PLEASE NOTE: Members, when addressing Faculty Council, please stand and identify yourselves. Guests wishing to speak please fill out a guest card to be handed to the Chair prior to speaking.

PLEASE NOTE: Members planning to introduce amendments are requested to provide copies to the Faculty Council Office, 18A Administration, at least 24 hours before this meeting.

AGENDA
Faculty Council Meeting
Tuesday, May 7, 2019 – 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences – C101

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA - MAY 7, 2019 – C101 Plant Sciences

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – September 3, 2019
   New location: Clark Building – Room A201 – 4:00 p.m.

2. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on the FC website – March 12 and 26, 2019; April 9 and 16, 2019 (http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

3. Graduate Student Council Advising Awards – Ryan Czarny

4. Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award-Announcement of winner

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – March 5, 2019 and April 2, 2019 (pp. 4-58)

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC meeting minutes – March 29, 2019; April 5, 12, and 19, 2019 (pp. 59-72)

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Election - Faculty Council Standing Committee nominees - Committee on Faculty Governance (pp. 73-74)

2. Proposed revisions to Section C.2.1.9.5 of the *Academic Faculty*

and Administrative Professional Manual – CoFG (pp. 75-77)

3. Proposed revisions to Section D.2 of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG (pp. 78-80)

4. Request for New Department: Systems Engineering, in the Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering - Section C.2.3.1.d Colleges and Academic Departments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG (pp. 81-83)

5. Request for Department name change in the College of Liberal Arts – Change Department of Anthropology to Department of Anthropology and Geography - Section C.2.3.1.e Colleges and Academic Departments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoFG (pp. 84-85)

6. Proposed revisions to Section I.11 Students Called to Active Duty of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL (pp. 86-87)

7. Proposed revisions to Section E.9.2 Individual Faculty Workload of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF (p. 88)

8. Proposed revisions to Section E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF (pp. 89-94)

9. Proposed revisions to Section E.12.3 Service of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF (p. 95)

10. Proposed revisions to Section E.17 Renewal of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF (pp. 96-99)

11. Biennial Reviews for Discontinuance and Continuance of Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (CIOSUs) for 2018 – CUP (pp. 100-103)

12. Proposed revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – Admissions Requirements and Procedures, Application: International Students – CoSRGE (pp. 104-105)

F. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

4. Dawn DeTienne and Jennifer Welding, Sesquicentennial Committee

5. Task Force on the Ethics of Learning Analytics (written report) -CoTL (pp. 106-111)

G. DISCUSSION

1. None

Secretary's Note: Please detach at this line, print your name, and leave in attendance box at the Faculty Council Meeting. If you must be absent, you are encouraged to send a substitute representative of academic faculty status in order to provide proper representation at the meeting. Substitutes should turn in the attendance slip at the meeting and indicate on the slip whom they are representing. Members will find it helpful to have copies of the Faculty Council, University Curriculum Committee and Executive Committee minutes available for reference at the meeting.

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, please call, send a memorandum, or E-mail immediately to Rita Knoll, ext 1-5693.

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

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
March 5, 2019 – 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences – Room C101

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.by Tim Gallagher, Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – April 2, 2019– Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 – 4:00 p.m. President Frank will also attend the April meeting.

   Gallagher announced that the Faculty Council meeting would be held on April 2, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences Building, Room C101. President Frank will also be attending.

2. Upcoming Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award (*presented at May 7, 2019 Faculty Council meeting*). Nomination materials will be emailed *early* March.
   Had award for three years now and was funded at the start by Sue Pendell, Previous chair of FC.

3. Election of faculty to Faculty Council Standing Committees and University Disciplinary Panel – Committee on Faculty Governance – April 2, 2019

4. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – January 15 and 22, 2019; February 12, 2019
   (http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

   Gallagher announced that the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes are posted on the FC website.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting Minutes – February 5, 2019

   Gallagher asked for any corrections or additions.

   Faculty Council approved the FC meeting minutes by unanimous consent. The minutes will be placed on the Faculty Council website.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. None.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC meeting minutes – January 18 and 25, 2019; February 1, 8 and 15, 2019

Brad Goetz moved for approval of the Consent Agenda.

.

The Consent Agenda was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Election: Faculty Council Chair – Committee on Faculty Governance – Tim Gallagher Nominated

TIMOTHY GALLAGHER Business 2020
Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance

MARGARITA LENK 2020
Nominated from the Floor

Sue Doe, Vice Chair, explained the process and turned over the elections to Don Estep, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance.

Don Estep stated that part of his responsibility as Chair, CoFG is to verify if the nominees are eligible to run.

Don Estep (Chair, CoFG): Are there any nominations from the floor?

Thomas Chermack (SOE): I would like to nominate Margarita Lenk.

Don Estep (Chair, CoFG): We are voting for the Chair of FC. Tim Gallagher and Margarita Lenk are the two candidates.

Ballots were distributed to FC members by Don Estep and Steve Reising, Vice Chair, CoFG.

Estep and Reising gathered all ballots and tallied the votes for each candidate.

Estep announced that Tim Gallagher was re-elected.

Faculty Council approved Timothy Gallagher to serve another term as Chair of Faculty Council starting July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020.

2. Election: Faculty Council Vice Chair – Committee on Faculty Governance – Sue Doe Nominated

SUE DOE Liberal Arts 2020
Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance

_____ 2020
Nominated from the Floor

Tim Gallagher, Chair, asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no nominations, the nominations were closed.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Sue Doe to serve another term as Vice Chair of Faculty Council starting July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020.

3. Election: Faculty Council Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Committee on Faculty Governance – Stephanie Clemons Nominated

STEPHANIE CLEMONS Business 2020
Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance

_____ 2020
Nominated from the Floor

Tim Gallagher, Chair, asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no nominations, the nominations were closed.

Tim Gallagher, Chair, announced Stephanie Clemons has been elected to serve as the Faculty Representative to the Board of Governors starting July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2021.

4. Elections – Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance

Don Estep, Chair, CoFG, moved that Faculty Council approve the following Standing Committee nominees:

Don Estep asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing none, the nominations were closed.

The below faculty members were unanimously elected to their respective Standing Committees starting July 1, 2019.

COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

		Term Expires
LISE AUBREY	WCNR	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON SCHOLASTIC STANDARDS

SALLY SUTTON	WCNR	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC AND FINANCIAL PLANNING

THOMAS CHERMACK	HHS	2021
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITEE

RUOH-NAN (TERRY) YAN	HHS	2021
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

5. Approval of Appeal Chair nominees for Student Conduct Services

Tim Gallagher, Chair, asked Faculty Council to approve the following Appeal Chair nominees:

We had a Student Appeal Chair for a very long time. The Provost and VP for Student Affairs choose the chairs. There are no nominations from the floor.

Faculty Council unanimously approved the Appeal Chair candidates.

BALLOT
March 5, 2019
Appeal Chair Candidates for Student Conduct Services

Jonathan Carlyon CLA Chair	Spring 2019
Murray Oliver CLA Backup Chair	Spring 2019
Kevin Foskin CLA Backup Chair	Spring 2019
Steven Newman Agricultural Sciences Interim Chair	Fall 2020

6. Proposed revisions of Section E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the proposed revisions.
Three reasons for this. E12.3 and E12.4 especially. What is appropriate service at appropriate rank and title? Different faculty have expectations based on their rank and appointment. Engagement is also noted as an important criterion for promotion consideration.

Gallagher invited discussion.

Dawn DeTienne (Management): Met with several faculty who are worried about things and feels there are significant changes that need to be made. Didn't have enough time to review.

Gallagher: The FC Operating Procedures require the FC to send out the agenda one week ahead.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): In addition, we first submitted this to EC in the fall, which represents all colleges, and we then made changes to reflect their recommendations.

Lisa Langstraat and other CLA faculty have discussed the differentiation and appreciate the changes but also agree that these should be closely scrutinized. Often the kind of work an assistant professor can do as service can be helpful to junior faculty. Perhaps the most compelling thing is that right now we have gender challenges with professors in full positions, and we have disparity between professors of color and white professors. Hence, the faculty doing this service will not represent the faculty as a whole.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large) is also not sure about the rank distinctions being pointed out, and not also due to gender but that we also need a diversity of perspectives and ideas. We need to try to understand that we need a diverse pool representing all areas of the faculty.

Matt Malcolm (Occupational Therapy) agrees that some faculty, even at assistant professor levels, have research intertwined with service. I understand that these are guidelines. They are not requirements. I think that each unit is completely equipped to give their faculty guidelines and it is not necessary to put in the Manual.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): These are suggested guidelines because things were occurring at the local level that were not cognizant of recommended practices. But again, these are guidelines.

Dawn DeTienne (Management): I would like to make a motion to move this to a different time—to postpone.

Gallagher: This is a debatable motion and takes a majority vote.

Gallagher: All in favor of postponing, please raise your hand. Vote was 32: 28

The motion to postpone Section E.12 was approved by Faculty Council.

Subject: Faculty Manual Section E.12 **Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases**

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT SECTIONS E.12 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases *(last revised ~~June 21, 2011~~xxx)*

All faculty members being considered for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate a level of excellence appropriate to the rank under consideration and consistent with the standards of their discipline, their unit's institutional mission, and the faculty member's individual effort distribution in teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service. Outreach~~/~~and engagement efforts (as described in Section E.12.4) ~~may~~should be integrated into the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service responsibilities, as appropriate.

Annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of a faculty member's performance are addressed in Sections C.2.5, E.12, and E.14, and the expectations articulated in this section are applicable to those reviews. The basis for annual and periodic comprehensive reviews shall be the set of criteria in place at the beginning of the review period. A~~ll~~ faculty member shall provide evidence, consistent with their stated effort distribution, of teaching and advising competence~~,~~; and/or sustained research and other creative activity~~,~~; and/or service ~~consistent with their stated effort distribution~~ (see Section E.9.1) for annual and periodic comprehensive reviews, as well as for tenure and promotion. The department code shall establish clearly articulated criteria and standards for evaluation in these areas.

E.12.1 Teaching and Advising *(last revised ~~June 21, 2011~~xxx)*
As part of its mission, the University is dedicated to undergraduate, graduate, professional, and continuing education locally, nationally, and internationally. Toward that end teachers engage learners, transfer knowledge, develop skills, create opportunities for learning, advise, and facilitate student academic and professional development

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, classroom and/or laboratory instruction;

individual tutoring; supervision and instruction of student researchers; clinical teaching; field work supervision and training; preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; service learning; outreach/engagement; and other activities that organize and disseminate knowledge. Faculty members' supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that do not confer any University credit also is considered teaching.

Associated teaching activities include class preparation; grading; laboratory or equipment maintenance; preparation and funding of proposals to improve instruction; attendance at workshops on teaching improvement; and planning of curricula and courses of study; and mentoring colleagues in any of these activities. Outreach/and engagement activities, ~~such as service learning, conducting workshops, seminars, and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes,~~ as specified by the department/unit, are important to CSU as a land-grant institution and should be integrated into teaching efforts, as appropriate (see Section E.12.4). ~~These outreach activities~~ This includes teaching efforts of faculty members with Extension appointments. Examples of engaged teaching include service-learning and conducting workshops, seminars and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes. Other examples can be found in the "Continuum of Engaged Scholarship".

Excellent teachers are characterized by their command of subject matter; logical organization and presentation of course material; formation of interrelationships among fields of knowledge; energy and enthusiasm; availability to help students outside of class; encouragement of curiosity, creativity, and critical thought; engagement of students in the learning process; use of clear grading criteria; and respectful responses to student questions and ideas.

Departments shall foster a culture that values and recognizes excellent teaching, and encourages reflective self-assessment. To that end, departmental codes should, within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching should be designed to highlight strengths, identify deficiencies, and improve teaching and learning. Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work Evaluation of teaching shall involve multiple sources of information such as course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; integration of service learning; appropriate course surveys of teaching; letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and evidence of the use of active and/or experiential learning, student learning achievement, professional development related to teaching and learning, and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Anonymous letters or comments shall not be used to evaluate teaching, except with the consent of the instructor or as authorized in a department's code. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., face-to-face and online settings; lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching assignments, in particular

the type and level of courses taught. The University provides resources to support the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, such as systems to create and assess teaching portfolios, access to exemplary teaching portfolios, and professional development programs focusing on teaching and learning.

Effective advising of students, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, is a vital part of the teaching/learning process. Advising activities include, but are not limited to, meeting with students to explain graduation requirements; giving academic advice; giving career advice or referring the student to the appropriate person for that advice; and supervision of or assistance with graduate student theses/dissertations/projects. It [advising] is characterized by being available to students, keeping appointments, providing accurate and appropriate advice and providing knowledgeable guidance. Evaluation of advising effectiveness can be based upon signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty members, and professional peers. The faculty in each academic unit shall develop specific criteria and standards for evaluation and methods for evaluating advising effectiveness and shall evaluate advising as part of annual and periodic comprehensive reviews. These criteria, standards, and methods shall be incorporated into departmental codes.

E.12.2 Research and Other Creative Activity *(last revised ~~August 12, 2009~~xxx)*
Research is the discovery and development of knowledge; other creative activity is original or imaginative accomplishment. Research and other creative activity include, but are not limited to, publications; exhibitions, presentations or performances; copyrighted, patented, or licensed works and inventions; supervision of or assistance with graduate student theses/dissertations and undergraduate research; and the award of funding to support research and other creative activities. Scholarly activities that advance the effectiveness of teaching and education could also be considered research. Scholarly activities with a research/creative artistry component that include reciprocal engagement with external partners (local, state, national, and international) are encouraged and should be considered research and creative activity (see Section E.12.4). Examples include applied research, community-based participatory research, and collaboratively-created new artistic or literary performances. Other examples can be found in the "Continuum of Engaged Scholarship".

The criteria for evaluating the original or imaginative nature of research and other creative activities should be the generally accepted standards prevailing in the applicable discipline or professional area. Standards for determining quality will vary among disciplines and should be specified by each academic unit. However, evaluations should be based primarily upon the quality of the product as judged by peers. Some measures of quality are the prestige of the journals in which publications appear, reviews of publications in the critical literature, reviews of artistic performance by recognized experts, prizes and other awards for significant professional accomplishment, grants obtained in open competition, and impact and outcome assessments as indicated by adoption of results by clientele. When work is a collaborative effort, every attempt should be made to assess the value of the contribution of the faculty member. Some categories of publication or other accomplishments, such as Extension publications, more properly are regarded as vehicles

for teaching or outreach/engagement; however, these may be considered evidence of other creative activity to the extent that new ideas and research are incorporated.

E.12.3 Service *(last revised xxxx)*

Service advances the interests of the institution, the community, and the professions and is described below.

E.12.3.1 University Service

In academic institutions the faculty members share in the formulation of University policies and in making and carrying out decisions affecting the educational and scholarly life of the University. University service can occur at the department, college, campus, and system-wide levels, as well as outside of the university system. Faculty are expected to participate in the governance and the common good of their department, the campus, and the advancement of their profession. University service includes but is not limited to contributions to the governance and leadership of the University through participation in the formulation and implementation of department/college/university policies via membership on committees, councils, and advisory groups and participation in administrative activities. University service also includes advising student organizations.

University service is evaluated through timely and effective participation in such activities ~~related to academic matters~~. The standards for assessing faculty service activities will vary among disciplines and should be specified by each academic unit and incorporated into departmental codes. ~~Senior f~~Faculty members should undertake ~~greater~~ service ~~and engagement~~ roles based upon their experience, but ~~junior~~all faculty members should be encouraged to participate in activities which contribute new perspectives, develop expertise, and further the mission of the University.

E.12.3.2 Professional Service *(last revised ~~August 12, 2009~~xxx)*

Service in local, state, national, or international professional organizations enhances the University's scholarly and academic reputations. Service in professional organizations includes but is not limited to editorial activities for professional publications; service as an officer or committee member of a professional society; participating in or organizing research conferences, workshops or professional meetings; reviewing grant proposals; and service on academic review or accreditation boards. Service rendered in one's professional capacity as a citizen of the community is commendable and may be evaluated as an appropriate faculty activity.

Professional service is evaluated through the amount and quality of participation ~~which~~and its contribution to the long-term improvement of teaching, scholarship, and the profession.

E.12.3.3 Clinical Service (*new section* xxxx). Professional education programs are often dependent upon faculty members with advanced training that devote a considerably fraction of time and effort to these important activities. Attainment of board certification is often an

external endorsement of competence granted by a professional organization representing the specialty.

E.12.3.4 Extension Service (*new section xxx).* Extension is dedicated to serving current and future needs of the population within the state, as well as nationally and internationally, through educational information and programs to address important and emerging community issues using dynamic, science-based educational resources. CSU Extension is highly valued for inclusive, impactful community engagement in support of our land-grant university mission.

E.12.3.5 Other Types of Service *(new section, xxxx)*

1. Leaves from the campus without salary for governmental or industrial positions. These leaves can result in long-term benefits to the individual and the campus.

2. Nonstandard service. In some cases, service may be considered "non-standard" or ambiguous with respect to how it should be considered. In the following situations, it may not be clear as to whether the contribution is to research, teaching, or service: (1) directing a field program overseas, which involves administrative service while at the same time contributing to one's research activities; or (2) administering an exchange program, where the faculty member directs the program while also teaching students in the program. The categorization of such activities may not be evident from the descriptions usually provided by the faculty member. Therefore, the department head, when preparing a faculty member's case for merit or promotion, should clarify the categorization of the activity under one or more of the headings of research, teaching, and service and should specify the nature of the activity in question.

3. Public service. As faculty members advance through the professorial ranks, they are expected to exhibit an increasing record of service in their dossier of performance. Recognition is given to service that fulfills the public mission of the University, such as involvement in community organizations and service to governmental agencies at the local, state and national level, and to professional associations at the local, national, and international level.

E.12.3.6 Guidelines for Evaluation of Service in Faculty Performance Reviews *(new section xxx)*

The following guidelines are for faculty, department heads, deans, and other reviewing committee members involved in the preparation and consideration of merit and promotion cases. In order to cultivate a culture of service at CSU, some suggested guidelines are offered here.

An Assistant Professor is expected to provide service at the local level of the department or school; for example, through clinical service in specialized areas of medicine or by serving as an undergraduate adviser, as a member of a graduate admissions committee, or

as a member of a faculty search committee. Service at the campus level is relatively rare for Assistant Professors, but, when it occurs, it is most appropriate for the service to be on campus committees that do not have intensive and prolonged time demands.

Assistant Professors in Extension or Clinical service are expected to provide their expertise to teaching at the professional student levels. These faculty, by definition, have high service loads within the clinics and/or within the community.

Associate Professors are expected to serve both their departments and the campus. It is understood, however, that Associate Professors in some departments may need to devote more service to the governance of their departments – whether as department heads or undergraduate/graduate directors. These faculty are thus not as free to perform campus service as faculty in other departments. It will be the job of the department head to explain such situations in sending forward promotion and merit cases.

At the level of Full Professor the expectations increase to include all of the categories mentioned in the lower ranks of the professorate, including the assumption of administrative positions such as department head, directors, or leadership in other research units such as field stations. Periodic service on Faculty Council and its committees is also expected unless the aforementioned positions preclude such service. In addition, faculty at the Full Professor level are expected to serve on University-wide committees when invited. In summary, Full Professors are expected to offer frequent and broadly distributed service to multiple constituencies within the academic community.

The type and level at which service is performed should be commensurate with the rank of the faculty member, with the expectation that, as a faculty member rises in rank, the level at which service is performed is expected to rise. A sustained deficiency in service should be a significant consideration when making decisions regarding merit increases and promotion.

Departments are encouraged to include contract and continuing faculty in service assignments, especially through membership on appropriate departmental committees. Also, contract and continuing faculty are encouraged to participate in service activities when the opportunity arises. Such service shall be acknowledged in the effort distribution and the annual evaluation of the faculty member. In addition, it shall be compensated for by a reduction in other duties and/or supplemental pay. It is understood that a reduction in other duties may need to be averaged over more than just one or two semesters. For example, a continuing service percentage of 5% might be compensated for by a release of one course every fourth semester.

The faculty member is responsible for taking the initiative in seeking service appropriate to their rank. Faculty members, when preparing background material for their promotion or merit case, should provide accurate information about their service record and should indicate any unusually demanding service they performed.

The service record will be considered similarly to the teaching and research records in merit and promotion cases. The role of the department head or dean is to evaluate the faculty member's service record. This should include a summary of the work performed and the time demands involved, as well as an assessment of the value of this work, the contribution made by the faculty member, and the effectiveness of the faculty member in performing this work. A simple listing of service activities is not sufficient.

Department heads who are being considered for academic advancement are subject to regular review procedures. Academic leadership is, in itself, a significant academic activity. Therefore, distinguished leadership and effective discharge of administrative duties by a department head shall be considered in evaluating the performance of a department head for a merit increase, accelerated increase, or promotion.

E.12.4 Outreach and Engagement *(new section, xxxx)*

Outreach and engagement are fundamental components of the University's land-grant mission, described as "the partnership of university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good (*Committee on Institutional Cooperation, 2003).* CSU applies this definition across a spectrum of scholarship-based outreach and engagement activities conducted in all areas of the university's mission: teaching, research, service, and extension (as described in the table "Continuum of Engaged Scholarship").

Outreach involves generating, transmitting, translating, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences, in support of university and unit missions. Faculty who conduct outreach programs generate and apply knowledge to address community needs without necessarily engaging community input. Examples of outreach include technology transfer, presentations at community or stakeholder meetings, advice to industry, presentations to K-12 audiences, and student recruitment.

As an inherent commitment of the university's land-grant mission, outreach may be seen as part of the University's public relations effort and enhances the status of CSU in the community and the state. These activities may also facilitate further and deeper engagement with external partners, as described in the paragraphs to follow.

Engagement is distinguished from outreach as "collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity" (Carnegie Foundation, 2008).

Engagement increases the effectiveness of university activities in its mission of improving the condition of the greater society and includes a continuum of progressively increasing levels of involvement with external partners and the community (see "Continuum of Engaged Scholarship"). While outreach may be seen as the first step in engaged scholarship, engagement is characterized by the development and maintenance of partnerships that are reciprocal and mutually beneficial and generally addresses challenges facing the University and the communities it serves. In some cases, increasingly effective engagement may include moving the engagement focus from local to regional to national to international communities.

