

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, e-mail immediately to Amy Barkley.

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

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
October 5, 2021 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

Chair Doe: Reminded members about Teams etiquette. Requested members raise their hand when they wish to speak and to turn off cameras and microphones when not speaking. Additionally reminded members that Faculty Council meetings are subject to the Open Meetings law. Thanked members for being considerate of these items.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – October 5, 2021

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – November 2, 2021 – Location TBD – 4:00pm

Chair Doe: Our next Faculty Council meeting will be on November 2nd, and we will once again hold it on Microsoft Teams.

- b. Shared Governance Manual changes update

Chair Doe: Will discuss this a bit more during the Chair's report.

- c. Laps and Chats – Wednesdays at 2:30pm on the Oval

Chair Doe: Will be resuming outdoor office hours on Wednesdays at 2:30pm on the Oval. Idea is to enjoy fresh air and talk as well. Encouraged members to join if able.

- d. Professor Adrianna Kezar Visit – November 8th and 9th

Chair Doe: Professor Adrianna Kezar will be visiting campus on November 8th and 9th. Professor Kezar is a professor of education at the University of Southern California and founding director of the Delphi Project on the changing faculty and student success. Her visit is sponsored by the Provost's Office and Faculty Council. Idea of this visit is to engage in meaningful futures

regarding integration of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. The open forum will be on Monday, November 8th at 4:00 p.m. More details to come.

e. National Science Foundation Grant – Ruth Hufbauer, Professor of Agricultural Biology

Ruth Hufbauer: CSU now has an advance grant. The advance grant is funding from the National Science Foundation that is narrowly focused on improving gender equity in STEM faculties at institutions. This is an adaptation grant, which means we are working on adapting evidence-based practices to the situation at CSU.

Hufbauer: The grant is \$1 million over three years. It reflects real progress at CSU. We have been trying for one of these grants for a long time. The funding will begin on October 15th.

Hufbauer: Even though the focus of the advance grant is gender equity, we will be initially focusing on an intersectional perspective on that. In the long run, we want the program to be something much more general at CSU for focus on faculty equity. This is why we rebranded it Advance @ CSU versus the CSU Steps that can be found in the agenda packet.

Hufbauer: We will be working on supporting chairs and creating an institute and providing some funding for them, as well as understanding retention and departures. There is a research component to this so we can address the questions and problems reflected in the data.

Chair Doe: Thanked Hufbauer for presenting this announcement. Will be eager to see what comes of this grant.

f. ASCSU Health Initiative – Alejandra Quesada-Stoner

Chair Doe: The ASCSU representatives were going to talk to us about a new health initiative, but are unable to be here today. They will be coming to our November Faculty Council meeting to inform us about this new initiative.

g. Faculty Council Bioethics Committee: Call for nominations

Chair Doe: Our next announcement is about the Faculty Council bioethics ad hoc committee. The purpose of the committee will be to discuss bioethics-related matters as they pertain to CSU faculty and the university community more generally. The central aim of the committee will be to gather input and to provide a collective voice to faculty with respect to matters at the intersection of health, the life sciences, and ethics, in the spirit of shared governance. For example, we know many faculty members have questions and concerns about CSU's COVID policies; this committee will, among other things, serve as a venue in which such questions and concerns can be shared and discussed, put into context; further, the committee, could potentially request discussion with CSU administration through formal communication channels.

Chair Doe: Encouraged members to contact either Moti Gorin (mgorin@colostate.edu) or Jennifer Peel (Jennifer.Peel@colostate.edu) if interested in joining this committee. Once they

have the committee up, they will begin soliciting feedback from Faculty Council members. Stated that members can share any topics that they wish to bring to the committee in the meantime.

h. 2021 Employee Climate Survey

Andrew Norton: The Employee Climate Survey will be launching on October 19th and closing November 19th. This will be the fourth iteration of the survey. We are now expecting to run on a 3-year cycle. Stated that the last survey received a 58.5% response rate. We hope to get even greater participation this time around.

Chair Doe: Encouraged members to participate in the survey.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

a. Faculty Council Meeting – September 7, 2021

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council meeting minutes from September 7th.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – August 27 & September 3, 10, & 17, 2021

Chair Doe: We have University Curriculum Committee minutes. Asked members if there were any items they wanted pulled for further consideration.

