

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
April 4, 2023 – 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 – April 4, 2023

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – May 2, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm

Chair Doe: Stated our next Faculty Council meeting will be held in the hybrid format, with the in-person component taking place in TILT 221. We will also have the virtual option over Teams.

- b. Save the Date -- Administrative Professional Celebration – Thursday, April 27, 2023 at 11:30am to 1:00pm in Ballrooms A-B in the Lory Student Center
- c. Poll – Virtual, Hybrid, or In-Person Meetings for Faculty Council in 2023-2024

Chair Doe: We would like to conduct a poll about Faculty Council’s preferences in terms of how to conduct meetings in 2023-2024, whether virtual, hybrid, or in-person. Stated that attendance has been high with the virtual approach but know some people would like to have the opportunity to be in-person. Requested a poll be placed in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Faculty Council members voted 59% for virtual, 29% hybrid, and 11% for in-person meetings.

Chair Doe: These results suggest that there is an argument for variety with the meetings, with perhaps most of the meetings virtual with the occasional hybrid or in-person meeting. This is great information. We will record the results and take it from there. Expressed appreciation for everyone’s input on this.

Chair Doe: Turned meeting over to Andrew Norton to introduce Board of Governors guests.

Andrew Norton: Reminded Faculty Council members that we are trying to have Board of Governors members attend our Faculty Council meetings to give them a better sense of what we

do as faculty and the kind of issues we face. This will also allow our Board of Governors members an opportunity to introduce themselves to us so we can get to know them a little better. Stated that Governors Polly Baca and Betsy Markey are present. Asked that they introduce themselves and explain what excites them about being on the Board of Governors.

Governor Polly Baca: Indicated that CSU had changed her life. Graduated from CSU with a bachelor's in political science in 1962. Had started at CSU as a physics major and received an Honors scholarship that paid tuition and fees at CSU. While on campus, was very involved, which was due to a professor that was the academic advisor for the Young Democrats, Dr. Lee Sefton. Was elected secretary of graduating class and Vice President of the Young Democrats. Dr. Sefton suggested switching majors to political science, and the rest is history.

Governor Baca: Invited everyone to watch Rocky Mountain PBS on Thursday, April 13th at 7:30 p.m. They are running some documentaries on great women of Colorado. Stated that there will be a documentary about her on April 13th. Credited CSU for a lot of her successes.

Norton: Congratulated Governor Baca. That is very well deserved. Invited Governor Markey to speak about background.

Governor Betsy Markey: Thanked Norton for the invitation to attend Faculty Council. Feels this is a great opportunity to get to know everyone better.

Governor Markey: Was thrilled to hear from Governor Jared Polis about serving on the Board of Governors. Had recently retired from Governor Polis' cabinet as the Head of Economic Development and International Trade. Have lived in Fort Collins for nearly thirty (30) years and CSU is really part of our family and community, which is what is so special about the University. Have taken classes at CSU as an adult, as well as husband. We saw that CSU was Fort Collins and is such a vital part of the community and still is. Was a member of Congress and represented CSU during term. Have always loved being on campus and meeting with students and faculty. Have also seen the importance of CSU across the state because of the land-grant mission and Extension offices. It is exciting that CSU has such a statewide presence and is so valued across the state. Owned a small coffee shop in Fort Collins for a while and only hired CSU students. They work so hard and are passionate about changing the world. Gives us hope and am excited to support their journey.

Norton: Thanked Governors Baca and Markey. Invited them to stay for the remainder of the meeting.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

a. Faculty Council Meeting – March 7, 2023

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any changes to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from March 7th.

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – February 24, March 3, 10 & 24, 2023

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any items to be pulled for further consideration.

Hearing none, consent agenda approved by unanimous consent.

E. ACTION ITEMS

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

Steve Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the election of the academic faculty nominees to the Faculty Council standing committees as shown in the agenda packet.

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

Motion approved.

2. Motion on Fresh Start Policy – Committee on Scholastic Standards – Alan Kennan, Chair

Alan Kennan: This is a proposal that deals with systems that allow students a one-time opportunity to reset their GPA. Currently there are two (2) systems. The first is specific to people who do badly their first semester, so first-time, first-year students who are below a 1.0 GPA. They can get a fresh start if they stay away from one (1) to three (3) semesters. The second system is open to all first-time students is Academic Fresh Start, which currently requires them to stay away for two (2) years.

Kennan: Since 2017, there have been 829 students eligible for Freshman Accelerated Fresh Start, and the results have not indicated that this is having the intended effect of improving student persistence and success. Only about 3% of the eligible students wound up taking advantage of the program. Of that 3%, only about half of them ended up in good academic standing at the end of their first semester.

Kennan: With the regular Academic Fresh Start, the perceived problem is that students are asked to stay away for two (2) years, but in practice, there is a back door where they can apply to come back early. This back door system is not well-advertised, so there is an equity issue about who has access to this and who does not. A lot of people are not staying away for the full two (2)

years, but they reapply to come back and are told they cannot come back with the Fresh Start and they come back anyway with bad outcomes.

Kennan: We would like to simplify everything to get everyone on the same page and provide every student with the same opportunity. We want to eliminate the Freshman Accelerated Fresh Start and change the requirement for the regular Fresh Start so that students only have to be away for one (1) year instead of two (2) years. This seems to better match the way students are voting with their feet.