Examples of engagement include community-based participatory research; service-learning; managed learning environments such as museums, libraries and gardens; and work with defined communities such as producer groups, industries and businesses, teachers, and civic-minded non-profit entities.

Distinguishing characteristics of engagement include:

i. Engagement is scholarly as it co-creates discipline-generated, evidence-based practices and experiences.

ii. Engagement cuts across the university activities of teaching, research, service, and extension, so that it represents a particular approach to these activities rather than a separate activity.

Due to its embedded and integrative nature, outreach and engagement cannot and should not be evaluated separately. Engagement is not an end in itself, but rather, can be a means for accomplishing, informing and enriching teaching, research and service outcomes. It can bring together effort in these three traditional areas of work in a systematic way and makes more visible the full value of faculty effort.

Where appropriate and consistent with the academic mission of the department, the department code should define outreach/engagement expectations and how those expectations are addressed in the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service effort distribution (see Section E.9). The standards for assessing the scholarship of outreach/engagement activities will vary among disciplines and should be specified by each academic unit and incorporated into departmental codes (see Section E.9.1).

Rationale:

1. CoRSAF was tasked with modernizing and defining service roles at the University. Service at all levels which is recognized to play a vital role to the academy. Our original

task was additionally to give suggestions for appropriate service at different faculty ranks.

2. Faculty have differing percentages of effort in the various components of teaching and advising, and/or research and scholarly activity, and/or service and extension so a one-size fits all approach is not adequate. These proposed changes make it clear that a faculty member need only provide evidence for those components of effort which make up their workload distribution.

3. The Provost's Council for Engagement, a faculty-driven initiative with representation from all eight colleges and Libraries, helped to clarify and strengthen existing manual language regarding outreach and engagement, defined as a particular approach to teaching, research and service and extension in support of the university's land-grant mission. The creation of a stand-alone section (12.4) for Outreach and Engagement helps to better define and distinguish these entities and how they relate to service.

7. Proposed revisions to Section E.11.1 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments of *the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the proposed revisions. When this was previously presented to Faculty Council, it was suggested that we add working re: if someone is not renewed, they are informed of their right to appeal. Also, previously there was no mechanism for discussion re: early termination.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): This doesn't have anything to do with non-renewal of contracts. It has to do with early termination.

Gallagher: The floor is open to discussion.

Gallagher: All in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

Section E.11.1 was unanimously approved.

Subject: Faculty Manual Section **E.11.1 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments**

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT SECTION E.11 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE AMMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions <u>Underlined</u>

E.11 Appeal of Early Termination of Contract Faculty Appointments

A contract faculty member may appeal a recommendation to the President to terminate their appointment prior to the ending date of the contract. This section of the Manual sets forth the procedures for such an appeal. The University Grievance Officer (UGO) shall be charged with overseeing this appeal process. At the discretion of the UGO, any of the time limits in this section may be extended for reasonable periods. Such extensions shall be reported immediately to all parties concerned.

E.11.1. Initiating the Process

When a Recommendation to the President to terminate a Contract Faculty Appointment prior to the ending date of the contract is sent to the Provost, a copy of this Recommendation shall be provided in writing to the faculty member by the person making the Recommendation (hereinafter referred to as the Recommender). At the same time, the Recommender shall notify the faculty member of their right to appeal this recommendation and refer them to Section E.11 of the Manual. The faculty member then has ten (10) working days to submit to the UGO an Appeal in writing of this Recommendation, along with the Recommendation itself. If an Appeal is submitted within this time frame, then the UGO shall notify the Provost within three (3) working days, and the Recommendation shall not be sent to the President until the conclusion of the Section E.11 process.
[all other content within E.11 remains the same]

Rationale:

1. This suggested addition was made on the floor of faculty council and CoRSAF is recommending that it be adopted. This sentence addition makes certain that the faculty member knows of their rights to appeal termination and where the process for such is outlined.

8. Proposed revisions to Section E.16 Appeal of Early Termination of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoked to the proposed motion. This is a new section to the *Manual*. Since NTTF on contract are not at-will, there needs to be a mechanism for addressing appeals to early termination.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): We are not amending anything, we are adding this new section to the *Manual*.

E.16 was unanimously approved.

Subject: Faculty Manual Section **E.16 Appeal of Early Termination of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments**

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT THIS NEW SECTION E.16 BE ADDED TO THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, AND THE CURRENT E.16 AND E.17 SECTIONS BE RENUMBERED TO E.17 AND E.18:

E.16 Appeal of Early Termination of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments

A tenure-track faculty member may appeal a recommendation to the President to terminate their appointment prior to the ending date of the contract. This section of the Manual sets forth the procedures for such an appeal. The University Grievance Officer (UGO) shall be charged with overseeing this appeal process. At the discretion of the UGO, any of the time limits in this section may be extended for reasonable periods. Such extensions shall be reported immediately to all parties concerned.

E.16.1. Initiating the Process

When a Recommendation to the President to terminate a Tenure-Track Faculty Appointment prior to the ending date of the Appointment is sent to the Provost, a copy of this Recommendation shall be provided in writing to the faculty member by the person making the Recommendation (hereinafter referred to as the Recommender). At the same time, the recommender shall notify the faculty member of their right to appeal this recommendation and refer them to Section E.16 of the Manual. The faculty member then has ten (10) working days to submit to the UGO an Appeal in writing of this Recommendation, along with the Recommendation itself. If an Appeal is submitted within this time frame, then the UGO shall notify the Provost within three (3) working days, and the Recommendation shall not be sent to the President until the conclusion of the Section E.16 process.

If the faculty member fails to submit an Appeal within this time frame, then they shall forfeit the right to appeal the Recommendation for termination (unless the UGO decides that extenuating circumstances justify an extension of this deadline). If the Provost has not been notified by the UGO of an Appeal within twenty (20) working days of receiving the Recommendation from the Recommender, then the Provost may assume that no Appeal will be filed, and they may forward the Recommendation to the President for a final decision.

The Appeal should provide all of the information that the Appeal Committee (see Section E.16.2) will need in order to make its decision whether to support or oppose the Recommendation for termination. This may include relevant documentation and persons that the Appeal Committee may contact for additional supporting information. The relevance of each person should be stated in the Appeal. The Appeal Committee is not required to contact all of the persons listed in the Appeal. The UGO will review the Appeal to make sure that the information included is relevant to the issue of termination. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Appeal to the Appellant for editing before it is acceptable.

Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Appeal from the Appellant, the UGO shall forward the Appeal to the Recommender and to the members of the Appeal Committee. The Recommender shall then have ten (10) working days to provide a

Response. This Response should provide all of the information that the Appeal Committee will need in order to make its decision whether to support or oppose the Recommendation for termination. This may include relevant documentation and persons that the Appeal Committee may contact for additional supporting information. The relevance of each person should be stated in the Response. The Appeal Committee is not required to contact all of the persons listed in the Response. The UGO will review the Response to make sure that the information included is relevant to the issue of termination. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Response to the Recommender for editing before it is acceptable.
Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Response from the Recommender, the UGO shall forward the Response to the Appellant and to the members of the Appeal Committee.

E.16.2 Appeal Committee

The Appeal Committee shall consist of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the Chair of Faculty Council, and the Chair of the Faculty Council Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. The Chair of Faculty Council shall serve as the Chair of the Appeal Committee. After receiving both the Appeal and the Response from the UGO, the members of the Appeals Committee shall begin their consideration of the Appeal. As part of this consideration, they shall meet with the Recommender, the Appellant, and any other persons that they consider relevant to their consideration of the Appeal. All three members of the Appeal Committee must be present at each of these meetings. At their discretion, the members of the Appeal Committee may request additional information from the Recommender and/or the Appellant, and they may choose to meet more than once with some persons.

E.16.3 Report of the Appeal Committee

After the completion of the process described in Section E.16.2, the three members of the Appeal Committee shall meet to discuss the case and to reach a final decision by majority vote whether to support or oppose the Recommendation for the termination of the Appellant.
After the conclusion of this meeting, the Chair of the Appeal Committee shall prepare a final Report. This Report shall include the overall vote of the Appeal Committee and the reasons supporting its decision. If the vote was not unanimous, then the Report shall also summarize the reasons given by the dissenting member. The Report shall be submitted to the UGO within twenty (20) working days of the receipt from the UGO of both the Appeal and the Response by the members of the Appeal Committee.

E.16.4 Final Decision by the President

Within three (3) working days of receiving the Report from the Chair of the Appeal Committee, the UGO shall send the Report to the President, along with the initial Recommendation, the Appeal, and the Response. Within twenty (20) working days of receiving these materials from the UGO, the President shall make a final decision regarding the termination of the Appellant and send it in writing to the UGO. This written decision shall include the reasoning that supports the decision. The UGO shall forward this decision by the President to the Appellant, the Recommender, and the Provost. This decision by the President is final.

Rationale:

1. We are proposing to insert this new section into the Manual. The proposed E.16 above deals with faculty on tenure-track appointments, who are not at-will employees. Thus, the early termination of such an appointment should require more due process than the termination of an at-will employee. This new section creates such due process.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.16.

9. Proposed revisions to Section E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF spoke to the proposed revisions. These changes bring the *Manual* up-to-date, reflecting new appointment types.

Gallagher: For or against?

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Asking for clarification. On page 74--letter b referring to one-year appointments. His sense was that an appointment was for two years once you are at year 4. I don't know how that is working or affects the situation.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): We are not proposing any change to the current language included here. That new reappointment comes fairly early. Always has been one-year appointments.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): There is no change. If there are departments that are doing other things, then they have not been understanding the *Manual.* If voted down, the appointment would still be for one year. Faculty are always appointed one year at a time. This has always been the policy.

Doug Cloud (English): The language says one year, it does not say one year at a time. That's where I think the disagreement is.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): Which letter are you talking about?

Doug Cloud (English): E.6.b

Richard Eykholt (UGO): You will notice that there is no change to the language or wording you are describing. If there are departments that are doing other things, then they are violating the *Manual*.

Richard Eykholt (UGO): If you were to vote this down, it still says they cannot exceed an appointment for one year. It might help to restate that it is updating the language but not the policy. We just renamed the appointment types awhile back, but now we are updating this in the *Manual*.

Gallagher: It is time to vote.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.6.

Subject: Faculty Manual Section **E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointments and Employment of Faculty**

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT Section **E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointments and Employment of Faculty** BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

E.6 General Policies Relating to Appointment and Employment of Faculty *(last revised ~~May 8, 2015~~xxx)*

a. The conditions and expectations of every appointment shall be confirmed in writing. Any subsequent modifications of the appointment shall also be confirmed in writing after the faculty member and the administrator have mutually determined the new conditions. The faculty member shall receive a copy of these documents.
b. All faculty members who are on ~~regular full-time or regular part-time appointments and who have not acquired tenure~~ tenure-track appointments, shall be appointed for a period not exceeding one (1) year.
c. All faculty members on ~~special or temporary~~ continuing or adjunct appointments shall be appointed "at will."
~~c~~d. Faculty members on ~~multi-year~~ contract~~s~~ appointments shall be appointed for periods of ~~one (1)~~ two (2) to five (5) years for research and ~~one (1)~~ two (2) to three (3) years for teaching.
1. A multi-year contract does not carry any guarantee that the contract will be renewed, even though the duties of the employee may have been discharged satisfactorily.

2. Renewal of a multi-year contract does not entitle the individual to further renewals, a tenure-track appointment, or to a decision concerning tenure.
3. Renewal or extension of multi-year contracts may be made at any time during or after the onset of the contract and shall meet the same conditions required for the initial contract as specified in Section~~s~~ E.2.1.3 ~~and E.2.1.4~~.
4. If the contract is not renewed ~~and the individual was originally 'at-will' and entered into a multi-year contract~~, employment ~~as a senior teaching or special appointment faculty reverts to~~ will be converted to an 'at will' continuing appointment as specified in Section~~s~~ E.2.1.3 ~~and E.2.1.4~~.
d. If the department head does not propose to reappoint a ~~non-tenured~~ tenure-track faculty member ~~holding a regular full-time or regular part-time appointment~~, the faculty member shall be informed in writing that the appointment will not be renewed. This must be done by March 1 during the first year of employment, by December 15 during the second year, and at least twelve (12) months before the expiration of the appointment in succeeding years.
e. A ~~non-tenured~~ tenure-track or contract faculty member ~~holding a regular full-time, regular part-time, or multi-year contract~~ may be disciplined or terminated for cause without following the procedures of Section E.15 for tenured faculty. Termination may be appealed by following the procedures in Section E.11 (for contract faculty) or Section E.16 (for tenure-track faculty). ~~Such~~ Other disciplinary action~~s~~ may be grieved as described in Section K.
f. If a decision made at a higher administrative level will have the effect of altering or reversing a decision made at a departmental level regarding conditions of employment, including reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary, then, before this change can take effect, the department head must be notified in writing of both the proposed change and the reasons for this change, and ~~he or she~~ they must be given the opportunity to submit a written reply.
Rationale: The amendments proposed above assure that E.6 is in compliance with changes in other sections of the Manual approved by Faculty Council.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.6.

10. Proposed revisions to Section E.12.1 Teaching and Advising of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL) spoke to the proposed revisions.

Gallagher states that CoTL requests a change to today's agenda order, and requests discussing Section I.8 first, then the appropriate use of the E.12.1.

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): Now on to E.12.1. The language attempts to make clear that the new tool is not to be used alone. It must be accompanied by multi-factorial approaches.

Gallagher: The motion is on the floor for discussion.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): I have an issue with discarding anonymous comments. If we are taking evaluations from students, we should take all of them, not just the ones where students are willing to sign.

Joseph DiVerdi (Chair, CoSFP): I agree with Antonio. On page 79 it says that anonymous documents will not be used except for when consent is given by the instructor, so this provides the opportunity but not the requirement.

Gallagher: Are you ready to vote on E.12.1? All in favor of approving Section E.12.1, please indicate by saying "aye". The motion was approved.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.12.1.

MOVED, THAT SECTION E.12.1 OF THE *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

E.12.1 Teaching and Advising *(~~last revised December 1, 2017~~)*

As part of its mission, the University is dedicated to undergraduate, graduate, professional, and continuing education locally, nationally, and internationally. Toward that end teachers engage learners, transfer knowledge, develop skills, create opportunities for learning, advise, and facilitate students' transfer of knowledge across contexts and their academic and professional development.

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, classroom and/or laboratory instruction; individual tutoring; supervision and instruction of student researchers; clinical teaching; field work supervision and training; preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; service learning; outreach/engagement; and other activities that organize and disseminate knowledge. Faculty members' supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that do not confer any University credit also is considered teaching and should be included in portfolio materials and be considered as part of the evidence of teaching effectiveness. Associated teaching activities include class preparation; grading; laboratory or equipment maintenance; preparation and funding of proposals to improve instruction; attendance at workshops on teaching improvement; and planning of curricula and courses of study; and mentoring colleagues in any of these activities. Outreach/engagement activities such as service learning, conducting workshops, seminars, and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes, may be integrated into teaching efforts. These outreach activities include teaching efforts of faculty members with Extension appointments.

Excellent teachers are characterized by their command of subject matter; logical organization and presentation of course material; ability to help students recognize relationships among fields of knowledge; energy and enthusiasm; availability to help students outside of class; encouragement of curiosity, creativity, and critical thought;

engagement of students in the learning process; understanding of how students learn and encouragement of effective learning strategies; use of clear grading criteria; and respectful responses to student questions and ideas.

Departments shall foster a culture that values and recognizes excellent teaching and encourages reflective self-assessment. To that end, departmental codes ~~will~~ must, within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Evaluation of teaching should be designed to highlight strengths, identify deficiencies, and improve teaching and learning.

Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching must involve substantive review of multiple sources of information such as course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; integration of service learning; summaries of how the instructor used information from student feedback to improve course design or instructional delivery, as well as any evidence of the outcomes of such improvements; letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and evidence of the use of active and/or experiential learning, student learning achievement, professional development related to teaching and learning, and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Importantly, student perceptions of the learning environment are, by definition, *not* evaluations of teaching effectiveness and cannot be taken as such; they are simply the student perspectives on their experience in a learning environment. Departments must not use student survey responses as a direct or comparative measure of teaching effectiveness nor use student responses or attendant metrics derived from student responses independent of multiple sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness. The use of student survey responses is appropriate only in the context of multifactorial reviews of multiple resources oriented toward an instructor's continuous improvement in fulfilling our teaching mission. Given this, reflection on, and use of, student perceptions can be one part of instructors' formative development because these perceptions can offer insights into the learning environment that only the students can provide. As such, results from student course surveys should be shared with department heads and promotion and tenure committees and considered only *in context of* a multifactorial review for the purpose of mentoring and evaluating teaching that includes information on courses taught, patterns in student survey responses, and instructors' reflections on such patterns in teaching portfolios that document their accounts of how they have used this and other feedback. Anonymous letters or comments shall not be used to evaluate teaching, except with the consent of the instructor or as authorized in a department's code. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness must take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., face-to-face and online settings; lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching assignments, in the context of the type and level of courses taught. The University provides resources to support the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, such as structures for observing and offering formative feedback on instructors' teaching practices, systems to create and assess teaching portfolios, access to

exemplary teaching portfolios, tools to document and evaluate teaching effectiveness, and professional development programs focusing on teaching and learning.

Effective advising of students, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, is a vital part of the teaching/learning process. Advising activities include, but are not limited to, meeting with students to explain graduation requirements; giving academic advice; giving career advice or referring the student to the appropriate person for that advice; and supervision of or assistance with graduate student theses/dissertations/projects. Advising is characterized by being available to students, keeping appointments, providing accurate and appropriate advice, and providing knowledgeable guidance. Evaluation of advising effectiveness can be based upon signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty members, and professional peers. The faculty in each academic unit shall develop specific criteria and standards for evaluation and methods for evaluating teaching and advising effectiveness and shall evaluate advising as part of annual and periodic comprehensive reviews. These criteria, standards, and methods shall be incorporated into departmental codes.

Rationale:

The proposed changes to the language incorporate recommendations from the 2015 UDTS/TILT Task Force Report on Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness and from published evidence on the use and abuse of student feedback in teaching evaluations. The proposed changes in language aim to:

1. Mandate that academic units define teaching effectiveness and the mentoring and evaluation criteria to be used within their codes.
2. Frame the evaluation of teaching effectiveness in units with respect to the department code so that faculty are mentored and evaluated with respect to clearly stated expectations, and not on the basis of inappropriate comparisons to each other.
3. Make clear that student feedback does not constitute an evaluation of teaching effectiveness, but simply student reflections on their experiences in the learning environment in question as the revised course survey tool is designed to capture.
4. Stop the use of student "scores" as the sole or primary basis of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
5. Properly frame the place of student feedback in the mentoring an evaluation of teaching effectiveness; faculty reflections upon student feedback and relevant adjustments made to one's approach to teaching are certainly germane as part of the reflective professional development in the classroom, and are germane to the ongoing mentoring and evaluation of teaching. Given this, student feedback must be accessible as part of the mentoring and evaluation process as one component of a teaching portfolio or dossier.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section E.12.1.

11. Proposed revisions to Section I.8 Student Course Survey of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoTL

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL) spoke to the proposed revisions.

Hickey noted the revisions to Section I.8 as described on pages 81-82 in the packet, which speaks to the new tool. No rating of the instructor and away from means, which is where bias occurs. A principle source of the bias is predicated on comparing means which no longer exist in I.8. Adds that the language states that codes must incorporate how faculty are evaluated.

Gallagher: A motion has been made by CoTL. Is there any discussion of this?

Mary Meyer (Natural Sciences): Makes a motion to amend the motion.

Gallagher states that it is very much appreciated when such motions are sent ahead as Mary's was so that Faculty Council can see and review what they are being asked to consider.

Mary Meyer (Natural Sciences) speaks to how the surveys are used. States her appreciation of the new instrument. Likes the mood of the new one but would like to not use if at all for T&P, for awards, and raises. She provides a set of references that address the biases. Online instruction was demonstrated on "fake women" getting worse evaluations than "fake men" when genders were deliberately inverted. Describes a bias toward easier teaching and that student evaluation of teaching leading to grade inflation. Would like to change some specific language as indicated in her amendment.

Stephen Hayne (CoB): seconds Mary Meyer's motion.

Jenny Morse (Chair, CoNTTF): Can we separate the two amendments? The reason why they are addressing the same subject with both, disallowing the survey instrument as an evaluation of teaching.

Gallagher: The parts would be conflicting if we took out one and left the other. The key words are "as well as."

Doug Cloud (English): On the one hand I want to speak to supporting the amendment because it's thrilling. Can an amendment be amended to reflect improved wording to eliminate the first three words "the use of."

Steve Reising (CoE) seconds.

Unanimous support of the amendment to the amendment.

Joseph DiVerdi (Chair, CoSFP): Another question of language - "should" or "must" or "shall" not be used. I propose an amendment to the amendment changing should to shall.

Unanimous support of a second amendment to the amendment.

Stephen Hayne (CoB): I would like to speak in support of this amendment. I am appalled that we would consider adopting such a flawed instrument.

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): The instrument we have is not a student evaluation of teaching. We have been in touch with other institutions. The University of Oregon is not doing what this amendment is proposing to do. They are doing much the same thing we are doing. The opportunity to reflect on student feedback. Phil Stark was the second reference. His own division at Berkeley repositioned not as a single quantitative score but as student feedback. We do not want to use the same-old, same-old. We are not talking about student evaluation of teaching. That is not what this instrument does.

Joe Cannon (CoB): I'm concerned about the amendment. How are we going to figure out what's going on in the classroom. What is going to happen is Impression Management. The students we are hired to teach should have some say. Department chairs will hopefully use a wider portfolio, but eliminating the student voice is a big mistake, as that student is in the classroom every day.

Anne Avery (CVMBS): I would like to support the amendment. I think there is the possibility to collect data using the instrument and collecting data for the next few years.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): I appreciate the changes in the instrument. It is far and above better than the earlier instrument. The amendment we are talking about is dependent on the satisfactory nature of the instrument. Can we discuss fine-tuning the instrument before deciding? While far superior than the previous, can we table the amendment?

Gallagher: Are you asking for a postponement to the amendment? [checks with Parliamentarian] It would be in order to hold off on this amendment until the instrument is discussed.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon seconds.

Gallagher asked for a vote to postpone the amendment.

Postponement of the amendment does not pass.

Gallagher: We are returning to the amendment. We strike the first three words and we changed "should" to "shall". That is the motion on the floor right now.