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

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Election – Undergraduate and Graduate Student Representatives to the Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Steve Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move to approve the nomination for graduate and undergraduate student positions on Faculty Council standing committees as shown in the agenda packet.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that no second was required. Asked if there was any discussion of the candidates.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, requested vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved. Undergraduate and graduate student candidates approved for Faculty Council standing committees.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising, the Committee on Faculty Governance, the Associated Students of Colorado State University, and the Graduate Student Council for putting forward these names.

2. Proposed Revisions to Section D.4 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Marie Legare, Chair

Marie Legare: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty would like to move that Section D.4 be revised as seen in the agenda packet. Richard Eykholt, the University Grievance Officer, is also here to respond to any questions.

Legare: The rationale is that these letters of expectation and reprimand are using quite a bit across CSU, but they were not described adequately in the Manual. This was written to remedy that omission.

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

Ross McConnell: The current version of the Manual has letters of reprimand, which are grievable, but there is no mention of letters of expectations. This gives administrators a new avenue for lodging a complaint about somebody's performance or behavior. The fact that they are currently doing this does not feel a good enough reason to put it in the Manual. A better option is to ask administrators to use a letter of reprimand when they have a complaint. There is nothing in the Manual that requires that a letter of reprimand actually impose a penalty. There is also the possibility that one of these letters could raise questions of academic freedom. Seems also that the criteria that dictated that the University Grievance Officer should reclassify a letter of expectations as a letter of reprimand is not clearly spelled out.

Richard Eykholt: Stated that both letters of expectation and letters of reprimand have been in use for many years. We are not creating this, and just because it is not in the Manual does not mean it cannot be used. A letter of expectation is not disciplinary, it is a clear statement of what the expectations of the position are. This is important, especially for administrative professionals, who are at will. A letter of reprimand is disciplinary. We do not want to move to discipline every time, but can inform people the expectations of their position.

Eykholt: What we have seen is that these letters have been misused. They may label a letter of expectation as punitive, which means it should have been a letter of reprimand. Letters of expectation are not grievable, whereas letters of reprimand are. In Section K, the Manual tells us that the University Grievance Officer has the authority to decide when something is grievable. When someone receives a letter of expectation and feels it is punitive, they can bring it to the University Grievance Officer for clarification. A letter of reprimand is mentioned in the Manual

but was not described. We had the choice to put the language in the Manual that explains the current policy and will help limit misuse of these letters.

McConnell: Asked about when this raises issues of academic freedom, such as a chair not liking what is being taught in the class. Asked: Why not make these things grievable?

Eykholt: It depends on what you mean by that statement. If a chair expressed dislike for something in your class, that is neither a letter of expectation nor a letter of reprimand. That is simply a comment by an administrator. If an administrator puts that in an annual evaluation or takes action against somebody because of that, then that is grievable. A letter of expectation is simply a statement of the expectations of the position.

McConnell: Know of one case where a chair threatened a letter of expectation for something going on in a class. Asked: What happens in those cases?

Eykholt: Don't understand the term threaten a letter of expectation, because there is nothing punitive in a letter of expectation. Suspect that someone was trying to call a letter of reprimand a letter of expectation, and that is one of the reasons it is so important to have this so that administrators cannot do that. They cannot avoid grievances by mislabeling something.

McConnell: Asked: What is the distinction or criteria used by the University Grievance Officer to reclassify a letter of expectation as a letter of reprimand?

Eykholt: A letter of expectation is not punitive, while a letter of reprimand is. If there is anything punitive, then it should be a letter of reprimand. Understand the concerns here.

McConnell: An alternative would be to tell administrators to not write letters of expectations. Would have them write a letter of reprimand if there is a complaint and get the faculty member access to the grievance process.

Eykholt: Reiterated that letters of expectations are not complaints. They are clear statements of the expectations so that someone cannot get fired without knowing that they were not meeting the expectations of their position.

Mary Van Buren: Experience with letters of expectation is that they are issued when there is a perceived problem on the part of the administrators. In that sense, they are punitive, even though they may not spell out specific consequences.

Legare: Understand what is being said here. This is one of the reasons we need this verbiage in the Manual, because they are not being used appropriately in some cases. The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty had a long discussion that letters of expectation don't necessarily mean something negative. As an example, for someone struggling to get grants, it could suggest a grant-writing workshop. They can outline these kinds of expectations.

Chair Doe: Changing directions for a moment. It was mentioned that a letter of expectation is often used with administrative professionals. Asked: is that correct?

Eykholt: Confirmed. It is sometimes used for faculty, but primarily for administrative professionals.