Kennan: The Committee on Scholastic Standards undertook some due diligence with this proposal. We contacted a lot of campus stakeholders and received universal enthusiasm from all those stakeholders, particularly from Admissions and the Registrar's Office.

Kennan: The Committee on Scholastic Standards moves that the Freshman Accelerated Fresh Start policy for first-year students who earn below a 1.0 GPA in their first term be eliminated, and that the timeline for granting a Fresh Start be adjusted to one (1) year since the student's last term of enrollment as an admitted degree-seeking student.

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

Marni Berg: Wondering what kind of support there is once a student comes back for a Fresh Start. Asked: Is there academic support or mentoring or anything like that so they can be successful the second time around?

Gaye DiGregorio: These students make an academic plan for success, and they work with an academic success coordinator or their advisor.

Silvia Canetto: Asked: Is there a particular profile of the students who have this kind of experience, so that we can understand the context of the difficulties? This may help us to think in terms of prevention, as well as different ways to think about admission. Requested that the term "freshman" be removed in the policy and replaced with the term "first-year."

Kennan: We will look for the term "freshman" in the policy to make sure we do that substitution in the proposal. In the proposal, it refers to the existing policy. Not sure where else it exists, but we will look for that.

Kennan: In terms of profile, at the beginning of this process there was some analysis of that, but there was not anything that jumped out as being obvious. These were the kinds of students that we would expect to be having trouble. Not sure if there was anything specific about this subpopulation.

DiGregorio: Expressed appreciation for the question around wanting to be more proactive. We do have a lot of early intervention programs with early performance feedback. For at least over 90% of our first-year students, they have at least one (1) course where they get feedback if they are not meeting expectations. We have been taking a stock survey through the residence halls.

We are trying to do all those kinds of things in their first semester to support them early. We do have students that end up in this situation for various reasons.

Kennan: Noted that the word “freshman” was just in the motion, not the policy itself.

Chair Doe: Indicated that this could be a friendly amendment to the motion. Asked if there were any other questions or discussion. Hearing nothing further, requested a poll in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

3. CIOSU Biennial Reviews 2022 – Committee on University Programs – Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia, Chair

Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia: The Biennial report is the report in which the Committee on University Programs evaluates all the centers that are currently operating with their University affiliation. Normally, we have about 75 to 80 centers, and every two (2) years we evaluate them. We have certain guidelines that we use and procedures to evaluate.

Suarez-Garcia: The Committee on University Programs evaluated twenty-eight (28) centers. Twenty-six (26) of these centers are recommended for continuation. As part of the evaluation, we look at several items. We evaluate the number of faculty involved, the description of activities, the budget, the list of accomplishments, and their plan for the next twenty-four (24) months. The committee evaluates these five (5) major items, and we make recommendations to continue, consolidate, or terminate the CIOSU. We meet once we evaluate all the centers, typically after Winter Break.

Suarez-Garcia: The evaluation process this year was similar to last year. We follow the recommendations of not just the document, but the overseeing administrator and the director of the center. The Committee on University Programs recommended twenty-six (26) to continue and two (2) to be terminated. The two (2) being terminated are being terminated as requested by the director of the center.

Suarez-Garcia: This report also has observations at the end, where we underline some issues that we are facing and working on as a committee. We are hoping to solve these issues for future meetings. One of the issues is working on more inclusive language. Another is the guideline where an application that has only one (1) department affiliation does not need to apply for CIOSU status. You can operate a center, and it does not have to be affiliated unless you want an institutional affiliation. This has been an issue with some of the applications. We are spending time on the definition we have in the guidelines and clarifying it for future reference.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. Since this is a report, we will just be placing this into the record. We are not able to alter it and we can have the support of the Faculty Council to put it in the record.

Suarez-Garcia: Would like this to put into the records of Faculty Council. Recommend that we approve the document as is.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. Expressed appreciation for the considerable work that is involved every year in evaluating half of the CIOUSUs. If there are no objections, requested a poll be placed into the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Report received.

4. New CIOUSU: Center for Science Communication – Committee on University Programs – Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia, Chair

Suarez-Garcia: This second item is an evaluation of a new application. We have been working with the director of this new center, Jamie Jacobson, for a couple of years to make sure that this application meets the requirements and follows the guidelines we have. We evaluated the mission and statement of goals and objectives. We also look to ensure there is no duplication with another center. There is also a description of the organization, explanation of funding, and who the overseeing administrator is. The overseeing administrator for this new center is the dean of the College of Liberal Arts. This application has met all the requirements.

Suarez-Garcia: Move to approve the Center for Science Communication as a new CIOUSU starting in Fall 2023.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. Asked if there was any discussion or questions.

Suarez-Garcia: Clarified that this center has been operating for a long time, so this is not completely new. They are just requesting new institutional affiliation. It is affiliated with a lot of different colleges and different personnel. Think this center is working nicely.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. Hearing no further discussion, requested a poll in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

5. Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Requirements for all Graduate Degrees, “Scholastic Standards” – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – William Sanford, Chair

William Sanford: The Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education moves that Faculty Council adopt the following revisions to the section “Scholastic Standards” and update all instances referencing “academic probation” to “academic dismissal warning” in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin.