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): The concern of CoTL is that we make the opposite error of what we are discussing right now. What we are saying now is that we would not ever listen to any student voice. We are not handing a score to a

department head. "WE" are affording the faculty member to hear from students. We need to ask departments to write into their code how to ignore outlier statements from students.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): The feedback can be used as formative feedback but not used for overall evaluation.

Ramaa Vasudevan (Liberal Arts): We should be sure the instrument is appropriate before approving it. There is a student voice reflected in other ways, it will show up and is not being silenced.

Zachary Veishompoyon (Student representative to CoTL): My understanding is that even if the professor wanted to bring it to their evaluation, then this should not be a requirement—would change shall. But mostly creates the opposite problem. I understand that looking at the mean that a teacher is a 2.7 or other mean, but if you don't use the student survey there is no guarantee that other items won't be biased. If you have 200-person course you have 200 people who can chime in as opposed to only your T&P committee. Opens you up to more critique by a small number of people. #2) As was mentioned earlier, students are present in the room while your peers and your department chair are not in the room with you. Once or twice in a semester I will see someone observing, so if you get rid of this, you are getting rid of the broadest and deepest evaluation of your teaching on a daily basis. Yes, see if there is bias--keep an eye on this--but don't deprive yourself of the best tool you have available to you. Not knowing in the first place.

Doug Cloud (English): Calls the question

Gallagher: A 2/3 vote is required to pass. The motion to halt debate and immediately vote on the motion (to amend) passed by the required two-thirds margin.

We are now voting on the amendment proposed by Professor Meyer with the two amendments to that amendment that have been approved.

The amendment did not pass.

Gallagher: Back to discussion of the main motion.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): So this is where we can talk about the motion, right? This feedback is from many people. The specifics of the rating scales. Low, Reasonably high, Unreasonably high. Similarly, enough scale. Biases are built into the scales since language doesn't seem balanced. The online instructor does not feel that the language is appropriate for online instructors. List of strengths did not include things that would be useful for online instruction. Other features as well do not reflect online instruction.

Doug Cloud (English): Speaks in favor of the new instrument.

Dawn DeTienne (Management): I feel that we want to pass this and it's not what we want but it's better than what we have. I think we should get this right.

Jenny Morse (Chair, CoNTTF): This tool is so much better. We have the ability to tweak this in the future and adjust it in the future and it's such a good tool.

Lisa Langstraat (CLA At-Large): Does the CoTL have a plan to conduct research and is such research a part of the plan?

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): Yes. We will report back at least once a year.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): So is there no possibility of amending this to say "with minor tweaks"? It's just a matter of making this a little bit better.

Gallagher: You have to give a specific motion to amend as in "I want to strike these words or amend these words."

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): I move to amend the survey instrument itself. Would say "low, moderate, or high". For the workload items: "low, challenging, or overwhelming".

Joseph DiVerdi (Chair, CoSFP): Calls the question.

Steve Reising (CoE): Seconds the motion.

The motion carries to call the question.

Gallagher: We will vote on the survey instrument. Approved unanimously.

Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL): The language attempts to make clear that the new tool is not to be used alone. It must be accompanied by multi-factorial approaches.

A motion is on the floor for discussion.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): I have an issue with discarding anonymous documents. If we are taking evaluations from students, we should take all of them, not just the ones where student are willing to sign.

Joseph DiVerdi (Chair, CoSFP): I agree with Antonio. On page 79 it says that anonymous will not be used except for when consent is given by the instructor so this provides the opportunity but not the requirement.

Gallagher: Are we ready to vote?

I.8 was unanimously approved.

CoTL MOVED, THAT SECTION I.8 OF THE *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

I.8 Student Course Survey *(~~last revised December 1, 2017~~)*

The Student Course Survey is designed to provide formative feedback to course instructors and is to be used for course improvement. In addition, it is designed to provide information for students to make informed choices about courses. If used for teaching mentoring or as part of the evaluation of teaching, the student course surveys must be used only in conjunction with other sources of evidence (see section E.12.1) Thus, these surveys may not be used, in whole or in part, as the primary source of evidence for an instructor's teaching effectiveness and must be treated as one element of limited weight alongside a range of evaluative tools (as mentioned in E.12.1). The use of ~~course~~ student course survey feedback as a stand-alone tool is not an ~~credible~~ acceptable means of evaluating the quality of teaching, and departments are required to use multiple sources of evidence in assessing teaching effectiveness (see section E.12.1).
Each term, course instructors shall conduct at least one student survey of all the courses they teach through a system administered by the University utilizing the standardized University-wide instrument. The use of any of the optional modules of additional questions or custom questions in addition to the core/common university wide instrument is at the discretion of the instructor. Summaries of quantitative responses (in the form of frequency distributions) for each course surveyed shall be posted at http://coursesurvey.colostate.edu. Access to the summaries shall be granted to anyone with a CSU ~~eid~~ eID. Access to digital copies of the survey ~~forms~~ report, which includes student comments, shall be granted only to the course instructor(s) and to individuals explicitly granted access by the instructor(s) or as specified by the department code.~~,~~ ~~and to any~~ In situations where other persons are granted access to the report by the department code, the report should be used only in the context of a comprehensive assessment, by which faculty are provided an opportunity to reflect upon student feedback and include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness (see section E.12.1). Costs for conducting and providing access to survey results ~~shall~~ should be shared by the University and the Associated Students of Colorado State University (ASCSU). ASCSU's financial contribution shall not exceed half of the required financial resources to operate this program.

The Committee on Teaching and Learning is responsible for making recommendations regarding the survey instrument and its use, as well as additional forms of evidence to be used in assessing teaching effectiveness. Changes to the Student Course Survey shall be approved by Faculty Council.

Rationale:
These changes respond to the charge to CoTL from the Faculty Council Executive Committee to propose changes to the student course survey.

- The proposed language reframes the course survey report to end the reporting of item means, replacing this with the appropriate use of frequency distributions.
- The routing of the course survey report and the appropriate use of the course survey in the context of the mentoring and evaluation of teaching is clarified.

Faculty Council unanimously approved Section I.8.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Budget. Draft budget presented to the Board at the February meeting. No changes from previous versions and none since then. Main elements--increase in state appropriations with no increase to in-state tuition. Seen as offsetting elements.

Salary and compensation: Put in request for more than a 4% salary increase to faculty--expectation of about 4% average; faculty and staff. The actual amount budgeted is higher than that but we've reserved about a half-percent for equity and promotions, so the remaining is down to about 4%. We have a skewed situation in faculty evaluations (which should be correlated with salary increases, statistically); it's not symmetric at all, it's about 50/50 with meets and with exceeds expectations, with a few people in the two categories below meets and a few in the one category above meets. If you're in the middle of the evaluation scale, with 'meets expectations', it is therefore difficult to give a salary raise in the middle of the raise scale (e.g. 4% if that ends up being the average). It's sort of a public relations problem….

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Any update on salary raises in Boulder for NTTF?

Miranda: Boulder has floated the idea to increase salaries for NTTF. Our budget and Boulder's budget looks quite different.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Has been sitting in on the search for the Dean's position for CHHS. The President's Committee on culture is continuing its work. There will be more things to come from this. I also want to let you know that I have talked to multiple people, department heads, individual NTTF, and CoNTTF in terms of the code changes that are going on across campus. Gallagher is attempting to assist with these efforts.

.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

The Board representative was not present today, due to her obligations as a member of the Presidential Search Committee, so no report was received; however, Lenk emailed the following summary of the February 6-8, 2019 Board meeting:

CSU System Board of Governor's Meeting in Pueblo, CO February 6-8, 2019
Respectfully submitted by Prof. Margarita Maria Lenk, CSU- Fort Collins Faculty Representative

CSU System received a clean, unqualified audit opinion from Clifton Larson Allen, external auditors.

CSU Treasury Fund Update: performing very well ($5.7 million income). Federal nonoperating grants and contracts has $1.6 million shortfall (less PELL enrollments, and less students attending who are PELL eligible).

CSU system budget update: $17-18 million incremental funds request made to the state for next year. New expenses include multi-year central investments in strategic initiatives ($3.1 mill), increases in faculty and staff compensation ($19 million); academic incentive funding ($2.7 mill); increases in mandatory costs ($5.2 million); and quality enhancements ($ 2.5 mill). 1% RUG increase = $94 per year for student chare; 1% NRUG increase = $273 per year. 1% RUG and NRUG increase =$1.5 million, and $1.3 million, respectively. Utilities and Insurance costs are expected to go up (August). Planned internal investments and strategic initiatives. The 4.5% salary/benefit increase is due to equity pay adjustments, and to keep salaries competitive. This 4.5% includes the lower line of $19 million for new compensation, which has base components, promotions and new titles, new benefits, and state authorized faculty increases. The average faculty member can hope to get an increase of 4-4.5%, which is in the response to the market conditions in Fort Collins. However, there are CSU functional areas, such as business and financial services and human resources, which have high turnover and stress because we are not paying a market wage. Dave Ryan is hiring 5-6 replacement people right now. Whenever salaries increase, the benefit rate to add to the base salary for State Classified is 42%, and for Faculty and AP is 28%. Also, next year there is a .25% increase to PERA obligation, and that is probably going up to .5% the following year. The planned reallocation pool is much smaller ($2.7 million). Past practices are being revisited (start,

stop, keep) for improved algorithm changes. Reallocation (internal) amounts to about 33% of the cost changes across campus. In the past 3 years, 147 positions have been reallocated across campus.

My insights: As colleges continue to grow in enrollments, so are college operations office overhead costs. Some of these general overhead cost allocations might motivate some departments to kill programs that are either leading in their fields, and/or are contributing margin towards covering the central college overhead. Discussions within each college should ensure to make sure that the optimal programmatic decisions are made. I suggest that specific mission/strategy metrics be used at the department level as well as the college level (e.g., # students, increases in student retention and engagement, etc.) may be useful additions to these decision processes.

CSU Pueblo is exploring the possibility of becoming the first U.S. university completely solar powered.

Tip from CSU Global Soft skills, technical skills, and industry knowledge are the three primary hiring buckets. Investments in these areas may be useful for increasing enrollments and placements. Middle skill jobs no longer have undergraduate degree requirements at Apple, Google, Bank of America, Penguin Random House, Whole Foods, and Starbucks. Sub-baccalaureate certifications, industry training certifications, professional licenses training, internship training, and apprenticeship trainings are rising. Recent success at CSU Global (Q2 2019 incremental income >$ 3 million) is based on retention and more programming after initial degree or certificate, much more dependent on re-enrollment and keeping them engaged, and less on recruiting new students.

Western Stock Show 2019, Amy Parsons report: 3rd highest attendance ever, over 700 at the CSU Day rodeo, 17 different outreach groups served by CSU students, Ag Adventure involved 25 CSU upward bound students. CSU highlights community engagement, reaching out also to 16 schools in Denver area. CSU stands down for 2020 stock show as construction kicks into gear.

Todos Santos Campus of CSU: has plenty of new projects utilizing its capacity over the next year as CSU Pueblo and CSU Fort Collins faculty are busy developing programming.

4. Annual Report of the University Grievance Officer for 2019

Annual Report of the University Grievance Officer for 2018

One duty of the UGO is to oversee the disciplinary process for tenured faculty, as described in Section E.15 of the Manual. During calendar year 2108, this process was never initiated.

Another duty of the UGO is to manage the grievance process, as described in Section K of the Manual. During calendar year 2018, the UGO dealt with 20 cases from 24 faculty members and

11 cases from 12 administrative professionals. The distribution of the 20 cases from faculty members by college is as follows:

Business	7
Health & Human Sci.	4
Liberal Arts	6
Vet. Med. & Biom. Sci.	3

The distribution of the 11 cases from administrative professionals is as follows:

Continuing Education	1
Engineering	1
Health & Human Sci.	1
Housing & Dining	1
Natural Resources	1
Natural Sciences	1
Student Services	1
TILT	1
Vet. Med. & Biom. Sci.	1
Vice Pres. for Research	2

Before summarizing these cases, it is important to note that, if a case is ruled not to be grievable, then it cannot be pursued through the grievance process. However, the UGO can choose to hold off on making this determination in order to have discussions with the persons involved and even to allow the case to proceed to formal mediation. On the other hand, a case cannot proceed to a formal hearing unless it is ruled to be grievable.

For the 11 cases involving administrative professionals, three cases involved termination. Since administrative professionals are at-will employees, these cases were not grievable.

One case involved an employee being placed on administrative leave, which later led to an intent to terminate the employee. While termination of an administrative professional is not grievable, there were some unusual aspects to this case. As a result, the UGO got involved in discussions with the persons involved, and these discussions are still underway.

Two cases involved letters of expectations that the employees found to be unreasonable. However, letters of expectation are not punitive, so they are not grievable.

One case involved an annual evaluation. After an initial discussion, the employee decided not to pursue the matter through Section K.

One case involved a change in the job description and the conditions of employment for the employee. For this case, the conflict was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

One case involved a denial of a promotion. For this case, the UGO got involved in discussions with the persons involved. It turned out that the supervisor who denied the promotion was preparing to retire, so the employee decided to wait until next year and apply again for the promotion.

In the remaining two cases, the employees felt that they were being treated unfairly by their supervisors. The UGO referred them to the bullying policy as the appropriate avenue to pursue. In both cases, the employees decided not to pursue the matters through Section K.

None of these 11 cases led to formal mediation or a formal hearing.

There were two cases from the previous year involving administrative professionals that were not completed that year, because they were put on hold while an OEO investigation was conducted. In both cases, OEO did not find evidence of wrongdoing by the supervisor, so the matters were not pursued through Section K.

For the 20 cases involving faculty members, 12 involved tenured faculty, 1 involved a tenure-track faculty member, and 7 involved non- tenure-track faculty members.

For the 7 cases involving non-tenure-track faculty members, one case involved a disagreement over the terms in a new appointment letter, one case involved a disagreement over employment expectations, and one case involved a delay in receiving payment. For each of these cases, the conflict was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

One case involved unfair treatment and claims that policies in the Manual were not being followed. For this case, the conflict was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

One case involved an annual evaluation and alleged bullying by the supervisor. With regard to the latter allegation, the UGO referred the employee to the bullying policy. However, the employee decided not to pursue either matter and to resign instead.

One case involved an employee not being allowed to continue to do extra work and receive overtime pay. This case was not grievable.

For the remaining case, the employee sent an email message to the UGO, but decided not to meet with the UGO, so the issue is not known. The 1 case involving a tenure-track faculty member involved termination for cause based on behavioral issues. This case was resolved through discussion between the UGO and the persons involved, and the faculty member decided to resign.

For the 12 cases involving tenured faculty members, one case involved a loss of research lab space, one case involved a change is research lab space, and one case involved a diversion of

funds from a program. In each of these three cases, the faculty member decided not to pursue the matter through Section K.

Two cases involved the denial of promotion to full professor. In one case, the faculty member decided not to pursue the matter through Section K. In the other case, the faculty member filed a grievance against the Provost that resulted in a formal hearing. The hearing committee found in favor of the Provost, and this finding was upheld by the President.

In two of the cases, the employees felt that they were being treated unfairly by their supervisors. The UGO referred them to the bullying policy as the appropriate avenue to pursue. In both cases, the employees decided not to pursue the matters through Section K.

In one case, several faculty members felt that they were being bullied by the department head and that a hostile work environment had been created. This case was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved, and it ended with a decision to replace the department head.

One case involved an annual evaluation and a claim that the faculty member was being treated unfairly by their supervisor. In this case, the UGO spent considerable time in discussions with the persons involved. In the end, the faculty member decided to resign.

One case involved a letter of reprimand. This case was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved, and the letter of reprimand was withdrawn.

One case involved a claim of academic interference by the supervisor, and this case was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved.

One case involved a claim of academic interference by an office on campus. The UGO attempted to resolve this case through discussions between the persons involved, but the faculty member then decided to quit pursuing the matter through Section K.

Of the 20 cases involving faculty members, none led to formal mediation, but one led to a formal hearing. In that hearing, the hearing committee found for the supervisor, and the President upheld that decision. There was one case from the previous year involving a non-tenure-track faculty member that was not completed that year, because it was put on hold while an OEO investigation was conducted. OEO did not find evidence of wrongdoing by the supervisor. This case involved the early termination of a teaching contract for cause. After the completion of the OEO investigation, this case was resolved through discussions between the UGO and the persons involved, and the faculty member was allowed to remain employed for the duration of their contract and resign after the contract ended.

Submitted by: Richard Eykholt,
University Grievance Officer

Gallagher: Anyone who has questions or comments about the Grievance Officer's report are welcome to contact him.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): The question was specifically about two cases that involved letters of expectation were found unreasonable. If an administrator changes the terms for a person, that person has no capacity for challenging. What would be the process?

Gallagher: I cannot respond to your question directly. Gallagher encouraged Pedros-Gascon to contact Richard Eykholt.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon expressed that this report should go out to all faculty.

Gallagher feels there would be no problem to distribute this report to all faculty.

DISCUSSION

1. None.

Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 5:38 p.m.

Tim Gallagher, Chair
Sue Doe, Vice Chair
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant to Faculty Council

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2019
Jason Bruemmer	Animal Sciences	2021
Cynthia (Cini) Brown	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management	2021
Adam Heuberger	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2019
Thomas Borch	Soil and Crop Sciences	2020
Jane Choi	College-at-Large	2019
Ruth Hufbauer	College-at-Large	2020
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2019
Health and Human Sciences		
Stephanie Clemons (substituting for Nancy Miller sabbatical Spring '19)	Design and Merchandising	2021
Raoul Reiser	Health and Exercise Science	2021
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2019
Karen Barrett	Human Development and Family Studies	2020
Erin Arneson (substituting for Bolivar Senior)	Construction Management	2020
Matt Malcolm	Occupational Therapy	2020
Thomas Chermack	School of Education	2021
Anne Williford	School of Social Work	2019
Business		
Bill Rankin	Accounting	2019
Stephen Hayne	Computer Information Systems	2021
Tianyang Wang	Finance and Real Estate	2019
Dawn DeTienne	Management	2021
Kathleen Kelly	Marketing	2021
Joe Cannon	College-at-Large	2019
John Hoxmeier	College-at-Large	2019
Engineering		
Kristen Rasmussen	Atmospheric Science	2021
Travis Bailey	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2019
Peter Nelson	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2021
Siddharth Suryanarayanan	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2019
Shantanu Jathar	Mechanical Engineering	2020
J. Rockey Luo	College-at-Large	2019
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2019
Jason Quinn	College-at-Large	2021

Liberal Arts		
Michael Pante (excused)	Anthropology	2020
Marius Lehene	Art	2019
Julia Khrebtan-Horhager	Communication Studies	2019
Ramaa Vasudevan	Economics	2020
Doug Cloud	English	2020
Albert Bimper (excused)	Ethnic Studies	2019
Jonathan Carlyon	Languages, Literatures and Cultures	2019
Thaddeus Sunseri	History	2020
Michael Humphrey	Journalism and Technical Communication	2020
Wesley Ferreira	Music, Theater, and Dance	2019
Moti Gorin (excused)	Philosophy	2019
Peter Harris	Political Science	2021
Tara Opsal	Sociology	2019
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2019
Steve Shulman	College-at-Large	2020
Allison Prasch	College-at-Large	2020
Lisa Langstraat	College-at-Large	2020
Marcela Velasco	College-at-Large	2021
Del Harrow	College-at-Large	2021
Maura Velazquez-Castillo	College-at-Large	2021
Natural Resources		
Monique Rocca	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2020
David Koons	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2021
Chad Hoffman	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2020
Bill Sanford	Geosciences	2020
Alan Bright (substituting for Tara Teel)	HDNR in Warner College	2020
Natural Sciences		
Jennifer Nyborg	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	2019
Melinda Smith	Biology	2021
George Barisas	Chemistry	2020
Ross McConnell	Computer Science	2019
Yongcheng Zhou	Mathematics	2020
Dylan Yost	Physics	2021
Alyssa Gibbons (substituting for Silvia Canetto)	Psychology	2019
Mary Meyer	Statistics	2019
Chuck Anderson	College-at-Large	2020
Anton Betten	College-at-Large	2019
TBD	College-at-Large	2018
Brad Conner	College-at-Large	2021
Alan Van Orden	College-at-Large	2020

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences		
DN Rao Veeramachaneni	Biomedical Sciences	2019
Dean Hendrickson	Clinical Sciences	2019
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2020
Tony Schountz	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2021
Noreen Reist	College-at-Large	2020
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2020
William Black	College-at-Large	2020
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2019
Anne Avery	College-at-Large	2019
Tod Clapp	College-at-Large	2019
Dawn Duval	College-at-Large	2019
TBD	College-at-Large	2018
Gerrit (Jerry) Bouma	College-at-Large	2021
University Libraries		
Linda Meyer	Libraries	2019
***Ex Officio* Voting Members**		
Timothy Gallagher	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2018
Sue Doe	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2018
Margarita Lenk (excused)	BOG Faculty Representative	2018
Don Estep, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2019
Todd Donavan, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2017
Jerry Magloughlin, Chair	Committee on Libraries	2019
Jenny Morse, Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Marie Legare, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty	2018
Donald Samelson, Chair	Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education	2019
Karen Barrett, Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2019
Joseph DiVerdi, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2019
Matt Hickey, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2019
Mo Salman, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2018
Bradley Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2018
Susan (Suellen) Melzer	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
Denise Apodaca	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
Christine Pawliuk	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Ashley Harvey (substituting for Patty Stutz-Tanenbaum)	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Daniel Baker	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Leslie Stone-Roy	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Mary Van Buren	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Steve Benoit	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Natalie Ooi	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019

***Ex-Officio* Non-Voting Members**

Anthony Frank	President
Rick Miranda	Provost/Executive Vice President
Brett Anderson	Special Advisor to the President
Kim Tobin	Vice President for Advancement
Mary Ontiveros	Vice President for Diversity
Louis Swanson	Vice Provost for Engagement/Director of Extension
Leslie Taylor	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
Dan Bush	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Patrick Burns	Vice President for Information Technology/Dean Libraries
Jim Cooney	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Pam Jackson	Interim Vice President for External Relations
Alan Rudolph	Vice President for Research
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Kelly Long	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
Lynn Johnson	Vice President for University Operations
Ajay Menon	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Jeff McCubbin	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
David McLean	Dean, College of Engineering
Mary Stromberger	Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Jan Nerger	Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Mark Stetter	Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
John Hayes	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Shannon Wagner	Chair, Administrative Professional Council

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, please call, send a memorandum, or E-mail immediately to Rita Knoll, ext 1-5693.