Chair Doe: Asked: Would it fair to say that a letter of expectation would be a reasonable thing for an administrative professional to expect if their performance was less than satisfactory?

Eykholt: Confirmed. The state law allows for termination of at will employees at any time without even needing a reason. CSU's policy is that if somebody is not meeting expectations, they are given a letter to outline clearly what the expectations are. The employee can then talk to their supervisor about it, and then if the employee can meet those expectations, there is no issue.

Chair Doe: This would seem to be an enormous improvement from the perspective of an administrative professional, to have something they can reasonably anticipate.

John Elder: Asked in the chat about the "supervisory chain". That language does not exist in the Manual currently. Usually it says "immediate supervisory".

Eykholt: Stated that "supervisory chain" is just a commonly used term for the chain of supervisors. Just common terminology.

Legare: The terminology needs to exist for the faculty as well as administrative professionals.

Norton: Get the sense that the confusion is around what constitutes a letter of expectation versus a letter of reprimand. Asked if examples could be provided.

Eykholt: Have seen many of each. Will focus on administrative professionals for the letter of expectation, as that is more standard. If someone is not doing one or more aspects of their job, they can be told what is in their job description, which is generally what is in a letter of expectation. To Legare's point, it does not necessarily have to have a negative tone. It can state that certain things are not being done and that you need to do various things.

Eykholt: A letter of reprimand would have something punitive, such as needing to do sexual harassment training or being barred from a lab. These sorts of things are often a letter of reprimand. It is something punitive, whereas a letter of expectation is just a clear statement of what is expected of you as faculty or administrative professionals.

Chair Doe: Thanked Eykholt. Asked if there were any other points of discussion.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, we do have a motion of the floor. Asked members to vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

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

Chair Doe: Thanked the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty for their diligence on this item. Thanked the membership for their attention on this.

3. Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Admissions Requirements and Procedures, Track II Admissions and Plan C – Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education – Melinda Smith, Chair

Melinda Smith: The Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education moves that Faculty Council adopt the revisions for the sections on Admissions Requirements and Procedures in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin.

Smith: These changes are being made because the Track II Admission has been eliminated and is no longer used as a separate admission process. It used to be that for students with a GPA below 3.000, they would be admitted using this separate admissions process, but it is no longer necessary. The Graduate School takes submissions regardless of GPA.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith. Asked if there was any further discussion of this item.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, we have a motion on the floor. Requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

4. Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Inter-University Graduate Programs – Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education – Melinda Smith, Chair

Smith: The Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education moves that Faculty Council adopt the following revisions to the section on Inter-University Graduate Programs in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin.

Smith: These revisions are clarifying the nature of the collaboration between CSU and international partnerships or universities. They are formalized through academic collaboration agreements, which are facilitated through the Office of International Programs. This is cleaning up the language so it reflects the process as it currently occurs when people enter into these kind of collaborative degree programs.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith. Asked if there was any discussion of this item.

Peter Jan van Leeuwen: Unsure about the wording around “international university”. Asked if more accurate wording was needed, or if that was standard language adopted by the university.

Smith: Believe that it is a standard adoption, meaning any university outside of the United States.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any other questions or discussion. Hearing none, there is a motion on the floor. Requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

F. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – President Joyce McConnell

President Joyce McConnell: Want to start with a CSU Board of Governors update. Thanked Smith for service as the Board of Governors Representative, has been wonderful to serve together. Smith is thoughtful and a great advocate.

President McConnell: The Board of Governors was on campus last week. We began last Tuesday by having breakfast with first generation students, which was incredible. Was wonderful to hear from them. In the afternoon, we took a tour of the Global Food Innovation Center, which including a glimpse of the Temple Grandin statue. On Wednesday, the Board attended remarks in the Lory Student Center by U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack. Most important thing that Secretary Vilsack announced was a comprehensive set of federal investments to address challenges facing the country's agricultural producers. There is a [SOURCE story](#) about this announcement. We will be examining how we might be able to take advantage and align with that funding with our climate change work and agricultural.

President McConnell: Report to the Board included a presentation of the current budget, which we discussed at the last Faculty Council meeting. It included a 3% increase in the graduate student stipends, and the same increase for faculty and staff that had been announced on campus. When we first presented budget in September, we had a \$12 million deficit. We have shaved that down to \$5 million, which was due to our uptick in enrollment. We will provide some final numbers once we complete census, but are feeling optimistic.

