulterated and there is no intention to edit it.

Vice Provost Susan James: Indicated that people are asking in the chat if other employee groups will be included as part of this anonymous survey.

Chair Doe: Asked President Miranda how he felt about the concept of a survey.

President Miranda: Indicated support for survey. The more communication, the better.

Van Buren: Given that we have had little input and what is being solicited is not anonymous, move that the Faculty Council conduct a survey soliciting anonymous input from faculty and staff about the Presidential finalist.

Fremstad: Seconded Van Buren's motion.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote of hands in the room and through a poll in the chat using Microsoft Forms in the virtual room.

Motion approved.

Randall Boone: Wanted to confirm that this would be just a survey to share our thoughts. Think if we start her time with us with a vote of no confidence, that would be a bad thing.

Chair Doe: Confirmed. The other thing that this might do is provide our sole finalist with some understanding of concerns, in fairness to her.

Kroll: Asked about the timeline for the survey.

Andrew Norton: Indicated that the meeting for final consideration by the Board of Governors is on Friday, December 16th. Think it would be good to get the comments to the Board by next Wednesday, December 14th. Would mean we should close the survey by 5:00 p.m. on Monday to allow for analysis next Tuesday.

Chair Doe: Encouraged members to get feedback from their constituencies, as we may not be able to survey all faculty. [This statement was revised following the meeting to reflect the motion – all faculty and staff were determined to be sent the survey for their input]. Gave examples of some questions that may appear as part of the survey.

Vice Provost James: Requested clarification. Asked: The comment just made for Faculty Council would apply to the Administrative Professional Council and the Classified Personnel Council, correct?

Van Buren: Motion included staff as well as faculty.

Amy Barkley: Would likely need to send this to the chairs of the councils for distribution, since we do not own those email lists.

Canetto: Asked: How will the survey results make a difference? Wondering also what questions will be asked so we have some clarity in terms of what this survey would look like.

Chair Doe: Think it would be a simple survey, such as whether we find a candidate acceptable or unacceptable, open-ended questions, and responses for why. Cannot promise this will make a difference. Asked if Norton could speak to this.

Norton: Think it is important. We have had discussions for some time now in Faculty Council that the Board should get a better sense of what faculty think, and that probably goes the other way as well. As to whether this will make any change, cannot predict that.

Chair Doe: Directed members' attention to a comment in the chat about including faculty that find themselves in non-academic homes.

G. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Ceded time for discussion with President Miranda.

Interim Provost Janice Nerger: Expressed appreciation for the conversation. Think it is important to hear what people have to say. Indicated that people are also welcome to send comments to her and she will relay those. Know it will not be anonymous to herself, but am genuine in saying that comments will be passed on anonymously as sent.

Provost Nerger: Gave a report to the Board of Governors. Will send this to Chair Doe so that people can see that report.

H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Fall 2022 Task Force Reports
 - a. Administrative Leave Task Force
 - b. Budget 101 to Capstone Task Force
 - c. Contracts Task Force
 - d. Innovative Directions Task Force
 - e. Shared Governance Task Force

Postponed to February Faculty Council meeting.

Chair Doe: Noted that the task forces are completing their work. We will discuss this more at our February meeting when we have the full set.

2. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Submitted written [Chair's report](#).

3. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: The Board of Governors meeting completed last Friday. Have heard the most important updates from President Miranda regarding the updates on budget. Will be giving more information in February with a full report.

I. DISCUSSION

1. YOU@CSU Presentation – John McGuire, CSU Leadership Fellow
 - a. [Faculty and staff version of YOU@CSU brings confidential well-being resources to employees \(colostate.edu\)](#)

Postponed to February Faculty Council meeting.

President Miranda: Thanked everyone for their work. Expressed hope that everyone has a great rest of the semester.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for coming. Called the meeting adjourned.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:59 p.m.

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

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING
2022-2023

Chair: Sue Doe

Executive Assistant: Amy Barkley

Professional Registered Parliamentarian: Lola Fehr

Vice-Chair: Melinda Smith

BOG Representative: Andrew Norton

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2025
Jennifer Martin	Animal Sciences	2024
Jane Stewart	Agricultural Biology	2024
Kelly Curl	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2025
Jim Ippolito	Soil and Crop Sciences	2023
<u>Marco Costanigro</u>	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Bradley Goetz</u>	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
<u>Erin Arneson</u>	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		
<u>Bill Rankin</u>	Accounting	2023
<u>John Hoxmeier</u>	Computer Information Systems	2024
<u>Bharadwaj Kannan</u>	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
Thomas Bradley	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 Media Communication	2025
Madeline Harvey	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2025
Andre Archie	Philosophy	2025
<u>Marni Berg</u>	Political Science	2024
KuoRay Mao	Sociology	2025
(substituting for Laura Raynolds, on sabbatical 2022-2023)		

Ajean Ryan	College-at-Large	2023
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2025
Emily Morgan	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Lisa Langstraat</u>	College-at-Large	2024
<u>Erica LaFehr</u>	College-at-Large	2024
(substituting for Allison Goar, on sabbatical Fall 2022)		
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
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
Alan Van Orden	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
Tony Schountz	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
Katriana Popichak	College-at-Large	2025
Fiona Hollinshead	College-at-Large	2025
Doreene Hyatt	College-at-Large	2024
Tara Nordgren	College-at-Large	2025
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2023
John Rosecrance	College-at-Large	2023
Zaid Abdo	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	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 Matt Klein, Chair of APC)	