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

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
April 2, 2019 – 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences – Room C101

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.by Tim Gallagher, Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – May 7, 2019– Plant Sciences Building – Room C101 – 4:00 p.m.

   Gallagher announced that the last Faculty Council meeting of the semester would be held on May 7, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. – Plant Sciences Building, Room C101.

2. Faculty Council Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award nominations due by: Friday, April 5, 2019. Gallagher encourages faculty to think of a good recipient. All of the processes explaining the award were sent out via email on March 25.

3. Executive Committee Meeting Minutes located on FC website – February 19 and 26, 2019 (http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/faculty-council-meeting-dates-agendas-minutes/)

   Gallagher announced that the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes are posted on the FC website.

   Gallagher also introduced our guest Professional Registered Parliamentarian for today's meeting - Donna Thompson.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Proposed revisions of Section E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* – CoRSAF

Gallagher read a statement out of Robert's Rules of stating that because less than ¼ year has passed, Faculty Council can bring the discussion of Section E.12 back as Unfinished Business.

Marie Legare, Chair, CoRSAF stated that CoRSAF moves for further discussion of Section E.12 as in today's FC agenda packet. CoRSAF has also addressed several questions since the March FC meeting.

Gallagher: Any discussion on this motion?

Doug Cloud (English): Question on page 65 at the very bottom, which reads--A simple listing of service activities is not sufficient. Who is this statement applied to? What does this mean exactly? Is there more or less detail requested here?

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): It's about faculty being responsible for what is put together for department head support—giving an indication of the level of effort as suggested by number of hours, complexity of tasks, etc. It has been suggested to delete this line if a contentious issue.

Mary Meyer (Statistics): Sent a list of proposed amendments to the FC office. She met with a group of people yesterday regarding the proposed amendments.

Gallagher put the amendments on the screen for faculty to see.

Mary Meyer (Statistics): Proposed amending the third indented paragraph on page 65. Strike "In addition, faculty at the Full Professor level are expected to serve on University-wide committees when invited." Meyer moves that language be stricken in expectation of full professors.

Ross McConnell (CNS): Seconded the motion.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): Strongly agrees. Sounds like it's a requirement. The faculty members should have a decision of the workload decided on their own.

Gallagher: Are we ready to vote on the motion to amend by striking this sentence?

Unanimously approved by Faculty Council.

Meyer: Second amendment: Moved to strike the word "significant" in the next paragraph, in the sentence starting, "A sustained…..

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Seconded the motion.

Gallagher: The floor is open for discussion of this amendment.

Gallagher: All in favor of the motion to strike the word "significant".

Unanimously approved by Faculty Council.

Mary Meyer (Statistics): Third amendment. Second paragraph from the bottom, strike the sentence "The faculty member is responsible for taking the initiative in seeking service appropriate to their rank."

Seconded by Matt Hickey (Chair, CoTL)

Gallagher: The floor is open for discussion.

Joe Cannon (CoB): Who would be responsible then? Is my department responsible? It seems that it's the faculty that should be responsible.

Doug Cloud (English): Speaks in favor of the motion. Couldn't we just leave this out? Not striking it completely. The Chair is responsible.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Supports the motion. My understanding is that service is very personal.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): I also want to speak in favor of the motion. The reason is there may be more than one way to decide what service is needed, but if incumbent upon the faculty member, then this would mean that the faculty member might be dinged in their evaluation for not agreeing with the right amount with the department head.

Dean Hendrickson (CVMBS): We don't want anyone else to tell us but we don't want to take responsibility either? This is confusing. We should negotiate with our department head as part of our job. I don't think it's a great amendment.

Ross McConnell (CNS): Mentors should be working with faculty since faculty need feedback. You are mischaracterizing the previous amendment. We want to have a voice, not resisting being told what to do.

Margarita Lenk (BOG Representative): Agrees with what previous faculty have said. Given diverse department cultures, couldn't we just defer to the department code? I believe it is a part of our responsibility.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): It's not in department codes and that's part of the reason we're doing this. One of the reasons we put this in there is because Legare's own department head did not know about admissions and she did. That was CoRSAF's thought behind it.

Dan Bush (Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs): I would like to make an amendment to the amendment. Service is part of the job, so maybe another wording is that the faculty member is responsible for undertaking service to commensurate with their rank.

Gallagher: Is there a second to make an amendment to the amendment?

The motion was seconded.

Jenny Morse (Chair, CoNTTF): NTTF are serving in ways that might not be seen as appropriate to rank.

Gallagher: This is out of order. An amendment to an amendment cannot be amended. Only the amendment to the amendment, currently on the floor, can be addressed on the floor.

Doug Cloud (English): I speak against the amendment to the amendment since the language Dan Bush indicated is already present.

Margarita Lenk (BOG Representative): I have a question to the amendment to the amendment. Would Jenny Morse's concern be resolved if the language said appropriate to the contract type and rank?

Gallagher calls for a vote on the amendment to the amendment.

Faculty Council did not approve the amendment to the amendment.

Gallagher: The amendment to the amendment is defeated, so we are back to the original amendment. More discussion on Mary Meyer's amendment?

Moti Gorin (Philosophy): The interests of people who are retiring are not identical to those that are not. The faulty member is expected to take service that is appropriate to their rank. There are good reasons for having faculty from all levels serving on committees. I have worries about the language "appropriate to the rank." If I understand the intention, then we should talk about the amount of time and energy people put in, not rank. Each of us has a contract that states how much time in service. If everyone is doing 10%, it's 10%. It seems ill-conceived.

Provost Miranda: The nature of the service is not just by time but rather that a more senior faculty member would take more leadership.

Moti Gorin (Philosophy): For instance, don't we want junior faculty members on Faculty Council?

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): This was stated earlier. There are some from junior ranks who will want to do university service. Full professors tend to not want to do service and need to be encouraged. Junior faculty who want to, can, so this is not exclusionary.

Gallagher calls for the vote for or against the amendment to strike the sentence "The faculty member is responsible for taking the initiative in seeking service appropriate to their rank." All in favor, raise your hand.

Faculty Council approved the amendment.

Mary Meyer (Statistics): Fourth amendment. Last paragraph, first sentence, substitute "along with" for "similarly." Meyer stated that "similarly" seems to be safer. Also, everyone Meyer talked to appreciate the effort and intentions of CoRSAF, but they just want to clarify things a little better.

Gallagher: Is there a second for this amendment?

Doug Cloud (English): Seconded the motion.

No discussion.

Gallagher: All in favor?

Faculty Council approved unanimously.

Mary Meyer (Statistics): One minor change in the last paragraph, strike word "simple". This word is not necessary.

No discussion.

Gallagher: All in favor to amend?

Faculty Council approved unanimously.

Doug Cloud (English): Moved to make a minor amendment to Section E.12.3. Can we change "considerably" to "considerable"?

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Seconded.

Gallagher: All in favor to amend?

Motion passes.

Moti Gorin (Philosophy): I would like to discuss more about the tying of rank to service.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): This started approximately 2.5 years ago. A lot of problems for people not getting service at the university (i.e., Mechanical Engineering: associate professor description. Where it says some associate professors might not be advisable to become department heads due to inability to then advance). Was asked by the Chair of FC to give a general guideline. We provided a general guideline for levels and ranks. We did our homework and checked with other universities. This is our rationale.

Gallagher: More discussion?

Ross McConnell (CNS): How much of this compels and how much of this invites the possibility? The last paragraph on page 66 describes engagement, while the last paragraph of the amendment seems to compel faculty to do certain kinds of service they haven't done in the past.

Mare Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): We are not here to compel. Legare referred McConnell's question to Jennifer Martin, Department of Animal Sciences.

Jennifer Martin (Department of Animal Sciences): This would be defined in the department code.

Peter Nelson (Engineering): I sent this to my department. Everyone was very positive.

Ross Mc Connell (CNS): I am uneasy about taking these expectations in the Manual and putting in the department code. The Manual should say what we are responsible for and not the departments.

Paula Mills (Office of Engagement): CoRSAF invited us to offer comment on Outreach and Engagement. We do not see these as service, rather they are means for accomplishing teaching, research, and service. When appropriate to faculty, goals can be negotiated with the department chair. Section 12.4 echoes what is necessary.

Ross McConnell (CNS): How is this going to be handled? It sounds good in principle but leaves a lot of power in the hands of the department and how people conduct their service.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): I would disagree in that it leaves a lot of opportunity for the faculty member.

Gallagher: More questions?

Moti Gorin (Philosophy): I would like to ask Marie another question, please. When you described the problem as a senior faculty problem. Did you find they were not serving on department committees, or just not serving? Two different problems.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): Let's define what it is as you go farther up the food chain.

Dawn DeTienne (CoB): Is this anecdotal. I wanted to thank Marie. I have come to realize that things are significantly different across campus. I would lean to not defining everything so tightly because it might not work from one college to another. I worry that we get so deep into the heap that we don't know what's going on.

Marie Legare (Chair, CoRSAF): "WE" (CoRSAF) try to be as general and umbrella-like as possible. We think, for instance, "How is this going to affect the Libraries?"

Dawn DeTienne (CoB): Refers to one example that she believes is too specific.

Ross McConnell (CNS): This is one of the most important sections of the Manual for faculty rights and evaluations. We only got this four days ago. We didn't know this was going to be discussed until four days ago. I move to send this back to the committee and talk about our remaining reservations.

Motion seconded Maura Velasquez-Castillo.

Lenk: My concerns are a little different. I find that CSU really values teaching and research, so perhaps those sections should be more detailed.

Gallagher: The only discussion on the floor now is "should this be sent back to the committee?"

Gallagher: Any more discussion returning this back to the committee?

Anton Betten (CNS At-Large): I just had this come through my email four days ago and this seems it is a very important decision. I haven't had the time to get feedback from my college. I would like more time.

Gallagher: All in favor of sending this back to the committee?

The motion to refer back to the committee did not pass.

Gallagher: Now back to voting on the motion with the amendments.

The motion was approved by Faculty Council with the amendments.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC meeting minutes – February 22, 2019; March 1, 8, and 15, 2019

   Brad Goetz moved for approval of the Consent Agenda.

   The Consent Agenda was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

1. New Degree: Professional Science Master's in Biomanufacturing and Biotechnology, to be established ***effective***

Fall 2019 in the Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, Walter Scott, Jr. College of Engineering – UCC

Brad Goetz spoke to the New Degree.

Gallagher: The floor is now open for discussion.

There was no discussion.

Gallagher: All in favor of approving the new degree?

Faculty Council unanimously approved.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. President – Tony Frank

Frank reported on the following:

The long bill was passed by the Senate. One amendment would add $106 million to transportation. Not clarified where this money would come from. This could have an impact on higher education. What's not clear is if this amendment results in cuts whether it would be possible to go back to the tuition authority question. This is a new wrinkle we haven't seen before this last in the budget process.

OSPM has moved up the cycle for when the State gets budget information. This makes the planning more interesting. We're currently asked to plan for two scenarios-- a 2% budget increase and a 5% budget decrease. One thing that's interesting about the two scenarios is that they don't match budgetary projections but seem instead to be scenario planning instead. If there is a 5% reduction, then is the higher education funding model still intact--would tuition authority be granted? This would be hard on students. There is also a discussion of a 5% reduction in all funds—including cash funds. The analogy is 5% few fishing licenses sold next year. For us that 5% reduction would be decrease in enrollment, tuition, etc., which would have a drastic effect. This is not driven by budgetary projections so there seems to be a lack of understanding among new OSPB officials at the State level. DHE is going back to OSPB to get clarifications. There doesn't seem to be anything driving these formulations so there will be opportunities to weigh in on the budget.

"Things that seem too bad to be true, usually aren't." (quote from President Frank's father!)

Frank discussed the new president. The search committee reviewed 80 applications, interviewed 11, referred 3 to the Board, the Board named Joyce McConnell. The mandatory two-week waiting period for a sole finalist has passed and so they have now entered into contract negotiations with her. Frank provided her credentials and mentioned

a genuine sense of loss at her leaving from West Virginia based on her commitment to shared governance, which is something we value too.

Frank says thank you. Unless something goes tragically wrong, this will be my last time before you. So for the last few decades, I have worked with you and want to say thank you.

Margarita Lenk (BOG Representative): I want to say thank you from all of us.

Faculty Council applause.

Margarita Lenk (BOG Representative): Would a 5% reduction put us into enterprise?

Frank: We are already there.

Cini Brown (Ag Sciences): What are the implications?

Frank: Worrying about this scenario won't keep me up at night, I think it's a fundamental misunderstanding

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Will we have a Chancellor? Or will the roles be joined again?

Frank: Yes, we will have a Chancellor, and that is me.

Dawn DeTienne (CoB): How much of the State budget is constrained after all the designated funds?

Frank: Over the last decade, there have been a Byzantine set of exceptions. It's difficult with all of the exceptions that have been found to know how intact the formula really is. For instance, K-12 funding stipulation amendment is a case in point. This makes it hard for most of us to understand what is really going on. There's a learning curve every time there's a change in leadership. Colorado budgeting is complicated.

Karen Barrett (HDFS and Chair, CoSS): Has there been an effort to talk to the Governor about getting rid of Tabor?

Frank: Yes. The House has introduced a bill that would de-Bruce the entire state. He is not sure exactly where that stands right now. The problem, from my nonpolitical science opinion, is that there was a time in the past decade when you would have had support for that as people crossed over political lines. That kind of crossing over does not exist now. Social impact issues show the full fracture so Frank doubts the Democrats will get much

support from Republicans for this effort. Frank imagines our Board will take a position on this and then he will be able to state his opinion on behalf of the Board.

Frank's report was received.

2. Provost/Executive Vice President – Rick Miranda

Miranda reported on the following:

Gallagher placed a proposed budget spreadsheet, prepared by Miranda, on the overhead for faculty to view.

There were 95 Tenure cases and Miranda has made all of his recommendations to the President. Has sent out letters informing the candidates of his recommendation.

Back to spreadsheet: New resources at the top of the budget, expenses at the bottom. Close to the final budget for the Board. This will go to the Board at the end of the month.

Tuition impacted by rate and enrollment. We had enrollment growth this year and didn't budget for that so put that into next year's budget. The State insists on 0% tuition rate increase for in-state but allowable increase to out of state. $21 million additional tuition revenue. State funding is $18 million and that's pretty good, the best he's seen. This is a significant increase. Estimating about $6 million more in indirect costs. Research expenditures have increased over the last several years. Add tuition to F&A and you get a $41 million increase.

Financial aid budgeting for an increase of over 6%. $6.7 million. Is this revenue or expense. It's subtracted, then distributed to the other categories of expenses--the largest is compensation. Total compensation for faculty and staff will go up $19.5 million. Differential tuition, DVM, variety of revenue sharing programs. Academic incentive programs. Utility bills-when this goes up, it goes up. When we bring new buildings on line, we have to heat them and operate and maintain them. So that adds up to $5million

. Quality enhancements are things that emerge from campus units by request. In addition, there are multiyear strategic investments that are more Presidential-level decisions, and include things like the VPR's request for an enhanced research commitment, which was recommended several years ago. The Student Success Initiative is another one.

They want to leave a little extra for the new president.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Have you allocated money for promotions and professional development of NTTF? I expect that most of the NTTF promotions will occur next year and then staged over the next few years, depending on how the departments phase in the promotions.

Margarita Lenk (BOG Representative): What's the worst case scenario in light of what President Frank told us about possibilities?

Miranda: Our level of risk is $2-3 million, not the whole $18 million

Michael Pante (CLA): Are any of the salary adjustments in the CLA? Anthropology?

Miranda: I think we're doing Anthropology this year.

Miranda: On shorter items, if no more questions on the budget, we have approved some of the new program proposals. The Council of Deans heard eight new program proposals. All were approved at that level and we are seeing some of them now.

The new Dean of CHHS has not been chosen yet. I would like to consult with President McConnell on Friday. We will move to a decision later this week.

Gallagher: Any more questions for the Provost? There were none.

Miranda's report was received.

2. Faculty Council Chair – Tim Gallagher

Gallagher reported on the following:

Working over the summer months regarding the UGO survey. As you know, this year a new survey instrument was used. There was a question in the survey—"If you did not interact with the UGO, did you want to or chose not to?" We received a large number of yes responses. A number of survey answers had to do with HR, OEO, and the Ombuds office. Gallagher has been communicating with the Provost and will get together with those people who handle grievances. Something will be put out for the whole campus to decipher where you go to handle a grievance.

Gallagher had the privilege to meet President McConnell. He has requested that Faculty Council be among the first entities to get the President for the September Faculty Council meeting.

Gallagher's report was received.

3. Board of Governors Faculty Representative – Margarita Lenk

No report.

Lenk talked about the UGO survey and thanked Linda Meyer, Libraries, for her role in creating the new survey.

Likes the idea of the Table since there are many comments in the responses to the UGO survey that reflect questions about climate. The Executive Committee wants to share this information with other offices. The main thing that the survey did was to invite feedback on the UGO and was provided by someone other than the UGO's own report.

Lenk has probed faculty interested in E-Sports as a minor. What is this industry about? It's more than a trillion dollar industry. It can involve all parts of the curriculum. Lenk is the advisor for the sport. The Mountain West now competes in E-Sports. The limits of E-Sports is unknown. The other thing that emerged from this report is the range of things, in terms of career, that might be available in the realm of augmented reality. If you or others are interested and have expertise, please contact the committee through Margarita.

Lenk thanks Faculty Council for the opportunity to be the representative to the Board of Governors. She stated that the Board has recognized her consistent and effective preparation, research, and participation throughout her term as Board Representative. Lenk also reports better metrics on student success now. If you have any other questions, or if you'd like meet to discuss her insights, then just let her know and she'd be happy to chat.

The Faculty Council thanks Lenk for her service. Applause.

Gallagher recognized Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA At-Large): Speaks to expectations sent via e-mail on March 15 about Code changes.

Dan Bush (Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs): The requirements that emerged from last year's Manual changes were a heavy lift for some units. First step: Move people into appropriate ranks, then what are the processes for promotion, and done by whom? These need to be done by next year. Overall, wants units to proceed thoughtfully. Variation across campus in terms of how far along. Next step: Codify how NTTF will interact, will they vote, etc.

DISCUSSION

1. None.

Gallagher adjourned the meeting at 5:43 p.m.

Tim Gallagher, Chair
Sue Doe, Vice Chair
Rita Knoll, Executive Assistant to Faculty Council

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2019
Jason Bruemmer	Animal Sciences	2021
Cynthia (Cini) Brown	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management	2021
Adam Heuberger	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2019
Thomas Borch	Soil and Crop Sciences	2020
Jane Choi	College-at-Large	2019
Ruth Hufbauer	College-at-Large	2020
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2019
Health and Human Sciences		
Stephanie Clemons (substituting for Nancy Miller sabbatical Spring '19)	Design and Merchandising	2021
Raoul Reiser	Health and Exercise Science	2021
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2019
Karen Barrett	Human Development and Family Studies	2020
Bolivar Senior	Construction Management	2020
Matt Malcolm	Occupational Therapy	2020
Thomas Chermack	School of Education	2021
Anne Williford	School of Social Work	2019
Business		
Bill Rankin	Accounting	2019
Stephen Hayne	Computer Information Systems	2021
Tianyang Wang	Finance and Real Estate	2019
Dawn DeTienne	Management	2021
Kathleen Kelly	Marketing	2021
Joe Cannon	College-at-Large	2019
John Hoxmeier	College-at-Large	2019
Engineering		
Kristen Rasmussen	Atmospheric Science	2021
Travis Bailey	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2019
Peter Nelson	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2021
Siddharth Suryanarayanan	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2019
Shantanu Jathar	Mechanical Engineering	2020
J. Rockey Luo	College-at-Large	2019
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2019
Jason Quinn	College-at-Large	2021

Liberal Arts		
Michael Pante	Anthropology	2020
Marius Lehene	Art	2019
Julia Khrebtan-Horhager	Communication Studies	2019
Ramaa Vasudevan	Economics	2020
Doug Cloud	English	2020
Albert Bimper	Ethnic Studies	2019
Jonathan Carlyon	Languages, Literatures and Cultures	2019
Thaddeus Sunseri	History	2020
Michael Humphrey	Journalism and Technical Communication	2020
Wesley Ferreira	Music, Theater, and Dance	2019
Moti Gorin	Philosophy	2019
Peter Harris	Political Science	2021
Tara Opsal	Sociology	2019
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2019
Steve Shulman	College-at-Large	2020
Allison Prasch	College-at-Large	2020
Lisa Langstraat (excused)	College-at-Large	2020
Marcela Velasco	College-at-Large	2021
Del Harrow	College-at-Large	2021
Maura Velazquez-Castillo	College-at-Large	2021
Natural Resources		
Monique Rocca	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2020
David Koons	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2021
Chad Hoffman	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2020
Bill Sanford	Geosciences	2020
Tara Teel	HDNR in Warner College	2020
Natural Sciences		
Jennifer Nyborg	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology	2019
Melinda Smith	Biology	2021
George Barisas (excused)	Chemistry	2020
Ross McConnell	Computer Science	2019
Yongcheng Zhou	Mathematics	2020
Dylan Yost	Physics	2021
Silvia Canetto	Psychology	2019
Mary Meyer	Statistics	2019
Chuck Anderson	College-at-Large	2020
Anton Betten	College-at-Large	2019
TBD	College-at-Large	2018
Brad Conner	College-at-Large	2021
Alan Van Orden	College-at-Large	2020

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences		
DN Rao Veeramachaneni	Biomedical Sciences	2019
Dean Hendrickson	Clinical Sciences	2019
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2020
Tony Schountz	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2021
Noreen Reist	College-at-Large	2020
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2020
William Black	College-at-Large	2020
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2019
Anne Avery	College-at-Large	2019
Tod Clapp	College-at-Large	2019
Dawn Duval	College-at-Large	2019
TBD	College-at-Large	2018
Gerrit (Jerry) Bouma	College-at-Large	2021
University Libraries		
Linda Meyer	Libraries	2019
***Ex Officio* Voting Members**		
Timothy Gallagher	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2018
Sue Doe	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2018
Margarita Lenk	BOG Faculty Representative	2018
Don Estep, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2019
Todd Donavan, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2017
Jerry Magloughlin, Chair	Committee on Libraries	2019
Jenny Morse, Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Marie Legare, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty	2018
Donald Samelson, Chair	Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education	2019
Karen Barrett, Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2019
Joseph DiVerdi, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2019
Matt Hickey, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2019
Mo Salman, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2018
Bradley Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2018
Susan (Suellen) Melzer	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
Denise Apodaca	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2021
Christine Pawliuk	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Ashley Harvey (substituting for Patty Stutz-Tanenbaum)	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Daniel Baker	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Leslie Stone-Roy	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Mary Van Buren	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2020
Steve Benoit	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019
Natalie Ooi	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2019

***Ex-Officio* Non-Voting Members**

Anthony Frank	President
Rick Miranda	Provost/Executive Vice President
Brett Anderson	Special Advisor to the President
Kim Tobin	Vice President for Advancement
Mary Ontiveros	Vice President for Diversity
Louis Swanson	Vice Provost for Engagement/Director of Extension
Leslie Taylor	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
Dan Bush	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Patrick Burns	Vice President for Information Technology/Dean Libraries
Jim Cooney	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Pam Jackson	Interim Vice President for External Relations
Alan Rudolph	Vice President for Research
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Kelly Long	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
Lynn Johnson	Vice President for University Operations
Ajay Menon	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Jeff McCubbin	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
David McLean	Dean, College of Engineering
Mary Stromberger	Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Jan Nerger	Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Mark Stetter	Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
John Hayes	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Shannon Wagner	Chair, Administrative Professional Council

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

A regular meeting of the University Curriculum Committee was held on **March 29, 2019** at 2:00 p.m.
The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Minutes
The minutes of March 15, 2019 were electronically approved on March 18, 2019.