Sanford: The basic reason for this change was to change the “probation” term to parallel what was done with the undergraduate language.

Chair Doe: Thanked Sanford. Asked if there were any questions or discussion. Hearing none, requested a poll in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

6. Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Graduate Assistantships, “Assistantships” and “Terminations of Graduate Assistants” – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – William Sanford, Chair

Sanford: The Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education moves that Faculty Council adopt the following revisions to the section Graduate Assistantships, Assistantships, and Termination of Graduate Assistants in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin.

Chair Doe: Noted that there have been some objections to this motion raised by the Office of General Counsel and our President’s Office. Invited those present and able to speak to those concerns to do that before we hear from others.

Dean Colleen Webb: One of the main concerns we have is that we have a phase-in period for the graduate assistant mandatory fees benefit. There is concern that due to the way this is worded it might not be clear enough around that phase-in period. Our plan would be to not move forward with this suggested change at this time and instead work on a University policy piece that could be clearer around what the mandatory fee policy is, and then move forward with this after a clearer set of language is available. We want to have that policy piece before these changes are made to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin.

Executive Vice President Rick Miranda: Expressed agreement with Dean Webb. We think the best practice here would be to establish the University policy about mandatory fees. Would be happy to sponsor that as fast as possible. This is something we need to have in place soon because of our federal grant programs. This will help the Office of Sponsored Programs with grants that will help pay the mandatory fees and stay within the guardrails of the grants, and they will need to be able to point to a formal policy from the University.

Executive Vice President Miranda: We would like this to be referred back to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education. Committed to working with Dean Webb and this committee to develop that policy as soon as possible and get it published. There are also a few other points in this section that could use revision and we will work with Dean Webb and the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education on some of those points. Indicated that one of the revisions needed was in the first sentence in the “Assistantship” section that states that teaching assistantships are funded by the state of Colorado as part of the resident instruction budget, and that is incorrect. Similar considerations should be installed into this part of the Graduate and Professional Bulletin with respect to the Graduate Service Assistants, of which we have quite a few on campus. Expressed support for referring this back to the committee and developing the policy so that it can be referenced.

Dean Webb: Believe this section has not been updated for some time. In addition to working on the policy for the mandatory fee coverage, propose we work with the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education to update this section overall.

Norton: Asked if there was a timeline in mind for when this would get back to Faculty Council. Additionally asked what the timeline was for the policy related to sponsor agreements, since that seems like a time-sensitive issue.

Executive Vice President Miranda: For the policy, believe we could get that in place this month if we use the fast-track mechanism. We can turn this into a University policy without too much trouble. With the other changes in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin, would take a conversation with the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education. We might be able to bring this back to the May Faculty Council meeting.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Asked how much of the fees for graduate assistants still need to be covered. The second question is who the sponsor for the graduate assistants in his unit would be. Curious whether the sponsor would be the Graduate School or department.

Executive Vice President Miranda: The commitment we made last fall was that we would centrally start paying the mandatory fees at 50% next year, 75% the following year, and then 100% the year after that. This will be a three-year phase-in. We were able to find some one-time dollars for this spring. We anticipated making the 50% payment next year, but we have been able to do it this spring as well.

Dean Webb: For the second question, the fee benefit for Graduate Teaching Assistants will be funded by central, by the University, and that will flow through the Graduate School together with the tuition piece. It will be different for the Graduate Research Assistants because they are funded through different types of accounts and will have different rules depending on where the money is coming from. Stated there is a full FAQ available on the Graduate School website that talks about a lot of the details on the graduate student fees.

Scott Wiebensohn: Asked what the range of the current costs are for these mandatory fees. Not sure if the committee provided a range since there are a lot of different graduate assistants here and what their mandatory fees look like throughout.

Dean Webb: The mandatory fees depend on the number of credits that the student is taking, but all those fees for any particular student are covered up to the percentage. Whether the student is taking five (5) or nine (9) credits, half their fees will be covered this semester. The fees for a full-time student are about \$1,200 a semester.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for the discussion. We have a request for this to be referred back to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education. Requested a motion.

Norton: Move that this be referred back to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education with what is a reasonable timeline for reporting back at the May Faculty meeting.

Sanford: Indicated that the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education meets the first Thursday of the month. May not give us enough time. Think it would be hard to do it this semester.

Norton: Revised motion. Move that we refer this back to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education and that the committee work with all speed and alacrity to get back to us with it.

Reising: Second.

Chair Doe: Thanked Norton and Reising. Requested a poll in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion to refer proposed revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin back to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education approved.

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

Jennifer Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty proposes this amendment to Section J as outlined in the Faculty Council agenda packet. This revision of Section J makes this policy up to date with the many changes in federal policy, as well as specifically separate copyright and patent policies for our campus.

Chair Doe: Thanked Martin. Expressed hope that the Faculty Council membership understands the enormity of the task that was undertaken with Section J, as well as the amount of time spent, and the amount of shared governance involved. The Office of General Counsel, the Provost's Office, the Office of the Vice President for Research, and the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty were all involved.