Consent Agenda
The Consent Agenda was approved.

Please note: Approved curriculum changes are summarized below. Additional details may be viewed in the Curriculum Management (CIM) system by clicking on the hyperlinked course number or program title below. Once a course proposal is approved to the "Curriculum Liaison Specialist - hold for FC approval" queue in the CIM workflow, the course should be available to be added to the Class Schedule in ARIES/Banner (contingent on the effective term approved by UCC and Scheduling deadlines).

Exception Requests for Third Experimental Course Offerings			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
AGRI 181A1	Contemporary Agricultural Systems	No permanent course proposal found in workflow. Previous offerings: Fall 2017 (20 students); Fall 2018 (40 students)	Fall 2019
IU 281A3	Learning Assistants in Higher Education	Permanent course proposal in workflow: IU 274. Previous offerings: Fall 2018 (17 students); Spring 2019 (9 students)	Fall 2019

New Specialization		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
Master of Business Administration, Impact Specialization, Plan C	See Comprehensive Program Proposal document attached to proposal in CIM. This program will replace the Global Social and Sustainable Enterprise Specialization (BUSA-GSZ-MBA). A deactivation proposal will need to be submitted in CIM.	Spring 2020

Major Changes to Existing Programs		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
ANIM-BS: Major in Animal Science	Updates to elective lists; removal of Foreign Language from applied elective list.	Fall 2019
ECSS-BS: Major in Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	Addition of ESS 150 to a 'select from' list in Freshman year; updates to elective lists; reduction in number of ESS elective credits that must have the ESS prefix to 3 credits.	Fall 2019
ENVQ: Minor in Environmental Engineering	Replacing required course CIVE 437 with CIVE 442.	Fall 2019
CAMB-PHD: PhD in Cell and Molecular Biology	Replacing required course CM 502/NB 502 with MIP 611; updates to elective lists.	Fall 2019
CAMB-CBZ-PHD: PhD in Cell and Molecular Biology, Cancer Biology Specialization	Replacing required course CM 502/NB 502 with MIP 611; addition of required courses CM 510 and GRAD 550; updates to 'select from' groups; addition of elective lists.	Fall 2019
ECOL-HIZ-PHD: PhD in Ecology, Human-Environment Interactions Specialization	Program changes aligns this specialization with the current GDPE curriculum. The updates also clarify the course options unique to the HEI track and the categories of courses the students are required to take.	Fall 2019

SOWK-PHD: Ph.D. in Social Work	Program changes reflect best practices in doctoral education in social work and adhere more closely to the quality guidelines required by the Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education (GADE) that oversees doctoral programs in the field. Changes also reflect our attempt to streamline course content into being balanced between research training and educator preparation to adhere to our dual program mission to adequately prepare students to become successful researchers and educators.	Fall 2019

Existing Programs – Previously Unpublished in Catalog		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
Master of Science in Cell and Molecular Biology, Plan A		Fall 2019
Master of Science in Cell and Molecular Biology, Plan B		Fall 2019

CONSENT AGENDA

Experimental Courses – 1st Offering			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
ANEQ 381A4	Equine Sports Medicine and Rehabilitation	Permanent course proposal *(saved but not submitted in CIM)*: ANEQ 306	Fall 2019
ART 381A4	Screen-Printing in the Expanded Field	No permanent course proposal found in CIM.	Summer 2019
CHEM 180A2	Introductory Seminar in Chemistry Recitation	No permanent course proposal found in CIM.	Fall 2019
VS 580A2	Clinical Equine Reproduction	No permanent course proposal found in CIM.	Fall 2019

Experimental Courses – 2nd Offering *(for informational purposes only)*			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
STAT 380A1	Intermediate Applied Statistical Methods	No permanent course proposal found in CIM. 1st offering: Spring 2019 (21 students).	Fall 2019

Minor Changes to Courses			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
ECE 742	Topics in Electromagnetics	Edit to offering year: Every ~~Odd~~ Edit to offering term: As Needed ~~Spring~~	Spring 2020

Course Deactivations			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
ANEQ 202	Safety in Horse Handling	Not referenced in any courses or programs.	Fall 2019
ANEQ 348	Equine Training Techniques	Not referenced in any courses or programs.	Fall 2019

NR 621	Design of Geographic Information Systems	Listed in select from groups in: • LDAR-MLA: Master of Landscape Architecture, Plan C (M.L.A.) *(will be administratively removed)* • ECOL-MS: Master of Science in Ecology, Plan A and Plan B *(will be administratively removed)* • ECOL-PHD: Ph.D. in Ecology *(will be administratively removed)*	Fall 2019

Updates/Corrections to 2/8/19 Minutes

Per department instruction, the course changes approved below have been reversed, and each course restored to its previous version:

Course #	Course Title	Notes	Effective Term
CON 261	Construction Surveying and Layout	Credit decrease from 3 (2-3-0) to 2 (0-2-1); edits to course title, course description, and prerequisites.	Fall 2019
CON 351	Construction Field Management	Credit increase from 2 (1-2-0) to 3 (1-2-1); edits to prerequisites and registration info.	Fall 2019
CON 359	Structures I	Credit decrease from 4 (4-0-0) to 3 (3-0-0); edits to prerequisites. Listed in: • CTMQ: Minor in Construction Management *(per UCC, this program will be administratively updated in CIM)*	Fall 2019
CON 459	Structures II	Credit decrease from 4 (4-0-0) to 3 (3-0-0); edits to course description and prerequisites.	Fall 2019

Minutes electronically approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 4/2/19.

Brad Goetz, Chair
Shelly Ellerby and Susan Horan, Curriculum & Catalog

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

A regular meeting of the University Curriculum Committee was held on **April 5, 2019** at 2:00 p.m.
The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Minutes
The minutes of March 29, 2019 were electronically approved on April 2, 2019.

Consent Agenda
The Consent Agenda was approved.

Please note: Approved curriculum changes are summarized below. Additional details may be viewed in the Curriculum Management (CIM) system by clicking on the hyperlinked course number or program title below. Once a course proposal is approved to the "Curriculum Liaison Specialist - hold for FC approval" queue in the CIM workflow, the course should be available to be added to the Class Schedule in ARIES/Banner (contingent on the effective term approved by UCC and Scheduling deadlines).

Exception Requests for Third Experimental Course Offering			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
IU 380A4	Becoming a Scientist	1st offering: Fall 2018 (16 students); Spring 2019: 11 students). Permanent course proposal in workflow: IU 300	Fall 2019

Study Abroad Courses – 1st Offering			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
IE 382D	Study Abroad--Morocco: Educational Access in Morocco	**1st offering; 1 credit.** **Travel dates:** 1/5/20-1/15/20 *(11 days)*	Spring 2020

Study Abroad Courses – 2nd Offering			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
IE 382C	Study Abroad—Mexico: Community Engagement ~~in Mexico~~	**2nd offering in Mexico; 1 credit.** **Travel dates:** 1/3/20-1/13/20 *(11 days)* 1st offering in Nicaragua: Spring 2017 (no enrollment). 1st offering in Nicaragua w/enrollment: Spring 2018 (21 students). 1st offering in Mexico (location change due to safety concerns): Spring 2019 (10 students).	Spring 2020

New Courses			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
MIP 400H	Capstone in Microbiology: Prion Biology	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400I	Capstone in Microbiology: Mycobacterial Biology	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400J	Capstone in Microbiology: Big Data Sets in Microbiology	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400K	Capstone in Microbiology: Parasitology	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400L	Capstone in Microbiology: Microdome Biology	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400M	Capstone in Microbiology: Vector Biology	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019

MIP 400N	Capstone in Microbiology: Pathology of Infectious Disease	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400O	Capstone in Microbiology: Pathology of Infectious Disease	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400P	Capstone in Microbiology: Veterinary Microbiology	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400Q	Capstone in Microbiology: One Health	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400R	Capstone in Microbiology: Food Microbiology	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
MIP 400S	Capstone in Microbiology: Biofilm Biology	Approved for AUCC Cat 4C in the Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease concentration	Fall 2019
PPA 592	Special Topics in Public Policy and Admin	3 cr.; offered Distance/Online and Face-to-face.	Fall 2020
VMBS 100	Introduction to Biomedical Sciences Major	Currently under 'BMS 100' in CIM. VMBS subject code was approved by FC 4/2/19. We will administratively update course once we have the VMBS subject code created.	Summer 2020

AUCC/GT Pathways Course			
Course #	**Course Title**	**GTP Category/Notes**	**Effective Term**
CS 150	Culture and Coding ~~Introduction to Programming (CS0) – Java~~	Approved for AUCC 3B and GT-AH3 Edits to course title, description, and prerequisites.	Spring 2020

New Concentrations Replacing 'Standalone' Majors		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
Major in Biomedical Sciences	Standalone 'placeholder' proposal.	Summer 2020
Major in Biomedical Sciences, Anatomy and Physiology Concentration	This would replace the 'standalone' Major in Biomedical Sciences. AUCC Category 4 courses – same as existing BIOM-BS: • **4A & 4C:** BMS 400, BMS 421, BMS 461 • **4B:** BMS 345, BMS 420, BMS 460	Summer 2020
Major in Biomedical Sciences, Environmental Public Health Concentration	This would replace the Major in Environmental Health. AUCC Category 4 courses – same as existing EVHL-BS: • **4A:** ERHS 320 • **4B:** ERHS 410 • **4C:** ERHS 479 and ERHS 487	Summer 2020
Major in Biomedical Sciences, Microbiology and Infectious Disease Concentration	This would replace the Major in Microbiology. AUCC Category 4 courses – same as existing MICR-BS: • **4A:** MIP 420 • **4B:** MIP 351 • **4C:** MIP 400A-400S, MIP 498 o 400A-G existing; 400H-S new courses	Summer 2020

CONSENT AGENDA

Experimental Courses – 1st Offering			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
MATH 580A3	Linear Algebra for Data Science: Geometric Techniques for Data Reduction	Offered Distance/Online and Face-to-face.	Fall 2019
MATH 580A4	Linear Algebra for Data Science: Matrix Factorizations and Transformations	Offered Distance/Online and Face-to-face.	Fall 2019
MATH 580A5	Linear Algebra for Data Science: Theoretical Foundations	Offered Distance/Online and Face-to-face.	Fall 2019

Experimental Courses – 2nd Offering *(for informational purposes only)*			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
ANEQ 280A2	Equine Assessment, Evaluation and Retraining	1st offering: Spring 2019 (8 students). No permanent course proposal found in CIM.	Summer 2019
FACS 380A1	Family and Consumer Sciences Research	1st offering: Fall 2018 (13 students). Permanent new course proposal in workflow: FACS 360 *(proposal is being held in UCC Prep-Courses until we receive program change proposals for both FACS concentrations, because FACS 360 is being proposed for AUCC Cat 4B).*	Fall 2019

Minor Changes to Courses			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
MATH 450	Introduction to Numerical Analysis I	Edit to prerequisites: (CS 156 ~~or CS 160~~ or CS 163 or CS 164 or CS 253 or MATH 151) and (MATH 255 or MATH 261)	Spring 2020
MATH 451	Introduction to Numerical Analysis II	Edit to prerequisites: (CS 156 ~~or CS 160~~ or CS 163 or CS 164 or CS 253 or MATH 151) and (MATH 340 or MATH 345)	Spring 2020

Course Deactivations			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
PH 192	The Flying Circus of Physics	Not referenced in any programs or courses.	Spring 2020

Minor Changes to Existing Program		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
NAFS-FSNZ-BS: Major in Nutrition and Food Science, Food Safety and Nutrition Concentration	Adding new dual-listing of FTEC 447/ANEQ 447 *(existing AUCC Cat 4A and 4B in this program).*	Fall 2019

Minutes approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 4/12/19.

Brad Goetz, Chair
Shelly Ellerby and Susan Horan, Curriculum & Catalog

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

A regular meeting of the University Curriculum Committee was held on **April 12, 2019** at 2:00 p.m.
The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes
The minutes of April 5, 2019 were approved.

Consent Agenda
None.

Please note: Approved curriculum changes are summarized below. Additional details may be viewed in the Curriculum Management (CIM) system by clicking on the hyperlinked course number or program title below. Once a course proposal is approved to the "Curriculum Liaison Specialist - hold for FC approval" queue in the CIM workflow, the course should be available to be added to the Class Schedule in ARIES/Banner (contingent on the effective term approved by UCC and Scheduling deadlines).

Exception Requests for Third Experimental Course Offering			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
BZ 481A3	Marine Mammology	1st offering: Fall 2015 (13 students); Fall 2017: 14 students). Permanent course proposal in workflow: BZ 488	Fall 2019

New 'Second' Concentration in International Business		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
Major in Business Administration, Accounting Concentration With International Business Concentration	The International Business Concentration may only be completed in combination with one of the existing BUSA-BS concentrations.	Fall 2019
Major in Business Administration, Finance Concentration, Corporate Finance Option With International Business Concentration		
Major in Business Administration, Finance Concentration, Investment Analysis Option With International Business Concentration		
Major in Business Administration, Finance Concentration, Real Estate Finance Option With International Business Concentration		
Major in Business Administration, Financial Planning Concentration With International Business Concentration		
Major in Business Administration, Human Resource Management Concentration With International Business Concentration		
Major in Business Administration, Information Systems Concentration With International Business Concentration		
Major in Business Administration, Marketing Concentration With International Business Concentration		
Major in Business Administration, Organizational and Innovation Management Concentration With International Business Concentration		
Major in Business Administration, Real Estate Concentration With International Business Concentration		
Major in Business Administration, Supply Chain Management Concentration With International Business Concentration		

Other Business	
Topic	**Notes**
Study Abroad Curricular Policy	The proposed edits to pages 25-29 in the UCC Curricular Policies and Procedures Handbook were prepared by UCC in consultation with the Office of International Programs and the Office of the Registrar. 'Tracked changes' version comparing the 2007 policy to the proposed 2019 policy is listed below.

~~SEMESTER/YEAR STUDY~~EDUCATION ABROAD EXPERIENCES/PROGRAMS

Objectives

International education is an important part of the mission of ~~Colorado State University.~~CSU. The University maintains programs to contribute to interpersonal, intercultural, and international understanding. ~~Study~~Education Abroad at ~~Colorado State University is one such program which~~CSU encourages ~~its~~ students to undertake ~~a semester or full academic year of~~ study, research, internships, service learning, or other education opportunities outside the United States to broaden their perspectives and increase their awareness and understanding of other cultures and international issues. ~~The semester and year study abroad programs under direct supervision of Colorado State faculty have been conducted for several years and have been successful in accomplishing these objectives~~These learning opportunities are offered during the semester(s), summer, and university breaks to meet the academic needs and varied schedules of students, faculty, and staff. The benefits of education abroad experiences, considered a High Impact Practice (HIP), extend beyond personal growth, but contribute to a better-informed and civil society. A rich body of research connects the value of HIPs to students' academic growth and ability to graduate at higher rates. An education abroad creates added benefits to the curriculum offered on campus by improving and enhancing a student's academic experience through engaged learning in a host country - in and out of the classroom environment.

~~**Guidelines and Procedures**~~

Definitions

Education Abroad Experience/Program – This refers to an individual course or set of courses that are taught abroad by CSU faculty or staff members or by a host institution. These can range from 1 week to 1 year abroad and can offer CSU credits or transfer credits. The term "Program" refers to the more comprehensive international experience, which includes courses, housing, engagement with the host culture, excursions, risk management, social support, etc. Included in these experiences/programs are:

- ***Direct Enrollment, Exchange, or other transfer credit courses/programs abroad*** – This refers to a more traditional model of "study abroad", which typically involves a short-term, semester, or year abroad at a host institution. Students receive transfer credits from the host institution or through a School of Record, which is evaluated for transfer credit equivalencies first by the Office of the Registrar and then, as needed, by the academic department prior to departure. This is also the part of a larger *Education Abroad Experience/Program.*
- ***CSU Courses Offered Abroad*** – These refer to CSU courses developed by departments and vetted through all curriculum committee levels, which are taught by CSU faculty or qualified staff. These courses are integrated into a larger *Education Abroad Experience/Program*. Most of the following guidelines refer to the approval process for offering CSU courses abroad.

GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR CSU COURSES OFFERED ABROAD

The following guidelines and procedures ~~are provided to~~ aid ~~college and University~~ College Curriculum Committees and the UCC in reviewing the requests for ~~these programs.~~CSU courses offered abroad.

Initial Considerations for all Education Abroad

Any ~~Colorado State~~CSU course which involves travel to another country for more than one student participating in the same set of experiences is a study abroad course. **All** study abroad courses, both permanent and provisional, require approval by the Office of International Programs (OIP) for nonacademic aspects each time the course is offered.

Any CSU faculty or staff member may initiate ~~a semester or year long~~an education abroad program ~~of study abroad~~ by ~~first~~ submitting the ~~study~~course and program overview to the Department, College ~~unit~~, and OIP for approval. The nonacademic elements of the program, especially points related to risk management, must ~~then~~ be reviewed by ~~the Office of International Programs~~ OIP before submission ~~to~~through the ~~college curriculum committee~~Curriculum Management System (CIM) for ~~evaluation of~~ the educational merit of the ~~course~~CSU courses. Faculty members should explore how the acceptance of credits will apply toward a student's degree requirements prior to departmental approval. The program leader must act in accordance with professional ethics and responsibilities as described in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual of CSU.

Courses offered abroad for unique and individual cases (e.g. Practicum (-86), Internship (-87), Independent Study (-94 and -95), or Research (-98))

Please refer to the UCC Curricular Policies and Procedures Handbook. These courses would not be transcripted as "Study Abroad". However, all students traveling abroad for academic reasons must register their travel with the OIP and will receive international

insurance coverage as well as current health and safety information. All university employees should encourage students to visit the OIP to reduce potential risks and harm to students as well as liabilities for the institution and its employees.
The following procedures and guidelines have been adopted for requesting CSU courses offered abroad:

MECHANISM FOR COURSE OFFERING, ACCEPTANCE OF CREDITS, AND GRADES
Courses may be offered through CSU or the participating host institution. CSU courses that have been successfully offered for credit at least once may be resubmitted to UCC for permanent course consideration.
Students on Financial Aid~~General qualifications of a faculty director should include: interest in international education, familiarity with the language and culture of the host country (if appropriate), ability to work with undergraduates, and some organizational skills. The faculty director will be responsible for proposing a management plan, including provisions for the organization, administration, and on-site direction of the program. Furthermore, the faculty director must act in accordance with professional ethics and responsibilities as described in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* of Colorado State University.~~
CSU students who are eligible for financial aid may receive it while participating in approved, credit-bearing education abroad programs. All students have the opportunity to apply for additional financial aid. Students should work with the Office of Financial Aid to confirm eligibility.
Course Evaluation
At the completion of an education abroad program, the OIP will solicit written evaluations from the participating students, program leader, and possibly the representatives of the host institution/program provider. These evaluations will be used in the development of future courses and experiences/programs and will be available for review by interested parties within the University.
Mechanism for Approval of ~~Study~~CSU Courses Offered Abroad ~~Programs~~
~~A. No courses will be advertised until they are approved by the UCC.~~
A. ~~The Office of International Programs~~OIP shall not process student applications for any *Education Abroad Experience/Program* until all courses offered are approved by UCC. Education Abroad Experience/Programs (which is not a Program of Study) may be advertised prior to all courses being approved, but language should note that the course(s) is (are) still pending approval.
B. Faculty members interested in proposing a new course(s) should consult with their department and OIP to gather the following support and documents:
1. The OIP will initially review and approve the nonacademic aspects of the course and prepare a statement indicating which unit on campus at ~~Colorado State~~CSU will assume responsibility for overall administration of the education abroad experience/program. Program administration will include: arrangements of the flight, ground accommodations, classroom facilities, registration of students, handling of finances, medical insurance, orientation, and trouble-shooting, both before departure and while the program is underway.
2. Course ~~requests~~proposals will ~~then~~also be discussed and submitted to the unit's department and college curriculum ~~committee. In addition to standard University forms~~committees through the Curriculum Management System (CIM) for course ~~approval~~consideration. Prior to submission, the following additional information must be ~~provided~~addressed:
a. ~~A statement of approval~~Approval by the unit's ~~director~~leadership indicating the unit's commitment to the proposed program ~~and arrangements for assuming teaching/advising responsibilities of the faculty on leave.~~.
b. A description of the ~~program (courses~~course (course content, lectures, seminars, ~~tours). This must include a statement of instructional~~excursions, contact hours). Consideration of learning objectives and methods, credits ~~allowed~~, and the manner of evaluation of students' performance based on the existing grading system.

The ~~extent~~ following documents must be attached to the CIM course proposal for all CSU courses taught abroad:
~~1.~~ A budget that identifies the program and ~~manner~~tuition costs, the amount of ~~participation~~remuneration for the program instruction, amount of ~~Colorado State~~remuneration for the faculty member(s) and ~~students in the educational program of the host institution.~~
1. ~~The~~ the minimum number of students required to ~~conduct~~offer the ~~program~~course.
2. ~~The Office of International Programs report concerning the nonacademic~~ A letter of support from the OIP referencing the review of the non-academic aspects of the program.
~~B. Proponents should provide examples of comparable programs as models upon which the proposed program is based or they should explain how the proposed program differs from existing or previously offered programs.~~
~~C. Requests for semester/year programs must be submitted for college curriculum committee, UCC, and FC approval in time for inclusion in the applicable class schedule(s) prior to registration.~~

~~**Mechanism for**~~ Course ~~**Offering, Acceptance of Credits, and Grades**~~

~~Courses may be offered through Colorado State or the participating host institution. Courses that have been successfully offered for credit at least twice may be changed to permanent status upon application to the UCC from the department chair.~~
~~Courses to be offered through the Division of Continuing Education as well as courses to be offered in cooperation~~description with ~~the Colorado Association of International Education or with other educational institutions are subject to these procedures and guidelines.~~
~~Acceptance of credits towards a student's major requirement should receive prior departmental approval.~~
~~**Students on Financial Aid**~~
~~Colorado State students who are eligible for financial aid may receive it while participating in approved semester/year study abroad programs.~~
~~**Course Evaluation**~~
~~At the completion of the study abroad program, the Office of International Programs will solicit written evaluations from the participating students, faculty director, and representative of the host institution. These evaluations will be used in the development of future programs and will be available for review by interested parties within the University.~~

~~**TRAVEL COURSES**~~

~~Colorado State University recognizes that off-campus travel experiences may, for some students, be an important supplement to their educational experience. Off-campus travel experiences under direct supervision of Colorado State faculty may be made available to students for course credit. These experiences differ from already existing off-campus travel associated with field trips. Any Colorado State University course which involves travel to another country for more than one student participating in the same set of experiences is a travel abroad course. **All** travel abroad courses, both permanent and experimental, require approval by the Office of International Programs for nonacademic aspects **each time** the course is offered. Courses numbered -82 require approval by the UCC each time they are offered.~~
~~Experiences that are **custom designed for an individual student** for which Colorado State University gives academic credit, e.g., internship or independent study, where the student makes travel and other arrangements do not need the approval of the Office of International Programs. However, **it is strongly recommended** that the student check with the Office of International Programs to get current safety, travel, and health information. Faculty should encourage students to visit the Office of International Programs to determine the student's liability when traveling abroad.~~
3. ~~Although not typically conducted as most classroom courses, the travel experiences referred to here would conform to the same academic criteria of established instructional objectives, appropriate instructional exposure associated with the travel~~ itinerary, ~~and a plan for evaluation converted to conventional grades~~contact hours (online, in-person, including hours before, during, and/or after), and syllabus.

~~The following procedures and guidelines have been adopted for requesting off-campus travel experiences:~~
~~**Travel**~~**Provisional CSU Courses Offered Abroad (-82~~**, -83**~~)**
The following procedures apply for all subject codes except SA, Study Abroad~~:~~ (e.g. SA 482, SA 682):
A. ~~Travel courses~~ New CSU courses offered abroad shall be referred to as Provisional CSU Courses Offered Abroad (i.e. Study Abroad) and shall be designated by the number -82~~ for travel abroad and -83 for U.S. travel. Travel experiences may be offered~~.
B. Courses numbered -82 require approval by the UCC **each time** they are offered.
C. CSU courses offered abroad are available at the 100 through ~~500~~600 levels. ~~Credit allowed for travel experience is limited to~~Refer to course levels section in this handbook. The specific course number and subtopic letter will be assigned by the Office of the Registrar.
D. CSU courses offered abroad should be labeled as "Study Abroad *Course Topic in Location"* such as "Study Abroad Natural Resource Management in Tanzania". If there are more than 45 characters in the title, the subtopic line could include the location or other course descriptors.
E. An initial offering could be proposed as a permanent course if the purpose is to add a new location for an existing CSU course offered abroad.
~~A.~~F. Best practices recommend that international experiences complete approximately one credit per calendar ~~**(seven-day)**~~ week ~~**(40 hours)**~~, so that students have time to ~~a maximum of five~~process and reflect upon their learning. Additional credits~~. A **maximum of one additional credit (as defined for standard courses)**~~ may be allowed for class lectures and assignments, including readings, projects, or any other related academic endeavor before and/or after the travel. ~~Thus, the maximum number of credits a student can earn for a travel course is six credits. Special study credit may not be given in conjunction with travel courses~~ See Guidelines for Contact Hours outlined below.

~~A. Until attaining permanent status, requests for courses involving off-campus travel experiences must be submitted to the UCC on the standard form (Request for New Course/Major or Minor Change in Course Traditional) for requesting new courses **each time the course is to be offered**. If the course is being offered for a third time the offering unit may apply for permanent status (see Permanent Travel Courses below). The following additional information must be attached to the course request form:~~

~~1. Detailed description of the travel experience including a tentative itinerary~~
~~2. Specific requirements for the travel course (required readings, projects, reports, journals, etc.)~~
~~3. Statement of instructional objectives~~
~~4. Statement regarding number of credits to be earned and grading procedures~~
~~5. Student's costs and financial arrangements (refunds, cancellation policy, dates for payment, etc.)~~
~~6. Source and amount of remuneration for the faculty member(s)~~
~~7. Minimum number of students required to conduct the course and final date for course cancellation~~
~~8. Statement from the Office of International Programs indicating its review of the nonacademic aspects of the travel course. (This should be secured prior to presenting the proposed course to the college curriculum committee.)~~

~~B. Each time a unit plans to offer a travel course the Office of International Programs must review the nonacademic aspects of the plans prior to submitting the course request to the unit's college curriculum committee. The UCC must approve the travel course prior to the release of any publicity. Copy for any brochures advertising travel courses must be submitted to and approved by Curriculum and Catalog Administration before they are submitted to the printer.~~

~~B.~~G. Requests for ~~off-campus travel~~study abroad courses must be submitted in a timely manner based on the schedule provided by International Programs, Registrar's Office, and the UCC to allow for college curriculum committee, UCC, and FC approval in time for inclusion in the class schedule prior to registration for the term involved.

~~C.~~H. ~~Off-campus travel~~Study Abroad courses (unless they have permanent status) will not be listed in the General Catalog but will be included on the student's academic record.

~~C. Faculty members in charge of travel courses are responsible for informing student participants of the importance of having accident, death, dismemberment, and other insurance to cover the various contingencies involved in travel. Information on individual travel insurance may be obtained through the Colorado State Insurance Office.~~

~~D.~~I. Courses to be offered through ~~the Division of Continuing Education as well as courses to be offered in cooperation with the Colorado Association of International Education~~CSU Online or with another educational institution are subject to these policies and procedures.

J. An initial offering could be proposed as a permanent course if the course is intended to meet All-University Core Curriculum (AUCC) requirements. Department and College support is required prior to submission in CIM.

K. Students may not use the same study abroad course offered abroad to satisfy multiple AUCC categories/requirements. Education Abroad participants receiving at least **three** credits abroad in one course will satisfy AUCC category 3E: Diversity and Global Awareness.

Permanent ~~Travel~~CSU Courses Offered Abroad

A. ~~Instructors of travel~~CSU courses offered abroad that have been successfully offered at least ~~two times~~once may request permanent status ~~for their course.~~. A successfully offered course is one that has been offered at least once during ~~**two of**~~ the last ~~**five**~~four years in essentially the same format and in which students have earned ~~Colorado State credit~~CSU credit. A course cannot be considered for approval as a permanent course if it has not been successfully offered at least once for credit. Please note the exceptions for new locations and new AUCC courses noted above under Provisional CSU Courses Offered Abroad, points E and J.

B. A permanent ~~status travel~~study abroad course must use "~~Travel~~Study Abroad~~"@ or "U.S. Travel"@~~: *Course Topic* *in* ~~the title.~~*Location*".

C. To apply for permanent status, a unit ~~need only~~must complete the ~~information under Travel~~requirements for Study Abroad Courses~~, item B,~~ and use an available number (-00 to -79) within the course subject code~~, and document when the course was offered during the last five years and the number of students who received Colorado State credit.~~ (instead of -82).

D. ~~If the~~As with any CSU course, departments should submit changes to learning objectives, ~~itinerary, credit, tour length, or~~credits, title, location, and other ~~key facets are altered, appropriate course~~substantive changes ~~must be submitted~~through CIM to the UCC.

E. Each time a permanent ~~travel~~ course is offered abroad the ~~Office of International Programs~~OIP must review the nonacademic aspects of the plans prior to ~~the release of any publicity. Copy for any brochures advertising travel courses must be submitted and~~

~~approved by Curriculum and Catalog Administration before they are submitted to the printer.~~accepting students and making binding financial commitments.

~~A. Faculty members in charge of travel courses are responsible for informing student participants of the importance of having accident, death, dismemberment, and other insurance to cover the various contingencies involved in travel. Information on individual travel insurance may be obtained through the Colorado State Insurance Office.~~

F. Permanent ~~travel~~ courses offered abroad will be listed in the General Catalog and will be included on the student's academic record.

Noncredit Travel Courses

A. Noncredit travel courses are to be approved each time they are offered by the initiating department or administrative unit and then reviewed by the ~~Office of International Programs~~OIP. The faculty curricular committees do not need to review non-credit experiences abroad.

~~Noncredit travel~~**Guidelines for Contact Hours**

Federal Department of Education definition of a "credit hour" for all courses:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally-established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

1) one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

2) at least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other activities as established by an institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading toward to the award of credit hours. 34CFR 600.2 (11/1/2010)

Colorado Department of Higher Education (CDHE) guidelines:

Institutionally defined but must ~~then~~ be ~~submitted to the Provost/Senior Vice President for consideration and approval~~comparable with credit hour limits at other institutions nationally. Institutions must have written institutional policies and must keep records documenting programs offering study abroad and how the number of credits [sic] hours awarded was determined.

Minutes approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 4/19/19.

Brad Goetz, Chair
Shelly Ellerby and Susan Horan, Curriculum & Catalog

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

A regular meeting of the University Curriculum Committee was held on **April 19, 2019** at 2:00 p.m.
The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Minutes
The minutes of April 12, 2019 were approved.

Consent Agenda
The Consent Agenda was approved.

Please note: Approved curriculum changes are summarized below. Additional details may be viewed in the Curriculum Management (CIM) system by clicking on the hyperlinked course number or program title below. Once a course proposal is approved to the "Curriculum Liaison Specialist - hold for FC approval" queue in the CIM workflow, the course should be available to be added to the Class Schedule in ARIES/Banner (contingent on the effective term approved by UCC and Scheduling deadlines).

New Courses			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
CON 253	Surveying and Construction Layout		Fall 2019
CON 353	Field Management for Construction		Fall 2019
CON 358	Structural Systems for Construction I		Fall 2019
CON 458	Structural Systems for Construction II		Fall 2019

Major Changes to Existing Programs		
Program Title	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
CTMG-BS: Major in Construction Management	Addition of CON 192, CON 253, CON 353, CON 358 and CON 458; PH 121 (5 cr.) replaced with PH 110 (4 cr.) and PH 111 (1 cr.); addition of MATH 117 and 118 *(previously program prerequisites)*; removal of the 3-cr. 'Technical Elective' (and the accompanying list); replaced with a 3-cr. 'Open Elective'.	Fall 2019
CTMQ: Minor in Construction Management	Addition of CON 358 to 'select from' list.	Fall 2019
CIM-ID-GISP: International Development Interdisciplinary Studies Program	Edits to Program Description; updates to 'Select from' list and Supporting Courses; removal of requirement that students attend two on-campus events.	Fall 2019

CONSENT AGENDA

Experimental Courses – 1st Offering			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes/Changes**	**Effective Term**
AGED 581A1	4-H and Youth Programs in Extension	Distance/Online only.	Summer 2019
ENGR 580A5	Systems Data Lifecycle and Visualization	Distance/Online, Face-to-face, and Mixed Face-to-face.	Fall 2019
F 480A1	Western Ranch Management and Stewardship		Summer 2019
HORT 380A3	Native Plants in the Landscape	Distance/Online only.	Summer 2019

Minor Changes to Courses			
Course #	**Course Title**	**Notes**	**Effective Term**
HES 403	Physiology of Exercise	Edit to prerequisites: (BMS 300 or BMS 360) ~~and LIFE 102~~. Existing AUCC 4B in HAES-HPRZ-BS and HAES-SPMZ-BS.	Spring 2020

Minutes electronically approved by the University Curriculum Committee on 4/22/19.

Brad Goetz, Chair
Shelly Ellerby and Susan Horan, Curriculum & Catalog

BALLOT
Academic Faculty Nominations to Faculty Council Standing Committees
May 7, 2019

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

		Term Expires
LEO VIJAYASARATHY	CoB	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
BENJAMIN CLEGG	CNS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
TROY OCHELTREE	WCNR	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

KEVIN CROOKS	WCNR	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
KAREN HYLLEGARD	CHHS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES

JAMES WILSON	CNS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
PATRICIA RETTIG	Libraries	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		
JERRY MAGLOUGHLIN	WCNR	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		

COMMITTEE ON NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

STEVEN BENOIT	CNS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
LESLIE STONE-ROY	CVMBS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
CHRISTINE PAWLIUK	Libraries	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
NATALIE OOI	WCNR	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND GRADUATE EDUCATION

MICHELLE WILDE	Libraries	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		

COMMITTEE ON SCHOLASTIC STANDARDS

KAREN BARRETT	CHHS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
ZACHARY JOHNSON	CAS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
MICHAEL GROSS	COB	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC AND FINANCIAL PLANNING

YONGLI ZHOU	Libraries	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		
MATTHEW JOHNSTON	CVMBS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		
MICHELLE FOSTER	CHHS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance		

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

BENJAMIN CLEGG	CNS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
KARAN VENAYAGAMOORTHY	CoE	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
MATT HICKEY	CHHS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		
COURTNEY SCHULTZ	WCNR	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS

JOCELYN BOICE	Libraries	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

MARTIN GELFAND	CNS	2022
(Nominated by Committee on Faculty Governance)		

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 1, 2019

TO: Tim Gallagher, Chair of Faculty Council

FROM: Don Estep, Chair of the Committee of Faculty Governance

SUBJECT: Proposed revisions to Sections C.2.1.9.5 of the *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*

The Committee on Faculty Governance submits the following amendment:

MOVED, THAT SECTION C.2.1.9.5 of the ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

C.2.1.9.5 Standing Committees: Membership and Function

a. Executive Committee *(last revised January xx, 2017)*

The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chairperson of Faculty Council as Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson of Faculty Council as Vice Chairperson, the immediate past Chairperson of Faculty Council (ex officio), the Provost (ex officio), the faculty representative to the Board, and one (1) elected Faculty Council representative from each college and the Libraries. The continuing and newly-elected Faculty Council members from each college shall choose their representative from among themselves in April for a one (1) year term beginning July 1. The immediate past Chairperson of Faculty Council shall be a member of the Executive Committee for one (1) year immediately following the expiration of his or her term as Chairperson of Faculty Council.

The duties of the Executive Committee shall be:

1. To receive, review, and evaluate all recommendations from the various standing committees, and to report them to the Faculty Council.
2. To refer matters to standing committees of the Faculty Council.
3. To act for the Faculty Council between meetings of that body.
4. To execute those duties as may from time to time be given it by the Faculty Council or by the Board.
5. To receive petitions for calling additional meetings of the Faculty Council (see Section C.2.1.10, Article I, Section I).
6. To prepare the agenda for Faculty Council meetings.
7. To participate in the evaluation of University officers.
8. To recommend policies pertaining to the University calendar.
9. When appropriate, to establish priorities when assigning issues to Faculty Council standing committees.

10. To meet periodically with the faculty representatives to the Benefits Committee in order to ensure timely Faculty Council input and dialogue concerning University benefits programs.
11. To meet periodically with the faculty representatives to the University Policy Review Committee in order to ensure timely Faculty Council input and dialogue concerning development of proposed new University policies and review of major revisions of existing University policies.

b. Committee on Faculty Governance *(last revised December xx, 2017)*

The Committee on Faculty Governance shall consist of one (1) faculty member from each college and the Libraries. The duties of this standing committee shall be:

1. To recommend to the Faculty Council amendments to the University Code, including revisions to update it.
2. To periodically review practices and procedures of the Faculty Council and its standing committees to assure compliance with the University Code.
3. To apportion annually the elected representatives of the colleges and University Libraries to the Faculty Council.
4. To provide interpretations of the University Code.
5. To establish uniform procedures for electing Faculty Council officers and members of its standing committees and to supervise the election of representatives to the Faculty Council.
6. To make and forward nominations for standing committees of the Faculty Council and faculty members of Benefits Committee (see Section D.2.1), University Policy Review Committee (See Section D2.2), Grievance Panel (see Section K.15.1), Sexual Harassment Panel (see Appendix 1.III.B.2), and the University Discipline Panel (see Section I.7.3.2), and submit names of nominees for the offices of Faculty Council Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and Representative to the Board and for other positions as requested by the Faculty Council.

Rationale:

University policies have significant impact on the university community. The process for developing new policies and revising existing policies is coordinated and managed by the Office of Policy and Compliance (OPC). OPC helps identify stakeholders, gathers input from stakeholders and subject matter experts, helps the policy proponent assess the impacts of a proposed policy on groups and individuals of the University, and presents policies to the President's Cabinet for approval. However, there is no representative body for the employee councils and student government to interact in an organized way with OPC, receive input from the community, bring forward questions and concerns about policies, and make recommendations to the Administration. As a consequence, employee and student feedback is received in an ad hoc fashion that can hinder a systematic review.

The proposed committee will extend shared governance to the development and implementation of policies that direct day-to-day operations of the university. It will also provide a point of

contact for the Administration when contemplating new policies and policy changes and when they receive employee or student complaints about policy.

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty endorses this motion.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 1, 2019

TO: Tim Gallagher, Chair of Faculty Council

FROM: Don Estep, Chair of the Committee of Faculty Governance

SUBJECT: Proposed revision to Section D.2 of the *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*

The Committee on Faculty Governance submits the following amendment:

MOVED, THAT SECTION D.2 of the ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

D.2 University Committees of Faculty and Administrative Professionals

D.2.2 University Policy Review Committee *(last revised September xx, 2017)*

The University Policy Review Committee (UPRC) advises the University community regarding University policy.

> *A University policy is a set of governing principles formally approved to provide assistance in the conduct of university affairs. University policies apply across the university and have impact on a substantial segment of the campus population. University policies authorize or constrain actions to enhance the university mission and operational efficiency; mitigate and manage institutional risk; and, in some cases, ensure compliance with federal, state and local laws and regulations.*

The UPRC consists of two (2) faculty members, two (2) administrative professional members, two (2) state classified personnel members, one (1) graduate student, one (1) undergraduate student, and the Executive Director of the Department of Policy, Risk & Environmental Programs (*ex officio* non-voting). Each faculty, administrative professional, and classified personnel representative on the UPRC shall serve a three (3) year term, with terms beginning July 1, and are the ones eligible to chair this committee. Graduate and undergraduate student representatives shall serve 1-year terms, effective immediately following elections at the October Faculty Council meeting. The committee shall annually elect a Chair from its eligible members.

Faculty members shall be nominated by the Faculty Council Committee on Faculty Governance who shall provide nominees for election by the Faculty Council. The administrative professional and classified personnel members shall be appointed by their respective Councils. Nominations of the graduate student member shall be made by the University Graduate Student Council. Graduate student nominations shall be forwarded to the Faculty Council Committee on Faculty Governance for inclusion on the election ballot for voting by Faculty Council. Nominations of undergraduate students shall be made by the ASCSU Director of Academics with the advice and consultation of the President and the Vice President of ASCSU. All such nominees shall be recommended to the ASCSU Senate and shall have majority approval of the ASCSU Senate before the nominations are

forwarded to the Faculty Council Committee on Faculty Governance for inclusion on the election ballot for voting by Faculty Council.

The duties of the UPRC shall be:

1. To facilitate the review of the (potential) impact of proposed new university policies and to facilitate the review of the (potential) impact of current policies when they are significantly revised or when questions arise about their interpretation, effectiveness or impacts, and to gather and collate input from the bodies represented on the committee.

2. To solicit and facilitate input on (potential) conflicts between university administrative policies and the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual and the HR Manual.

3. To help identify parts of the university community that may be affected by university policy for consideration in a review of the impact of university policy.

4. To solicit and facilitate relevant and appropriate dialog within the university community for consideration in a review of the impact of a proposed new university policy or significant revision being carried out by the Office of Policy & Compliance.

5. To recommend evaluation of the impact of proposed university policies and their implementation by the appropriate, impacted groups or units, and of existing university policies when questions or concerns arise.

The UPRC shall consider requests for review of university policy from the university community. It shall transmit the results of reviews and recommendations to the Administration, the Faculty Council, the Administrative Professional Council, Classified Personnel Council, ASCSU, and the University Graduate Student Council.

The UPRC shall develop a set of operating procedures, which shall be made available to all members of the University community. The Chair of the UPRC shall submit copies of committee minutes and present an annual report to Faculty Council, the Administrative Professional Council, Classified Personnel Council, ASCSU, the University Graduate Student Council, and the Executive Director of the Department of Policy, Risk & Environmental Programs.

Rationale:

University policies have significant impact on the university community. The process for developing new policies and revising existing policies is coordinated and managed by the Office of Policy and Compliance (OPC). OPC helps identify stakeholders, gathers input from stakeholders and subject matter experts, helps the policy proponent assess the impacts of a proposed policy on groups and individuals of the University, and presents policies to the President's Cabinet for approval. However, there is no representative body for the employee councils and student government to interact in an organized way with OPC, receive input from the community, bring forward questions and concerns about policies, and make recommendations to the Administration. As a consequence, employee and student feedback is received in an ad hoc fashion that can hinder a systematic review.

The proposed committee will extend shared governance to the development and implementation of policies that direct day-to-day operations of the university. It will also provide a point of contact for the

Administration when contemplating new policies and policy changes and when they receive employee or student complaints about policy.