Chair Doe: There have been concerns raised about this item. We will want to hear those as well. Asked if Martin or Richard Eykholt would like to speak about this before we open it up to the membership.

Martin: Several of the questions we have heard from faculty as we have been working on this are around what has changed. Given how outdated Section J is currently, this section was largely, if not completely, rewritten to reflect and bring us into compliance with current policies. This may look a bit different because it is a complete revision. The version we are presenting to Faculty Council is our best effort as a committee, including other entities and parties across campus, who have been involved in this process of making sure we are not only compliant but have faculty and other entities' rights and responsibilities represented therein.

Richard Eykholt: We sent this out to Faculty Council members with a list of some of the key changes. This is something that has been worked on for four (4) or five (5) years. We worked with the Office of General Counsel and discussed this with the Council of Deans. It has been

discussed in departmental executive committee meetings and has been through lots of rounds of feedback and discussions.

Chair Doe: Thanked Martin and Eykholt. Expressed appreciation for the extended effort on this. This is a remarkable accomplishment. Stated there are some concerns out there. Would like to hear from someone about those concerns as well.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Eykholt is correct that they were working with members of the Office of General Counsel for quite a long time. However, the leadership of General Counsel and the Chancellor's Office had this come to their attention recently. They have some concerns about the document and how it does and does not conform to their understanding of how things might want to work and what might work. We will also have a new Vice President for Research shortly, likely with interviews in September, and we think that decision-making relative to Section J on patents, inventions, invention disclosures, licensing, and marketing issues, should be informed by the new leadership in the Office of the Vice President for Research. The second thing, from discussions with General Counsel, is that several things here are not quite consistent with the service agreement between the CSU System and CSU Strata, formerly the CSU Research Foundation (CSURF). Those need to be resolved before we make these changes to this section of the Manual. We would like to pause on this while some of the issues are resolved and wait until the new Vice President for Research is in place.

Chair Doe: Thanked Executive Vice President Miranda. If we were to proceed with this as suggested, this would again be referring back to committee, which requires a motion and a second. A question we might ask is whether the two (2) parts of this could be separated with one (1) part going ahead and the other part held back.

Eykholt: The problem with this idea is that the current Section J covers both patents and copyrights, and this revision was replacing that with a separate section. If we try to approve just one part, Section J.2, and eliminate the old section, there will be no policy on patents. If we try to pass Section J.2 and keep the old section that is in the Manual, then we have conflicts because they both discuss copyrights. Not sure there is a way forward to pass just Section J.2 without also passing Section J.1, because we are either going to have a conflict or an omission.

Chair Doe: Thanked Eykholt. Asked if there was any other discussion.

Randall Boone: Wondering if the changes that may occur if we hold off are to the degree that this is not worth sending out now, or if the changes are likely to be subtle. Wondering if this can be shared with other faculty for input.

Executive Vice President Miranda: This is not a secret document, and the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty have made efforts to reach out across the University as well. Do not see any reason to withhold discussion or any further discussion on any points of these revisions. For the potential changes, that is not easy to respond to since not in a leadership position in the Office of General Counsel. Think certain details relative to the relationship with CSU Strata and the flow of decision-making around licenses and patents may well be proposed for revision.

Chair Doe: Thanked Executive Vice President Miranda. Believe that timeline for the new Vice President for Research may stretch us beyond seeing this again in the fall.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Confirmed. Understand the desire to complete this, but think we are close, and we should stay there until we get this done. There is a lot of momentum built up around this revision. It is structurally sound. With some additional conversation and compromises, think we can make it happen.

Joseph DiVerdi: Can understand, while not appreciative of, the communication issues with the Office of General Counsel, but wondering why we are waiting for a new Vice President for Research. A policy like this for the University that is so substantial goes well beyond a single individual at the University, no matter where in the University. Wondering why we would hold this up for a new Vice President for Research.

Executive Vice President Miranda: This is a good point. Once we decide here, we may end up deciding that the next Vice President for Research need not weigh in on it and we can move forward. However, if there are details that substantially affect the philosophy of the Office of the Vice President for Research, we might want to wait.

DiVerdi: Would push back on that a bit. Holding this at bay rather than folding the new Vice President for Research into our philosophy and structures seems counterintuitive. Given the momentum and the work, the idea of getting this going forward is not unreasoned. If we can straighten out the other part, think it is good to go.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed frustration at the Office of General Counsel. Feels they either need to take more time before indicating that everything is fine or start changing the way in which they approach issues. Feels there needs to be a complaint raised about this. Feels this should not be the procedure from General Counsel.

Sybil Sharvelle: Expressed agreement with DiVerdi. Do not understand why the Vice President for Research transition is important. Not sure what the concerns with CSU Strata are. Requested more specifics around those concerns and what is bothering CSU Strata about the process.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Not able to articulate specifically what their concerns are. Know there are concerns about the flow of decisions related to patents, licensing and marketing of patents, and licensing and inventions. Think we will need to hear from the leadership of General Counsel and the Chancellor after they have had a chance to review this in more detail.

Eykholt: Since it appears there is a motion to postpone this, it means that the old policy is still in place. Asked: Is the old policy really better than this? Stated that the old policy does not even mention CSU Strata, so the old policy is out of date. Thinks it would make sense to pass this and then amend it as things come up, because this old policy is not aligned with federal regulations, which is something we have been told for two (2) or three (3) years.