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty endorses this motion.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 31, 2019

TO: Chair of Faculty Council

FROM: Don Estep, Chair
Committee of Faculty Governance

SUBJECT: Proposed revision to Sections C.2.3.1 of the *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*

The Committee on Faculty Governance submits the following amendment:

MOVED, THAT SECTION C.2.1.3.1.d of the ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

C.2.3.1 Colleges and Academic Departments

The colleges, each organized under their respective academic dean, have general charge over their respective undergraduate and/or professional degree programs. These are:

a. College of Agricultural Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Agricultural and Resource Economics; Animal Sciences; Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management; Horticulture and Landscape Architecture; and Soil and Crop Sciences.

b. College of Health and Human Sciences *(last revised February 6, 2013)*
Comprising the Departments of Construction Management; Design and Merchandising; Health and Exercise Science; Food Science and Human Nutrition; Human Development and Family Studies; Occupational Therapy; the School of Education; and the School of Social Work.

c. College of Business
Comprising the Departments of Accounting; Computer Information Systems; Finance and Real Estate; Management; and Marketing.

d. College of Engineering *(last revised January 27, 2006)*
Comprising the Departments of Atmospheric Science; Chemical and Biological Engineering; Civil and Environmental Engineering; Electrical and Computer Engineering; ~~and~~ Mechanical Engineering; and Systems Engineering.

e. College of Liberal Arts *(last revised March 31, 2019)*
Comprising the Departments of Anthropology; Art and Art History; Communication Studies; Economics; English; Ethnic Studies; History; Journalism and Media Communication; Languages, Literatures and Cultures; Philosophy; Political Science; Sociology; and School of Music, Theatre, and Dance.

f. College of Natural Resources *(last revised June 21, 2011)*
Comprising the Departments of Ecosystem Science and Sustainability; Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology; Forest and Rangeland Stewardship; Geosciences; and Human Dimensions of Natural Resources

g. College of Natural Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Biology; Chemistry; Computer Science; Mathematics; Physics; Psychology; and Statistics.

h. College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Biomedical Sciences; Clinical Sciences; Environmental and Radiological Health Sciences; and Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology.

Rationalization

The Systems Engineering Program in the College of Engineering was created in 2008 to offer graduate degrees and certificates in Systems Engineering for both resident and online students. The courses are offered under the general ENGR designation. Since its creation, it has granted 143 certificates, 102 Master's degrees and 11 Ph.D. degrees. The College of Engineering proposes to create a Department of Systems Engineering to become the home of the program. The reasons this is a timely move include:

- Systems Engineering is well recognized discipline with associated departments in over 45 universities in the United States. For 2019, the CSU Ph.D. in Systems Engineering was ranked #1 for Engineering Ph.D. programs available online (https://www.online-phd-programs.org/best-online-engineering-doctoral-programs/).
- The number of students has increased steadily so that currently more than 200 students are enrolled.
- Establishing a separate code (SYSE) for courses in a Department of Systems Engineering will provide students in the program with transcripts that clearly identify their systems-engineering specific coursework, make systems-engineering coursework more identifiable to students on campus, and provide a stronger basis for recruiting students to the program.
- There are currently 5 tenure track faculty associated with Systems Engineering that have their tenure home in Engineering Departments. The College of Engineering will hire 2 more tenure track faculty in Systems Engineering. All of these faculty have been or will be hired with the agreement that their tenure home would be transferred to a Department of Systems Engineering when it is created. A Department of Systems Engineering will strengthen the ability of the systems-engineering faculty to coordinate educational activities and pursue research opportunities and funding.

Notes

- One faculty member in Systems Engineering teaches an undergraduate course in Intellectual Property and we are exploring the possibilities for a minor in Systems Engineering and potential "4+1" options with some of the currently existing undergraduate degree programs.

- Staff and non-tenure track faculty with assignments to support Systems Engineering will be transferred to the new Department. It is not anticipated that additional resources, beyond the normal sharing of tuition from online enrollments, will be needed going forward.

This proposal has been endorsed by:

- The faculty to be associated with the new Department have been hired under the agreement to move to the Department when it is established.
- The Dean and Department Chairs of the College of Engineering have voted to support the motion.
- The University Curriculum Committee has voted to approve the motion.
- The Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning has voted to approve the motion.
- The Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education has voted to approve the motion.
- The Council of Deans and the Provost's Office has voted to support the motion.
- The Registrar's office is aware of the change and prepared to make the necessary adjustments.
- CSU Distance is aware of the change and are prepared to change communications accordingly.
- The Committee on Faculty Governance has voted to support the motion.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 31, 2018

TO: Chair of Faculty Council

FROM: Don Estep, Chair
Committee of Faculty Governance

SUBJECT: Proposed revision to Sections C.2.3.1 of the *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*

The Committee on Faculty Governance submits the following amendment:

MOVED, THAT SECTION C.2.3.1.e of the ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

C.2.3.1 Colleges and Academic Departments

The colleges, each organized under their respective academic dean, have general charge over their respective undergraduate and/or professional degree programs. These are:

a. College of Agricultural Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Agricultural and Resource Economics; Animal Sciences; Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management; Horticulture and Landscape Architecture; and Soil and Crop Sciences.

b. College of Health and Human Sciences *(last revised February 6, 2013)*
Comprising the Departments of Construction Management; Design and Merchandising; Health and Exercise Science; Food Science and Human Nutrition; Human Development and Family Studies; Occupational Therapy; the School of Education; and the School of Social Work.

c. College of Business
Comprising the Departments of Accounting; Computer Information Systems; Finance and Real Estate; Management; and Marketing.

d. College of Engineering *(last revised January 27, 2006)*
Comprising the Departments of Atmospheric Science; Chemical and Biological Engineering; Civil and Environmental Engineering; Electrical and Computer Engineering; and Mechanical Engineering.

e. College of Liberal Arts *(last revised March 31, 2019)*
Comprising the Departments of Anthropology and Geography.; Art and Art History; Communication Studies; Economics; English; Ethnic Studies; History; Journalism and Media Communication; Languages, Literatures and Cultures; Philosophy; Political Science; Sociology; and School of Music, Theatre, and Dance.

f. College of Natural Resources *(last revised June 21, 2011)*
Comprising the Departments of Ecosystem Science and Sustainability; Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology; Forest and Rangeland Stewardship; Geosciences; and Human Dimensions of Natural Resources

g. College of Natural Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Biology; Chemistry; Computer Science; Mathematics; Physics; Psychology; and Statistics.

h. College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
Comprising the Departments of Biomedical Sciences; Clinical Sciences; Environmental and Radiological Health Sciences; and Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology.

Rationalization

Rationale:

1) The name change will more accurately reflect the role of geography in the existing department. The new B.S. in Geography now has in excess of 35 majors. The new Ph.D. in Anthropology has emphases on space, place, and adaptation. Space and place figure prominently in geographical thinking, and these geographical insights will complement the work done by Anthropology Ph.D. students. The name change will provide a foundation for expansion of the geography program to the graduate level by giving prior institutional visibility to the importance of geography in the larger university curriculum. As of this year, one-third of the department's faculty consists of geographers.
2) The name change will help with both student and faculty recruitment in geography, as the more inclusive department name will give recruiting prospects an immediate sense of the curricular breadth of the department. We are especially optimistic about the impact on the recruitment of majors.
3) The name change will align with departments elsewhere that offer a combination of geography and anthropology programs. Louisiana State University, for example, a CSU "peer" university, has a Department of Geography and Anthropology.
4) The name change should enhance the research mission of the department, especially in terms of successful grant production, by communicating to funding agencies the growing importance of the geographical component in the overall research profile of the University.

This proposal has been endorsed by:

- The faculty in the Department of Anthropology have voted in favor of the change.
- The Dean and Department Chairs of the College of Liberal Arts have voted to support the motion.
- The University Curriculum Committee has voted to approve the motion.
- The Council of Deans and the Provost’s Office supports the motion.
- The Committee on Faculty Governance has voted to support the motion.
- CSU Distance is aware of the change and are prepared to change communications accordingly.

April 12, 2019

To: **Tim Gallagher, Chair, Faculty Council**
From: **Matt Hickey, Chair, Committee on Teaching and Learning**
Subject: **Students called to Active Duty**

The Committee on Teaching and Learning submits the following motion:

MOVED, THAT SECTION I.11 OF THE *ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL*, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

I.11 Students Called to Active Duty *~~(last revised May 5, 2005)~~*
In response to military action declared by the President of the United States or Congress in which United States forces are being called into active duty, the University shall apply this policy for the duration of such actions~~,~~. ~~and the Center for Advising and Student Achievement (CASA) shall execute it.~~ As a primary point of contact, students are encouraged to work with Adult Learner and Veteran Services (ALVS) in order to review all options prior to leaving CSU. Depending on when in the semester the student is called to duty, different options may be available including University withdrawal, late withdrawals, or incompletes. Additional information can be found in the General Catalog.
~~Any student called to active military duty may, upon presentation of a copy of his or her orders to CASA ALVS, be given a grade of Incomplete in courses for which she/he is registered. The student or his or her designate may make this request in person, by letter, or by telephone. However, the request will not be processed by CASA ALVS until a copy of the orders are received. The CASA advisors ALVS staff will counsel with the student or his or her designate and the student's instructors to select the option (either withdrawal from the University, cancellation of courses, or taking of an Incomplete) that is most appropriate to that student's situation. (Note: The CASA ALVS cannot disclose personally identifiable educational information with a third party, even a spouse or other designee, without a signed FERPA Release Form. The FERPA Release Form authorizes CASA ALVS to disclose the student's educational information to his or her designee. (See Section I.2.)~~
~~If the student chooses to withdraw from the University as a result of an undetermined amount of time required away from his or her studies during military service, the tuition paid for the semester will be refunded. If the student opts for a grade of Incomplete for the course, tuition will not be refunded. The grade of Incomplete shall remain on the student's record for a period not to exceed one year following the end of the semester in which the student re-enrolls at Colorado State University. By this date, the grade will be changed by the instructor or department head of record, or it will convert to a grade of "F." It will be the responsibility of CASA personnel to track these students and to keep the Office of the Registrar notified of the status of these students, since the time period for which the grade of Incomplete~~

~~may remain on the record may vary from the normal University time limits for resolution of grades of Incomplete~~.

Rationale:
The proposed changes seek to make the manual language consistent with revised language in the General Catalog approved by Faculty Council in December 2016. The faculty manual revisions were brought to the attention of CoTL by our Registrar's Office representative and the proposed changes shared here have been reviewed by the Registrar's office. Adult Learner and Veteran Services (ALVS) is the primary point of contact for CSU students who are called to active duty service. While the name may be taken to imply services only to retired military veterans, ALVS in fact serves a number of non-traditional student groups in addition to veterans and those students who are called to active duty service. ALVS works closely with the Registrar's Office and other groups on campus to ensure the needs of students who are called to active duty service are met. As such, this motion represents the operational steps already in place for students who are called to active duty service.

Date: April 5, 2019

To: Tim Gallagher
Chair, Faculty Council

From: Marie Legare DVM PhD
Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Subject: Faculty Manual **E.9.2 Individual Faculty Workload**

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT SECTIONS E.9.2 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

E.9.2 Individual Faculty Workload *(last revised ~~February 14, 2014~~xxx)*

Individual workloads for each area of responsibility may vary over time in accordance with the needs and missions of the different academic departments and shall be negotiated between the faculty member and the department head subject to the provisions of Section C.2.6.2.e. Factors for which workload ~~can~~ should be adjusted include, but are not limited to, course credits, class size, course level, method of course delivery, type of course (lecture, laboratory, independent study, internship, supervised student research, thesis/dissertation, clinical, practicum), service as a course coordinator or facilitator, advising/mentoring load, off-campus assignments, number of course preparations, new course preparations, contact hours, and teaching assistants~~,~~. For research and scholarly activity factors may include the size and activity of the research program or other creative activity, recognition of the research or creative activity in the form of shows, exhibits, presentations, awards, grants, publications and patents. Additionally, ~~and~~ service, outreach and engagement should be included in the faculty evaluation. Department codes shall make it clear how workload percentages are determined and set expectations accordingly.

Date: April 5th, 2019

To: Tim Gallagher
Chair, Faculty Council

From: Marie Legare DVM PhD
Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Subject: Faculty Manual **E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases**

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT SECTIONS E.12 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

E.12 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary Increases *(last revised ~~June 21, 2011~~xxx)*

All faculty members being considered for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate a level of excellence appropriate to the rank under consideration and consistent with the standards of their discipline, their unit's institutional mission, and the faculty member's individual effort distribution in teaching and advising/mentoring, research and other creative activity, and service. Outreach and engagement efforts (as described in Section E/12/4) should be integrated into the faculty member's teaching, research, and/or service responsibilities, as appropriate.

Annual and periodic comprehensive reviews of a faculty member's performance are addressed in Sections C.2.5, E.12, and E.14, and the expectations articulated in this section are applicable to those reviews. The basis for annual and periodic comprehensive reviews shall be the set of criteria in place at the beginning of the review period. A faculty member shall provide evidence, consistent with their stated effort distribution, of teaching and advising/mentoring competence, and/or sustained research and other creative activity, and/or service (see Section E.9.1) for annual and periodic

comprehensive reviews, as well as for tenure and promotion. The department code shall establish clearly articulated criteria and standards for evaluation in these areas. Performance expectations may take into consideration the current rank ~~and base salary~~ of the faculty member.

E.12.1 Teaching, ~~and~~ Advising and Mentoring *(last revised ~~December 1, 2017~~xxx)*

As part of its mission, the University is dedicated to undergraduate, graduate, professional, and continuing education locally, nationally, and internationally. Toward that end teachers engage learners, transfer knowledge, develop skills, create opportunities for learning, advise, and facilitate students' transfer of knowledge across contexts and their academic and professional development.

Teaching includes, but is not limited to, classroom and/or laboratory instruction; on-line instruction; individual tutoring; supervision and instruction of student researchers; clinical teaching; field work supervision and training; preparation and supervision of teaching assistants; supervision of field trips; teaching abroad; service learning; outreach/engagement; organization, coordination, marketing, and promotion of official university educational activities; and other activities that organize and disseminate knowledge. Faculty members' supervision or guidance of students in recognized academic pursuits that do not confer any University credit also is considered teaching and should be included in portfolio materials and be considered as part of the evidence of teaching effectiveness. Associated teaching activities include class preparation; grading; laboratory or equipment maintenance; preparation and funding of proposals to improve instruction; attendance at workshops on teaching improvement; and planning of curricula and courses of study; and mentoring colleagues in any of these activities. Outreach and engagement activities as specified by the department/unit, are important to CSU as a land-grant institution and should be integrated into teaching efforts, as appropriate (see Section E.12.4). This includes teaching efforts of faculty members with

Extension appointments. Examples of engaged teaching include service-learning and conducting workshops, seminars and consultations, and the preparation of educational materials for those purposes. Other examples can be found in the “Continuum of Engaged Scholarship”.

Excellent teachers are characterized by their command of subject matter; logical organization and presentation of course material; ability to help students recognize relationships among fields of knowledge; energy and enthusiasm; availability to help students outside of class; encouragement of curiosity, creativity, and critical thought; engagement of students in the learning process; understanding of how students learn and encouragement of effective learning strategies; use of clear grading criteria; and respectful responses to student questions and ideas.

Departments shall foster a culture that values and recognizes excellent teaching and encourages reflective self-assessment. To that end, departmental codes must, within the context of their disciplines, (1) define effective teaching and (2) describe the process and criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Department codes shall make it clear what is needed for a faculty member to meet teaching expectations and what is needed to exceed expectations. Evaluation of teaching should be designed to highlight strengths, identify deficiencies, and improve overall teaching and learning.

Evaluation criteria of teaching can include, but are not limited to, quality of curriculum design; quality of instructional materials; achievement of student learning outcomes; and effectiveness at presenting information, managing class sessions, encouraging student engagement and critical thinking, and responding to student work. Evaluation of teaching must involve substantive review of multiple sources of information such as course syllabi; signed peer evaluations; examples of course improvements; development of new courses and teaching techniques; integration of service learning; summaries of how the instructor used information from student feedback to improve course design or

instructional delivery, as well as any evidence of the outcomes of such improvements; letters, electronic mail messages, and/or other forms of written comments from current and/or former students; and evidence of the use of active and/or experiential learning, student learning achievement, professional development related to teaching and learning, and assessments from conference/workshop attendees. Importantly, student perceptions of the learning environment are, by definition, *not* evaluations of teaching effectiveness and cannot be taken as such; they are simply the student perspectives on their experience in a learning environment. Departments must not use student survey responses as a direct or comparative measure of teaching effectiveness nor use student responses or attendant metrics derived from student responses independent of multiple sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness. The use of student survey responses is appropriate only in the context of multifactorial reviews of multiple resources oriented toward an instructor's continuous improvement in fulfilling our teaching mission. Given this, reflection on, and use of, student perceptions can be one part of instructors' formative development because these perceptions can offer insights into the learning environment that only the students can provide. As such, results from student course surveys should be shared with department heads and promotion and tenure committees and considered only *in context of* a multifactorial review for the purpose of mentoring and evaluating teaching that includes information on courses taught, patterns in student survey responses, and instructors' reflections on such patterns in teaching portfolios that document their accounts of how they have used this and other feedback. Anonymous letters or comments shall not be used to evaluate teaching, except with the consent of the instructor or as authorized in a department's code. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should take into account the physical and curricular context in which teaching occurs (e.g., <u>lecture, practicum, lab courses, independent and group study courses;</u> face-to-face and online settings; lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses), established content standards and expectations, and the faculty member's teaching

assignments, in the context of the type and level of courses taught. The University provides resources to support the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, such as systems to create and assess teaching portfolios, access to exemplary teaching portfolios, and professional development programs focusing on teaching and learning.

Effective advising and mentoring of students, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, is a vital part of the teaching/learning process. Advising/mentoring activities include, but are not limited to, meeting with students to explain graduation requirements; giving academic advice; giving career advice or referring the student to the appropriate person for that advice; ~~and supervision of or assistance with graduate student theses/dissertations/projects~~ advising/mentoring students for official university activities and advising student organizations. Advising/mentoring of graduate students includes, but is not limited to, supervision of and/or assistance with thesis, dissertations, publications, presentations and project-related products. In particular, the advising/mentoring commitments are different for non-thesis masters students, thesis masters students, doctoral students, and postdoctoral fellows.

Advising and mentoring is characterized by being available to students, keeping appointments, providing accurate and appropriate advice, and providing knowledgeable guidance. Evaluation of advising/mentoring effectiveness can be based upon signed evaluations from current and/or former students, faculty members, and professional peers. Evaluation of advising/mentoring should take into account the quality of the advising/mentoring and the time spent on advising/mentoring activities. Department codes ~~The faculty in each academic unit~~ shall specify criteria and standards ~~for evaluation and methods~~ for evaluating ~~teaching and~~ advising/mentoring effectiveness and shall evaluate advising/mentoring as part of annual and periodic comprehensive reviews. ~~These criteria, standards, and methods shall be incorporated into departmental codes.~~

Rationale:

1. As teaching, advising and mentoring duties have expanded among faculty, an updated version incorporating some of these examples has been submitted for consideration.
2. As there is a greater push to have mentoring defined and recognized as a significant work load effort for some faculty, this was added to E.12.1.

Date: April 10th, 2019

To: Tim Gallagher
Chair, Faculty Council

From: Marie Legare DVM PhD
Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Subject: Faculty Manual E.12.3

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT SECTIONS E.12.3 OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

Deletions ~~Overscored~~ Additions Underlined

E.12.3.4 Service with External Partners and Communities (*new section xxx*). As a land-grant institution, the University is committed to engagement efforts that work with external partners to serve current and future needs of local, state, national and international communities (see Section E.12.4). Therefore, departments and units should encourage and support faculty efforts that are focused on such engagement. Examples of engaged service include technical assistance, consulting, and policy analysis. Other examples can be found in the "Continuum of Engaged Scholarship".

E.12.3.45 Extension Service. Extension is dedicated to serving current and future needs of the population within the state, as well as nationally and internationally, through educational information and programs to address important and emerging community issues using dynamic, science-based educational resources. CSU Extension is highly valued for inclusive, impactful community engagement in support of our land-grant university mission.

Rationale:

1. The Provost's Council for Engagement, a faculty-driven initiative with representation from all eight colleges and Libraries, helped to clarify and strengthen existing manual language regarding outreach and engagement, defined as a particular approach to teaching, research and service and extension in support of the university's land-grant mission. The addition of E.12.3.4, further defining Service with External Partners and Communities is a helpful addition to the Faculty and Administrative Manual.

Date: April 5, 2019

To: Tim Gallagher
Chair, Faculty Council

From: Marie Legare DVM PhD
Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty

Subject: Faculty Manual **E.17 Renewal of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments**

The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty submits the following:

MOVED, THAT THIS NEW SECTION E.17 BE ADDED TO THE ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL, AND THE CURRENT SECTIONS E.17 AND E.18 BE RENUMBERED AS SECTIONS E.18 AND E.19, RESPECTIVELY:

E.17 Renewal of Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments

Tenure-track faculty appointments are for a specified period of time and must be renewed periodically. Prior to the expiration of such an appointment, the Tenure and Promotion Committee within the Department shall meet and discuss the performance of the faculty member. This committee shall then prepare a report regarding the progress of the faculty member toward tenure and promotion. This report shall be submitted to the Department Head along with a recommendation whether or not to renew the tenure-track appointment. The Department Head shall then decide whether or not to renew the appointment.

If the Tenure and Promotion Committee within the Department recommends the renewal of a tenure-track faculty appointment, but the Department Head decides not to renew the appointment, then the Department Head shall notify the Tenure and Promotion Committee of this decision. The Tenure and Promotion Committee shall then reconsider their recommendation for renewal. If the Committee still believes that renewal is appropriate, then it shall prepare a document (hereinafter referred to as the Recommendation) explaining the reasons for recommending renewal, and this Recommendation shall be sent to the Department Head. If the Department Head still decides not to renew the appointment, then the Department Head shall prepare a document (hereinafter referred to as the Decision) explaining their reasons for this decision. The Recommendation and the Decision shall then be provided to the faculty member.

In this case, the faculty member may appeal the nonrenewal decision by the Department Head. This section of the Manual sets forth the procedures for such an appeal. The University Grievance Officer (UGO) shall be charged with overseeing this appeal process. At the discretion of the UGO, any of the time limits in this section may be extended for reasonable periods. Such extensions shall be reported immediately to all parties concerned.

E.17.1. Initiating the Appeal Process

When the faculty member is provided with a copy of the Recommendation and the Decision, the Department Head shall notify the faculty member of their right to appeal the nonrenewal decision and refer them to Section E.17 of the Manual. The faculty member then has ten (10) working days to submit to the UGO an Appeal in writing of the nonrenewal decision, along with the Recommendation and the Decision. If an Appeal is submitted within this time frame, then the UGO shall notify the Provost within three (3) working days.