Smith: Eykholt makes a good point. The question is how much risk CSU is willing to take on by having a non-compliant Section J versus potential revisions to Section J in the future.

Eykholt: Noted that the interactions with CSU Strata were not written by the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. Those were written by the Office of General Counsel, and the committee trusted that the Office of General Counsel understood how things were managed. The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty's input was more in protecting faculty rights and other similar issues.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Have spent the week carefully reviewing the service agreement with CSU Strata, and the things proposed in here are not consistent with that service agreement, which is between CSU Strata and the System Office. Would advise that we take a pause on this so that System administration and the leadership of General Counsel can all agree on these revisions.

Chair Doe: Thanked Executive Vice President Miranda. We have a basic dilemma here. The challenge is that if we refer back to the committee, all of the things we are discussing are deferred for a time. If we move forward and pass this motion, then we know almost certainly that the Office of General Counsel will not take this forward to the Board of Governors. Asked the membership how they would like to proceed.

Martin: Given the conversation on the floor, if we know the result will be that this comes back to the committee, it may make the most sense to just refer this back to give us more time to have additional comments provided. Perhaps we can bring it back in May if these items are resolvable.

Martin: Move that we refer this back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty.

Smith: Second.

Norton: Asked Martin what a reasonable timeframe for the committee would look like. It was mentioned that May could be for one decision, and possibly October for another. Requested clarification on that.

Martin: Think the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty can review this, and assuming we have conversations with the Office of General Counsel, we can review this before the May Faculty Council meeting. This would be to see if the currently amended Section J is the most suitable to move forward with at this time, and if not, we can have the fully revised version checked off by all people by October. Suggested a split timeline.

Chair Doe: We have a motion to refer back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty with a split timeline of May and October. Thanked everyone for the robust conversation. Expressed the hope that we can convey much of this to the Office of General Counsel. Requested a poll to be placed in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion to refer proposed Section J revisions back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty with split timeline of May and October approved.

Chair Doe: Expressed appreciation to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty and the numerous people involved in these discussions. We look forward to seeing it again in the near future.

F. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – President Amy Parsons

President Amy Parsons: Congratulated Chair Doe on her new position with TILT, and to Smith, Norton, and DiVerdi for the new positions on Faculty Council. Looking forward to working together.

President Parsons: Thanked Governors Baca and Markey for joining today. We have a tremendous Board of Governors, thanks in large part to Governors Baca and Markey. You can see their passion for CSU.

President Parsons: Over the last few weeks, have had a chance to meet a lot of faculty and students. Have attended classes and senior performances. One of the highlights was the chance to have Faculty Council's Executive Committee over to the Magnolia House, as well as the chairs of the task forces, to spend some time discussing their work on the budget, shared governance, contracts, and innovation. Thanked everyone for their investment of time. Would also like to meet with the standing committees as well in the future to get to know their work.

President Parsons: With the budget, we have talked a lot about the incremental budget, the educational and general budget, and the overall University budget. Vice President Brendan Hanlon is going to come back to the May meeting and do a line-by-line walkthrough of that budget so we can get more detail. Stated that the state's numbers are holding, and it looks like the state might increase its investment in higher education. We should know more this month and what that means. Feeling confident we can hold to our 5% salary pool. As we have discussed, we will be able to cap the tuition increase at 4%, although the state is increasing its allowance. Personal preference would be to be able to deploy those additional dollars toward salary equity and use those in a strategic and more defined way to address both our lowest-paid employees and address other areas of equity around the University. Will keep everyone updated on this.

President Parsons: One thing we have heard consistently over the past few weeks was that we talk a lot about the incremental budget and the educational and general budget, but we do not know as much collectively about the budgets within colleges or individual divisions. Looking ahead, we would like to understand that better, as well as how those funds are deployed within the colleges and divisions. Have been working with Interim Provost Janice Nerger, Executive Vice President Miranda, and Vice President Hanlon to start the semester off with a public budget kick-off where we do a full recap of what happened in the last year and the true expenses and revenues, as well as our working construct for the next year. We will look at our priorities and needs, not just at the University level, but the deans and the Vice Presidents will go through this exercise as well. We will get a schedule of those presentations that everyone can attend publicly for the ones they are interested in. We used to have a model like this some time ago, and we would like to go back to doing that. We will have a public vetting early in the year, and then we go through our normal cycle as the year goes on and our numbers firm up in terms of enrollment, state investment, and Board direction. It may not be perfect next year, but this will be a step in

the right direction toward understanding the budget better and have more transparency and participation. Open to suggestions on how you want to see this process going. Will be looking at the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning specifically for advice on this.

President Parsons: Something else we have heard repeatedly is the need for a new budget model that better incentivizes and responds to growth. We had a vision of tuition-sharing several years ago, which disappeared during COVID and has not come back. This is our opportunity to really look at those budget models going forward. There are a lot of people in our University community who have a lot of budget expertise. We have engaged Andrew Comrie, who is the Chief Academic Officer at the Arizona system. Indicated that Comrie has provided his book on budget models to be shared widely. Comrie will be coming to campus in the first week of May to meet with us and we can discuss our priorities. People can participate in this process however they want. They can read the book, meet with the consultants, or just be a part of reviewing and vetting options.

President Parsons: Since we last met, we have successfully completed our search for the Vice President for Advancement with the hiring of Derek Dictson. We have three (3) finalists here interviewing for the Vice President for Human Resources. We will have the four (4) finalists for the Dean of Engineering position here next week. We have also charged the search committee for the Provost and Executive Vice President, and Dean Lise Youngblade is chairing that search. Thanked Smith for representing Faculty Council on that search committee. We will also be charging the committee soon for the search for the Vice President for Research. Dean James Pritchett will be chairing that search. Thanked Jennifer Peel for representing Faculty Council on that search committee. Noted that for both the Provost and Executive Vice President search and the Vice President for Research search, we are hoping to save money by not using a search firm, but we are keeping that option open. We are starting these searches internally, advertising them, and actively recruiting through all our networks.

President Parsons: Will discuss at our next Faculty Council meeting about the start of construction on the Clark building. We will be starting with the A wing and then moving through the building. ASCSU elections are also underway, so we will have new leadership.

President Parsons: Recently returned from Japan. Was traveling with Governor Jared Polis on his trade mission. We were meeting with embassies that handle overseas student exchanges and working to reestablish a lot of our international partnerships and student exchanges. Those partnerships went away during COVID, not just for us but everywhere, so we are getting strategic about how we rebuild those and where we go. Asked that anyone on Faculty Council interested in international issues and those partnerships to reach out.

President Parsons: April is Celebrate CSU Month. Expressed excitement to celebrate all the amazing faculty and staff we have among us.

Anders Fremstad: Delighted to hear there might be some funding for equity increases for our lowest-paid colleagues. The Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual states that our Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning should recommend policies for the distribution of faculty compensation increases. Wondering whether your administration will

provide that committee with the information they need to think about that knowledgeably and represent our colleagues' interests and whether those recommendations will be taken seriously.

President Parsons: Would take their recommendations seriously. Not only that, but we need them to help us make good decisions. Would like to discuss offline what information you think they would need. Stated that Vice President Hanlon has a new budget model coming that will be a big improvement on transparency and data.

Mary Van Buren: Asked: Why do you think we need a new budget model? Wondering what is not working and what we would like to fix.

President Parsons: Back before COVID for some years, we had a tuition-sharing model where dollars would follow students in order to help fund growth. Have been hearing concerns over the last few years that as departments are growing that the dollars will not follow to fund the faculty and staff lines that are needed to support the growth because it all comes centrally. Have been hearing that as some departments have grown, they have not seen the additional dollars come through to support that growth or they feel they cannot grow in areas that are in high demand for students. We also talk about responsibility-centered management and budgeting. There are a lot of schools that have departments that run like auxiliaries, and they get the dollars that come from the students and they fund everything within the department. Analyzing our budget model is not something we have done for a long time. We may look at it and realize it is not as bad as we thought and it just requires tweaks to make it more efficient, or maybe we come out with a completely different model. Since we have been hearing complaints, it is worth looking at.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern that this administration will try to revive the reallocation exercises that we had for multiple years. Expressed hope that only tweaks are being considered and not submitting departments to reallocation exercises.

President Parsons: Will look into how those were deployed. Asked Pedros-Gascon when those reallocation budgets occurred.

Pedros-Gascon: Executive Vice President Miranda would know. Indicated that these were very unpopular. Expressed concern in the interest in reviving these systems.

Executive Vice President Miranda: We certainly had reallocation exercises and budget cuts during the recession of 2009, 2010, and 2011. We started coming out of that in 2012 and 2013 and avoided reallocation exercises for most of that period until 2019-2020 when the pandemic hit and budget cuts happened again. We can look up the incremental budgets for the last dozen years and identify the reallocation numbers.

Canetto: Was happy to hear in first Faculty Council visit that a high priority was to be at 100% of compensation to our peers. Wondering if more information can be provided as to when we will reach 100% of our peers. We were also informed that there would be both an equity raise as well as a merit raise happening, but then the update indicated that there would only be a merit raise. Requested that this issue be addressed, because there was a particular set of goals,

expectations, and intentions that were set up in early spring semester and we are scaling down substantially.

President Parsons: Would like to know this as well, and not sure about the scaling down. We are obviously not going to reach 100% of our peers now. It will cost around \$28 million for the 5% raise, which is what we were able to afford this year. The goal is 100% of our peers. We will see after we deploy the 5%, which is merit and the deans and Vice Presidents will decide how to distribute that within their divisions. We have always had a smaller amount that we will deploy to equity. Statements today were that the state legislature and Joint Budget Committee may give us even more that will allow us to go further on equity. Not sure what that looks like yet, not sure how far we will be able to go with equity. What we are going to be able to do is have the 5% and then deploy what we can address to the most egregious places of equity. On average, we are low, so we have to address the places where we are the farthest off, so that will be our priority going forward. Every year we will work to address those most egregious ones to raise the entire average until we are at 100%. A lot of this depends on state budget, enrollment, and other things not entirely in our control, so it is hard to say how long it will take us to get there.

Chair Doe: Thanked President Parsons. Asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing none, thanked President Parsons for being here.