If the faculty member fails to submit an Appeal within this time frame, then they shall forfeit the right to appeal the nonrenewal decision (unless the UGO decides that extenuating circumstances justify an extension of this deadline). If the Provost has not been notified by the UGO of an Appeal within twenty (20) working days of receiving the Recommendation from the Recommender, then the Provost may assume that no Appeal will be filed.

The Appeal should provide all of the information that the Appeal Committee (see Section E.17.2) will need in order to make its decision whether to support or oppose the nonrenewal decision. This may include relevant documentation and persons that the Appeal Committee may contact for additional supporting information. The relevance of each person should be stated in the Appeal. The Appeal Committee is not required to contact all of the persons listed in the Appeal. The UGO will review the Appeal to make sure that the information included is relevant to the issue of nonrenewal. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Appeal to the Appellant for editing before it is acceptable.

Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Appeal from the Appellant, the UGO shall forward the Appeal to the Department Head and to the members of the Appeal Committee. The Department Head shall then have ten (10) working days to provide a Response. This Response should provide all of the information that the Appeal Committee will need in order to make its decision whether to support or oppose the nonrenewal decision. This may include relevant documentation and persons that the Appeal Committee may contact for additional supporting information. The relevance of each person should be stated in the Response. The Appeal Committee is not required to contact all of the persons listed in the Response. The UGO will review the Response to make sure that the information included is relevant to the issue of nonrenewal. In some cases, it may be necessary for the UGO to return the Response to the Recommender for editing before it is acceptable.

Within three (3) working days of receiving an acceptable Response from the Recommender, the UGO shall forward the Response to the Appellant and to the members of the Appeal Committee.

E.17.2 Appeal Committee

The Appeal Committee shall consist of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the Chair of Faculty Council, and the College Dean. The Chair of Faculty Council shall serve as the Chair of the Appeal Committee. After receiving both the Appeal and the Response from the UGO, the members of the Appeals Committee shall begin their consideration of the Appeal. As part of this consideration, they shall meet with the Department Head, the Appellant, the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, and any other persons that they consider relevant to their consideration of the Appeal. All three members of the Appeal Committee must be present at each of these meetings. At their discretion, the members of the Appeal Committee may request additional information from the Department Head and/or the Appellant, and they may choose to meet more than once with some persons.

E.17.3 Report of the Appeal Committee

After the completion of the process described in Section E.17.2, the three members of the Appeal Committee shall meet to discuss the case and to reach a final decision by majority vote whether to support or oppose the nonrenewal of the Appellant.

After the conclusion of this meeting, the Chair of the Appeal Committee shall prepare a final Report. This Report shall include the overall vote of the Appeal Committee and the reasons supporting its decision. If the vote was not unanimous, then the Report shall also summarize the reasons given by the dissenting member. The Report shall be submitted to the UGO within twenty (20) working days of the receipt from the UGO of both the Appeal and the Response by the members of the Appeal Committee.

E.17.4 Final Decision by the President

Within three (3) working days of receiving the Report from the Chair of the Appeal Committee, the UGO shall send the Report to the President, along with the Recommendation, the Decision, the Appeal, and the Response. Within twenty (20) working days of receiving these materials from the UGO, the President shall make a final decision regarding the termination of the Appellant and send it in writing to the UGO. This written decision shall include the reasoning that supports the decision. The UGO shall forward this decision by the President to the Appellant, the Department Head, and the Provost. This decision by the President is final.

Rationale:

1. We are proposing to insert this new section into the Manual. Currently, the decision whether or not to renew the appointment of a tenure-track faculty member rests solely with the department head. However, faculty on tenure-track appointments are not at-will employees, so the nonrenewal of such an appointment should require more due process than just a decision by the department head. This new section creates such due process.

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 23, 2019

To: Tim Gallagher, Chair of Faculty Council

From: Mo Salman, Chair of the Committee on University Programs

Re: Biennial Reviews for Discontinuance and Continuance of Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (CIOSUs) for 2018 - Committee on University Programs Report – Modifications of the original memo of December 27, 2018

The Committee on University Programs (CUP) is responsible for reviewing approximately 50 percent of all registered Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (CIOSUs) on a biennial basis. Below is a table of the summary of outcomes and recommendations from the evaluation process of the submitted CIOSU applications for 2018. The evaluation process includes the use of a standardized assessment scoring form that was used by at least two committee members, without conflict of interest, for each application. The individual scoring outcome and the detailed comments are available upon request by interested parties.

The Committee would like to use this opportunity to propose construction of criteria for initiating and renewal of a university wide CIOSU that can support future applications as well as the evaluation process. In conjunction with the VPR office, this committee is initiating a set of questions about the expectation of CIOSUs that can be used to survey certain CSU population who have an interest in this issue. Attached is the summary of the responses from the CUP members in 2017 to the questions of the expectations. No follow up was done with the aim to draft criteria for initiating and renewal of CISOUs. The CUP committee is willing to pursue this task if there is the interest and benefit from this exercise.

The CUP recommendations to Faculty Council are to approve as follows:
The following CIOSUs have been reviewed through the biennial review process and are being recommended for ***continuance*** by the Committee on University Programs:

	College of Business
COB_CMSI	Center for Marketing and Social Issues
	Division of Continuing Education
DCE_OLLI (Continuation with some suggestions)	Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at CSU Adequate information in the report but could operate in a different structure rather than as a CIOSU or inclusion of research and outreach activities beyond the Division of Continuing Education. The current structure does not fit within the definition of CIOSU (Section B.2.6.1)
COE_CSITS *(Continuation with some suggestions)*	Center for Sustainable & Intelligent Transportation Systems - Bare minimum reporting; they should detail grant spending if it was the Center that got the grants rather than individual faculty. Plans indicate

	reorganization and ramping up activity.
COE_SBDC	Sustainable Bioenergy Development Center
COE_ESMEI *(Continuation with some suggestions)*	Earth System Modeling and Education Institute (ESMEI) - They are bringing in huge amounts of grants and have sufficient accomplishments and/or plans, however, report could have used more detail.
	College of Health and Human Sciences
CHHS_ATRC	Assistive Technology Resource Center
CHHS_CCP	Center for Community Partnerships
CHHS_ECC	Early Childhood Center
CHHS_HABIC	Human Animal Bond in Colorado
	College of Liberal Arts
CLA_CFAT *(Continuation with some suggestions)*	Center for Fair and Alternative Trade - The budget is not clear on expenditures
CLA_CLP	Center for Literary Publishing
CLA_CPD *(Continuation with some suggestions)*	Center for Public Deliberation - Complete report, and plenty of activity. However, appears that this CIOSU operates entirely within the Department of Communication Studies. Thus, it does not need to be classified as a CIOSU and could continue operations under a different structure or further elaborations on activities beyond the Department of Communication Studies.
CLA_REDI@CSU	Regional Economic Development Institute at CSU
	College of Natural Sciences
CNS_CSUMAP	Center for Sustainable Monomers and Polymers
CNS_CIF	Central Instrument Facility
CNS_CEN	College of Natural Sciences Education and Outreach Center
CNS_FMIAC	Florescence Microscopy/Image Analysis Center
CNS_GRAYBILL	Franklin A. Graybill Statistical Laboratory
CNS_MMAML	Magnetic Materials and Applied Magnetics Laboratory
CNS_TEC	Tri-Ethnic for Prevention Research
	College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
CVMBS_ARBL	Animal Reproduction and Biotechnology Laboratory
CVMBS_AIDL	Arthropod-Borne and Infectious Diseases Laboratory
CVMBS_ORC	Orthopaedic Research Center
CVMBS_PRC *(Continuation with some suggestions)*	Prion Research Center - Arrange the academic activities for future reporting. - In general, the report seems unorganized; lacking detail.
	Warner College of Natural Resources
WCNR_AIRIE	Applied Isotope Research for Industry and the Environment
WCNR_CEMML	Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands
WCNR_CPAMT	Center for Protected Area Management and Training
WCNR_CRU	Colorado Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit

WCNR_CFRI (Continuation with some suggestions)	Colorado Forest Restoration Institute • Complete report, and plenty of activity. However, appears that this CIOSU operates entirely within one department. Thus, it does not need to be classified as a CIOSU and could continue operations under a different structure or further elaborations on activities beyond one department.
WCNR_CNHP *(Continuation with some suggestions)*	Colorado Natural Heritage Program - Budget section should be consolidated in future reports.
WCNR_ELC *(Continuation with some suggestions)*	Environmental Learning Center - Goals for the next two years are provided but plans on how the goals will be accomplished should be included in future reports.
WCNR_LFL	Larval Fish Laboratory
WCNR_NREL	Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory
	Office of Engagement - Extension
VPE_CWI	Colorado Water Resources Research Institute
	Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President
Provost_GDPE	Graduate Degree Program in Ecology
Provost_SOGES	School of Global Environmental Sustainability

The following CIOSUs have been reviewed through the biennial review process and are ***not recommended for continuation*** by Committee on University Programs:

	College of Business
COB_CASE	Center for Advancement of Sustainable Enterprise - Center inactive for two years without presented budget
COB_CPDBR	Center for Professional Development and Business Research - Not recommended for continuation since this CIOSU is fully contained in one department of the College of Business and does not fit within the existing definition of CIOSU. - Reporting on the past two years seems incomplete and plans for next two years could use more detail. Really seems like they are providing a service more than doing collaborative research. Might make more sense to cease being CIOSU and continue their work under another structure.

The following CIOSUs have been deferred to the next reporting cycle:

Reviewed and determined additional information is needed:	
	College of Natural Sciences
CNS_TEC	Software Assurance Laboratory - Requires elaborations to show multi-disciplinary and team activities prior to consideration of the Center's qualifications. - Find out what activities and external projects the PIs are conducting that would only be possible through the existence of this center; rather than simply PIs doing individual research.

Accommodating reorganization/staffing plans:	
CLA_CDRA	College of Liberal Arts- Center for Disaster Risk Analysis
COB_BBI	College of Business- Beverage Business Institute

MEMO

TO: Tim Gallagher, Chair, Faculty Council

FROM: Sid Suryanarayanan, Chair, Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education

DATE: April 4, 2019

RE: Revisions to the *Graduate and Professional Bulletin* – ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES

THE COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH AND GRADUATE EDUCATION MOVE THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE REVISIONS TO SECTION: "ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENT AND PROCEDURES" OF THE *GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL BULLETIN*, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPTION, AS FOLLOWS:

ADDITIONS - UNDERLINED - DELETIONS ~~OVERSCORE~~

Application: International Students

CSU requires that proficiency in English language be demonstrated either by the TOEFL, IELTS, or PTE Academic tests prior to admissions. The minimum TOEFL score for admission without condition is ~~550 (paper -based), or~~ 80 for the (internet-based exam). Contact the Graduate School for guidance on interpreting paper-based exam scores. The minimum IELTS score for admission without condition is 6.5. The minimum PTE Academic Score for admission without condition is 58. Official scores, taken within two years prior to admission, must be submitted directly from the testing agency.

To be considered for conditional admission, a student must have a minimum TOEFL score of~~r 475 on the paper based test or~~ 50 on the internet based test, a ~~or~~ minimum IELTS score of 5.5 or PTE scores from 40-57. After receiving conditional admission, the student must satisfactorily complete the INTO CSU Academic English Program. Enrollment in regular CSU academic courses is at the discretion of the INTO CSU Academic English Program. Approval of both the department and the Dean of the Graduate School is necessary for such conditional admission.

Rationale:

1. ETS has discontinued its old paper-based test so the current Bulletin language regarding paper-based test scores is irrelevant.

2. There is a new revised paper-delivered TOEFL exam, but ETS does not report a total score for this exam. The reason is because the new paper-based exam consists of only three sections (Reading, Listening, and Writing) and does not include the 4th section (Speaking) that is part of the internet-based exam. ETS recommends that admissions decisions be partly based on scores in each of the three sections of the new paper-based test.

3. Because so few applicants submit scores from the paper-based TOEFL exam (only 1-2 over the last few years), CoSRGE recommends that admissions committees consider the scores of

individual sections on paper-based tests on a case-by-case basis by the admitting department and graduate school. If the number of applicants submitting paper-based test scores increases, CoSRGE will consider a University-wide policy regarding minimum scores on each section of the paper-based test.

April 3, 2019

To: Tim Gallagher, Chair, Faculty Council
From: Matt Hickey, Chair, Committee on Teaching and Learning
Subject: Report from the Task Force on the Ethics of Learning Analytics

The Committee on Teaching and Learning submits the following report from the Task Force on the Ethics of Learning Analytics.

Background:

In the Fall 2017 term, CoTL charged a Task Force with developing recommendations regarding the institutional approach to the application of learning analytics. The charge arose from discussions with multiple parties on campus, including the VPIT office, ACNS, the Registrar, the Research Integrity office, and individual faculty. Following receipt of the report, CoTL has sought stakeholder input; the draft has been reviewed by Dr. Pat Burns, staff in ACNS, staff in the registrar's office, and was discussed at an IRB retreat in Fall 2018 that addresses data safety and data privacy issues.

Ethical Principles of Learning Analytics at Colorado State University

A report created by the CoTL Task Force on the Ethics of Learning Analytics

Task Force Members:
Tim Amidon (English)
Steve Benoit (Mathematics)
Ben Clegg (Cognitive Psychology)
Gaye Digregorio (Collaborative for Student Achievement)
James Folkestad (School of Education) - (Task-Force Chair)
Moti Gorin (Philosophy)
Gwen Gorzelsky (The Institute for Learning and Teaching)
Matthew Hickey (Health and Exercise Science)
Laura Jensen (Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness)
Dave Johnson (CSU Online)
Mary Ontiveros (VP Diversity)
Mike Palmquist (Associate Provost for Instructional Innovation)
Mary Pilgrim (Mathematics)
Marla Roll (Assistive Technology Resource Center)
Chris Seng (Registrar)
Bayler Shubert (Associated Students of CSU)
Stephanie Yassa (Associated Students of CSU)

Task Force meeting dates (Fall 2017): August 29th, September 12th, September 26th, October 10th, October, 24th, November 7th, November 21st, December 5th

Introduction

Data science, and the specific application of data science in the context of the teaching and learning environment known as learning analytics (LA), involves the collection, measurement, analysis and reporting of data about learners, their behaviors, and their contexts (broadly defined). At its best, LA provides opportunities to employ evidence-based learning and teaching practices in pursuit of our educational mission. Inherently such opportunities are also coupled with significant ethical challenges. In the essay "What is Data Ethics?", Floridi & Taddeo (2016) observe that "*the extensive use of increasingly more data--often personal, if not sensitive (big data)--and the growing reliance on algorithms to analyze them in order to shape choices and to make decisions, as well as the gradual reduction of human involvement or even oversight over many automatic processes, pose pressing issues of fairness, responsibility and respect of human rights*".

The principles that are put forward in this report are based on the following foundational observations. First, at best, LA may inform and equip, but can never *replace* individual instructors or their interactions with students in the context of teaching and learning. Second, LA tools are not inherently good, or even neutral with respect to the learning environment. Like any

educational tool, the unreflective application of LA can in fact harm students and the learning environment. Any “good” for educational aims depends on thoughtful and informed application of LA by responsible instructors. Third, at best, LA and the attendant algorithms may help inform the learning environment for students. No algorithm should be taken to wholly define an individual student, nor can LA be taken as “determining” any specific educational outcomes for an individual student.

The Purpose

The purpose of this report is to establish and clarify a list of ethical principles that will guide the implementation and use of Learning Analytics at CSU. We recommend that CoTL develop a code of practice and guide the creation of faculty professional development initiatives based on these principles. In addition, in an effort to understand and practice Learning Analytics with the highest of standards that reinforce our commitment to the Colorado State University System mission and to its Principles of Community, we want to recognize that changes in institutional policy may be needed to reinforce the ethical principles in this report.

CoTL’s Task Force for the Ethics of Learning Analytics

During fall 2017, the Faculty Council Standing Committee on Teaching and Learning (CoTL) charged a task force to propose guiding principles for the design, development, and implementation of tools and technologies that employ LA on the CSU campus. The task force members were cautiously optimistic about the potential of LA to support teaching and learning. This cautionary tone grew stronger over time as the task force members deliberated on the ethical challenges presented by such work. This document is the result of that ongoing work and outlines principles that the task force considers essential for the ethical use of these advanced approaches on our campus.

The task force is convinced that decisions about how LA and related educational technologies are brought into learning environments are fundamentally decisions about CSU’s community and educational mission; LA is not merely a “technology choice.” Furthermore, these approaches are increasingly amorphous and are being employed across a spectrum that ranges from enterprise tools adopted campus-wide to the unique tools and techniques deployed in a single classroom. Moreover, LA and the attendant student data are not simply confined to the CSU environment; student data can move into vendor databases, where the subsequent uses of LA data, privacy protections, and ownership may not be clear. Deployment of LA at all levels can impact the community.

The Principles of Learning Analytics are currently under active development and review. Given this ongoing development, the committee is actively looking for critical review and feedback on this document. We recommend that CoTL continues to seek feedback from all stakeholders within our community including but not limited to students, faculty, staff, and administrators. We encourage all stakeholders to provide feedback. When seeking feedback we suggest that you consider and share with stakeholders the following tenets that arose repeatedly during our task force meetings and that guided the development of the language of the principles.

1. These ethical principles are intended to be a foundational component of our institutional ethos.
2. These ethical principles are intended to be congruent with our Principles of Community.
3. These ethical principles should guide the selection of Learning-Analytics technologies that are used on our campus.
4. These ethical principles should guide the application of Learning Analytics methods (including but not limited to technologies, algorithms, tools, and interventions) used in our institutional educational endeavors.
5. Evidence-based research is central to understanding the impact of LA on our community. We will hold this tenet central to all LA based projects, applying methods that adhere to the rigors of open science methodologies. It is critical that these methods, projects, and tools be open to critical review and evaluation.
6. LA resources and research efforts should be used with special attention to enhancing educational attainment opportunities for those most vulnerable within our community. Consistent with our ongoing Student Success Initiatives, projects should be selected that, when successful, will improve the learning opportunities for vulnerable populations and the entire community of learners at CSU.

Related CSU Policies:

This code of ethics has been developed with reference to and in support of the following principles, policies, guidelines and rules at CSU.

- CSU's Principles of Community
- CSU Policy: Accessibility of Electronic Information and Technologies
- CSU Policy: Inclusive Physical and Virtual Campus
- CSU Policy: Environmentally and Socially Responsible Procurement
- CSU Policy: Information Technology Governance
- CSU Policy: Human Subjects Research
- CSU Policy: Central Administrative Data Governance Policy
- CSU Policy: Information Collection and Personal Records Privacy
- CSU Policy: FERPA
- CSU Policy: Research Data
- CSU Policy: Information Collection and Personal Records Privacy Policy
- CSU Policy: Information Technology Security Policy
- CSU Policy: Red Flags Policy
- CSU Policy: Information Technology Governance Charter (ITEC)
- Colorado Open Records Act (CORA)
- Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)
- Colorado State Records Retention Schedule
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- The Electronic Communication Privacy Act of 1986 (ECPA)
- Gramm Leach Bliley Act (GLBA)
- Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

The CSU Principles of Community clearly articulate the shared values of our institution. The task force has developed the ethical principles of LA to frame the issues at stake and provide a framework on which future decision-making, policy construction, and practice can build. These ethical principles are intended to ensure that LA and related technologies/approaches are designed to serve our community mission of access, research, teaching, service and engagement.

Ethical Principles of Learning Analytics

The Committee on Teaching and Learning acknowledges that Learning Analytics raise a number of ethical and legal issues (including privacy rights). Furthermore, the body of literature makes frequent reference to the imperative that institutions articulate clear guidelines on ethical considerations surrounding such aspects as the rights and dignity of individuals, as well as openness about processes and practices (Pardo & Siemens, 2014; Siemens, 2013; Slade & Prinsloo, 2013). The literature is equally insistent on higher-education institutions ensuring that their legal obligations are being met in relation to personal privacy, data collection, and information protection (Kay, Korn & Oppenheim, 2012; Siemens, 2013).

The Ethical Principles of Learning Analytics are the foundational principles that define the University's approach to the use of Learning Analytics within CSU's teaching and learning environment. These are more than guiding principles; they are best thought of as the core ethical foundations of Learning Analytics at CSU. All Learning Analytics practices must be consistent with these most basic governing principles.

Principle 1: Learning Analytics serve the teaching and learning mission of CSU.

Learning Analytics, and all information technology in support of the institutional teaching mission, will serve to enhance the teacher and student interaction, placing an emphasis on enhancing individual student learning opportunities and student success.

Principle 2: Learning Analytics serve the aim of Inclusive Excellence in the Learning Environment

Learning Analytics are designed for equity and inclusive excellence in our educational mission. As educational leaders, we are responsible for being mindful of how Learning Analytics may reinforce the exclusion or marginalization of historically excluded groups and guard against such misuse.

Principle 3: Learning Analytics is accountable to academic and institutional integrity

As scholars, educators, and learners we are accountable for understanding the implications of collecting, distributing, analyzing, and making decisions based on Learning Analytics data. This includes the implications of making decisions based on algorithms or statistics that are not disclosed to or understood by the user(s).

Principle 4: Learning Analytics data will be collected and maintained to understand specific pedagogical questions.
Learning Analytics data is collected from learning and teaching systems, retained, and utilized for the purposes of enhancing learning and teaching. Holding true to this principle, LA data will be collected based on predetermined pedagogical reasons, used for those reasons alone, and deleted after that data has served that specific use.

Principle 5: Learning Analytics operates with transparency and accountability
As scholars and educators, we will be fully transparent with students about what types of data are collected, where and how it is stored, who has access to it, and how the threat of a data breach is mitigated. In addition, faculty and administrators are obligated to provide a method for dialog and discussion about any LA assessments. The use of LA algorithms that can not be clearly understood will be avoided.

Principle 6: Learning Analytics data use arises from respect for the individual
All faculty, staff, and students at CSU are valuable members of the CSU community. The design and application of all Learning Analytics methods recognizes the individual dignity, rights, and responsibilities of all students as learners, engaged with faculty in pursuit of educational excellence. Given this, the primary use of Learning Analytics should be formative, helping all students to understand and pursue excellence in learning and all faculty to pursue excellence in teaching.