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

Interim Provost Janice Nerger: This has been something going around various committees and audiences for the past five (5) or six (6) months, and wanted to present it to Faculty Council. This is a state of Colorado initiative called the Colorado Reengaged (CORE) initiative. This emerged out of the pandemic in 2021. It was a response to the negative economic impact that occurred as a lot of students were forced to drop out of school and then had no jobs available to them.

Provost Nerger: This is part of a student success initiative. It enables Colorado's four-year institutions to award associate degrees to students who meet certain eligibility criteria and have unenrolled from those institutions. The eligibility requirements are that the students must have earned at least seventy (70) credits, have not earned a bachelor's degree, and have completed the general education requirements for an associate degree as defined by the state. They also must have been unenrolled for at least two (2) consecutive semesters.

Provost Nerger: This program allows us to partner on a very successful initiative. The state puts together and awards a credential that the student has already earned. It does not require anything really on our part at all. It enables the degree recipients to hopefully obtain a higher-paying job because they will now have an associate degree as opposed to just a high school diploma. This will hopefully improve their economic prospects for their communities, and it will increase the number of Coloradoans that have academic credentials beyond a high school diploma. This will also hopefully strengthen the state's workforce and better position the degree recipients to return to higher education to complete their bachelor's degree.

Provost Nerger: It is optional for four-year institutions to engage in this, but it is highly encouraged by the legislature for us to do so. It was also encouraged by the Chancellor, the President, and the Board of Governors for CSU to consider doing this. The Colorado Department of Higher Education is charged with working with the four-year institutions to implement this, and they have made resources available for the administrative implementation costs. CSU Pueblo and University of Northern Colorado have already gone through this process. Metro State and CU Denver are still going through this process, and others are at various stages.

Provost Nerger: CSU would like to participate in this initiative. Have talked to the Board of Governors and at this point, we would like to only offer the Associate in General Studies. This is the basic, easiest one to offer. We can still offer the Associate in Science and Associate in Arts at a later date if we desire to do so. Again, these students will be required to have earned at least seventy (70) credits with no bachelor degree and they cannot have earned more than fifteen (15) credits from a community college. Those students have another option for obtaining an associate degree, not through the Colorado Reengaged initiative or through a four-year institution. Students will be required to have been unenrolled for at least two (2) consecutive semesters and have completed the general education requirements as defined by the state. The students will also need to opt into the program. The implementation of this is through the Office of the Registrar.

Provost Nerger: The Colorado Department of Higher Education's role is to publicize this initiative statewide. They also provide implementation funding. We have received a grant of \$26,000, all of which goes to the Office of the Registrar for them to implement this and to identify the students that are eligible. This would require us contacting them to see if they are interested in this degree. The Office of the Registrar has to check eligibility, and the Colorado Department of Higher Education would notify students along with us that they are eligible as part of this initiative. Our role would be to collaborate with the Colorado Department of Higher Education to contact these eligible students. It would also be our responsibility to confer the associate degree if the student requests it, and to also advise students of opportunities to re-enroll if they reapply to the institution so they complete their bachelor's degree. It is also our responsibility to give a report annually to the Colorado Department of Higher Education as to how many eligible students we identify and how many were awarded the degree.

Provost Nerger: Have been attending meetings of the Colorado Department of Higher Education since mid-fall. We requested authorization from the Higher Learning Commission to participate in the Colorado Reengaged initiative. We are only proposing the initial degree of the Associate of General Studies. We requested funding and got the \$26,000 that will go to the Office of the Registrar, who are working now to identify eligible students and facilitate the implementation with the Colorado Department of Higher Education. Presented this initiative to the Executive Committee on Faculty Council last November, and informed the Board of Governors of our intention at their December meeting. The University Curriculum Committee has discussed this at their last few meetings. They have stressed the importance of communication and suggested that this be presented to the Faculty Council. We are on track to start awarding these degrees in fiscal year 2024.

Provost Nerger: Provided link to [Colorado Reengaged initiative website](#). Indicated there is a FAQ sheet, as well as the original House bill.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Nerger. Have a couple questions. Asked about the administrative costs. Asked: Is the Colorado Department of Higher Education absorbing the cost to our University? The second question is whether we are planning to pass along any administrative costs to the students.

Provost Nerger: The state received American Rescue Plan Act funds in order to do this, several millions of dollars. We only requested \$26,000 to see what this will take for us to do this. Think it will only be right now, because we have to do a look back and it will only be iterative. There will be hardly any expenses beyond this. It will be reimbursed by the state and there will be no cost to the students. The cost to us will be administrative fees and the cost of diplomas, for which we can get reimbursed annually.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Nerger. Asked if there were additional questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Given past discussions, requested that we receive an official document indicating what the teaching load equivalents are per contract of tenure-track faculty in CSU departments. It seems that the equation is arbitrary and is having a negative impact on us. Would like to understand what facilitates that. For example, people may receive 20% with basically any teaching load equivalent of credits while we have to teach fifteen (15) credits and it seems to be a problem and it needs to be acknowledged and addressed.

Provost Nerger: Think teaching loads are determined at the department level. Will be meeting with the chair of the Department of Art and Art History to get a better understanding of this. Have not met with your chair yet but know there is a proposal being written.

Pedros-Gascon: The local level is granted a specific amount of money and we have to cover all the courses with existing faculty. Teaching load decisions come from the purse, and do not think it is logical to expect the chair can make a decision like that.

Provost Nerger: When we talk about the local level, we mean that the percent effort that an individual has toward teaching, research, service, outreach will be different from others. Not everyone in a department will have the same exact distribution.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed agreement. The thing is, we are having to teach five (5) courses but do not want reduced research. We want to be able to be productive and not research less. We need help reducing teaching loads so that we can be on equal footing with all the people in this University. Would be happy to reduce service, but if we do not do it, someone else will need to do this service.

Provost Nerger: Understand what you are saying. Am meeting with the chairs, as well as the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, so we are collecting information about this.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Nerger and Pedros-Gascon. Asked if there were any questions regarding the Provost report and the Colorado Reengaged initiative.

Sanford: Asked: How many people in Colorado will this effect?

Provost Nerger: For Colorado, it was about 25,000. For us, not sure. This is being looked at by D. Tobiassen Baitinger.

Ajean Ryan: Asked in the chat: Has there been an impact study on how this will affect community colleges?

Provost Nerger: Do not think there is any impact on the community colleges. If a student went to a community college and earned fifteen (15) credits, they cannot be a part of this process. They would be considered a community college student and there is another program for them. If they earned less than fifteen (15) credits and transferred in, then they can be part of this initiative. These are considered reverse transfers, and there is a program for them to go back to the community college to finish the degree there.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Nerger. Hearing no further questions, expressed appreciation for Provost Nerger being here today.

- a. Faculty Success Update – Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Ceded time to allow for President and Provost reports. Posted [Faculty Success slideshow](#) for Faculty Council members to view.

H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Ceded time to allow for President and Provost reports. Posted full [Chair's report](#).

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: We are between Board of Governors meetings. The next one will be on May 4th and 5th, right after our next Faculty Council meeting. This one will be on campus and will be a good one because we will have the final budget numbers at that point for board consideration.

I. DISCUSSION

1. Reaccreditation Process Update – Vice Provost for Planning and Effectiveness Laura Jensen

Postponed to a future meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:20 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

Vice-Chair: Melinda Smith

Executive Assistant: Amy Barkley

BOG Representative: Andrew Norton

Professional Registered Parliamentarian: Lola Fehr

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2025
Jennifer Martin	Animal Sciences	2024
<u>Jane Stewart</u>	Agricultural Biology	2024
Kelly Curl	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2025
<u>Jim Ippolito</u>	Soil and Crop Sciences	2023
Marco Costanigro	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
<u>Jennifer Richards</u>	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		
Lisa Kutcher	Accounting	2023
	(substituting for Bill Rankin, on sabbatical Spring 2023)	
John Hoxmeier	Computer Information Systems	2024
<u>Bharadwaj Kannan</u>	Finance and Real Estate	2025
Rob Mitchell	Management	2024
<u>Jonathan Zhang</u>	Marketing	2023
Engineering		
Peter Jan van Leeuwen	Atmospheric Science	2024
<u>Ashok Prasad</u>	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2025
<u>Hussam Mahmoud</u>	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2024
Steven Reising	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2025
Soheil Fatehiboroujeni	Mechanical Engineering	2023

(substituting for Kirk McGilvray)		
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
Tony Becker	English	2023
Ernesto Sagas	Ethnic Studies	2025
(substituting for Maricela DeMirjyn, on sabbatical Spring 2023)		
John Slater	Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	2025
Jared Orsi	History	2023
Marilee Long	Journalism and Media Communications	2025
<u>Madeline Harvey</u> (excused)	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2025
Andre Archie	Philosophy	2025
Marni Berg	Political Science	2024
KuoRay Mao	Sociology	2025
(substituting for Laura Raynolds, 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
Allison Goar	College-at-Large	2024
<u>Abigail Shupe</u>	College-at-Large	2024
Sanam Emami	College-at-Large	2024
(substituting for John Carlo Pierce, Spring 2023)		
Natural Resources		
Randall Boone	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2023
Camille Stevens-Rumann	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2024
(substituting for Chad Hoffman, Spring 2023)		
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
<u>Rob Paton</u>	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
Elizabeth Ryan	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
<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
<u>Brian Geiss</u>	College-at-Large	2025
University Libraries		
Christine Pawliuk	Libraries	2025
<i>Ex Officio Voting Members</i>		
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
<u>Shane Kanatous, Chair</u>	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2023
<u>Jerry Magloughlin, Chair</u>	Committee on Libraries	2023
Jenny Morse, Co-Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
<u>Olivia Arnold, Co-Chair</u>	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
<u>James Graham, Chair</u>	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2023
Shawn Archibeque, Co-Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2023
<u>Cayla Bellamy, Co-Chair</u>	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
<u>Jennifer Reinke</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Scott Weibensohn	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025

Ex Officio Non-Voting Members

Amy Parsons	President
Rick Miranda	Executive Vice 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
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Thomas Siller	Interim 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
Colleen Webb	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 Schwendenman-Curtis	Administrative Professional Council
(substituting for Matt Klein, Chair of APC)	