President McConnell: Walter Scott, Jr. passed away recently at the age of 90. He was a 1953 civil engineering alumnus, and of course he named the Walter Scott Junior College of Engineering. He has a historical giving of \$64.2 million to the University and has impacted the lives of many of our students. There is a [SOURCE story](#) about him as well.

President McConnell: As part of our work on access for undergraduate students, we are also working on expanding access online. One of the places we found a stumbling block was in the transfer of credits from another undergraduate program. We have eliminated that in terms of eligibility. We will still need record of those credits but we won't need them for admission, which may be helpful to people.

President McConnell: In rankings, we are doing well. We are still among the 100 best public universities in the country. We were also named a top value university, and are in the top 100 best universities for veterans. Commented that we are also doing well on student debt, with only about 50% of our undergraduates graduating with student debt. The students who do have debt have been averaging about \$24,000 in debt.

President McConnell: Want to talk about our position in terms of sustainability. We have been number one in the country in sustainability for the last three years, with a platinum rating number two in the world. We have been honored for the 10th straight year as a tree campus higher education institution. That designation recognizes our protection and maintenance of the campus urban forest. We eliminate and prevent hazardous tree risks to public safety, and we maintain a sustainable campus forest with species diversity and best management practices. We have a lot to learn from our arborist, and thanked them for their work.

President McConnell: Vice President for Inclusive Excellence, Kauline Cipriani, has been working very hard on the Diversity Symposium. The Symposium is October 25th through October 29th. We also have some important days coming up. October 11th is Indigenous People's Day, and the Native American Cultural Center will be holding an event on the LSC Plaza. The student cultural centers have put together some amazing programs for heritage months, including Latinx Heritage Month, Pride Month, and Native American Heritage Month. Encouraged members to participate as they are able.

President McConnell: Reported that the Employee Climate Survey will be coming out on October 19th. The Office of Inclusive Excellence is asking for assistance from all the employee councils to encourage survey completion among all these groups. Stated that it has been tradition for the Chair of the Faculty Council to serve on the Executive Leadership Team. This will now include the chairs of the Administrative Professional Council and the Classified Personnel Council.

President McConnell: The Office of Engagement and Extension has been doing a lot of work, and provided an update to the Board of Governors on September 28th. The Colorado Water Center shared a case study from the [Watershed Assessment and Vulnerability Evaluation Program](#) (WAVE). That is our assistance to private land owners who have had losses to wildfire, and helping them recover and try to reduce the amount of erosion that they experience after fires. On September 28th and 29th, the Salazar Center for North American Conservation held their third annual international symposium.

President McConnell: Will end with a Courageous Strategic Transformation update. The membership of the drafting groups are on the website. Each group has worked on their goals and metrics for completion. We have done the VPSA strategic alignments for inclusive excellence and student success, and have launched a university-wide marketing campaign to kick off the branded house and have implemented a dual responder program. The dual responder program is a partnership between the CSU Police Department, our Health Network, and UCHealth to make sure that our teams include a mental health professional going out on all interventions.

President McConnell: As we develop Courageous Strategic Transformation, we want to hear from everyone. We are accepting proposals for academic initiatives, operational improvements, or anything else that may advance your mission. These [proposals](#) are due by October 31st, and all the criteria are outlined on the Courageous Strategic Transformation website.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell. Asked if there were any questions.

Chair Doe: Wondering if any thought has been put into doing more around trees with our first-year students. Taught on a campus where every student was required to adopt a tree, and they kept a journal on that tree for a year. The students learned to see and observe. Saw another thing on a campus where trees were marked with how much energy they were saving or how much water they were holding. It was a remarkable statement about the power of shade to cool and the importance of trees.

Fred Haberecht: In the past we have done an Arbor Day event and have placed those same attributes on trees along the Oval. Really like the idea of adopting a tree. We have also thought about social media campaigns of hugging the trees, which parallels what the National Arbor Day Foundation does.

President McConnell: Used to teach land use planning as a law professor. One of the earliest ordinances in the United States was in the colonies in the northeast, describing tree planting and the specific number of trees that needed to be planted in yards and along sidewalks. Recently in the New York Times, some climatologists published maps correlating a lack of shade and poverty. You can see impoverished areas without trees. At SPUR, we are looking at how our urban forestry programs can support communities and create additional shade by planting and taking care of trees in those neighborhoods.

President McConnell: Reminded members that the Rams Read is coming up, and the author of *The Color of Food* will be here on Friday, October 15th. The book is about the role of people of color and their relationship to food and agricultural production.

Doreene Hyatt: Suggest working with the Center for Mindfulness in connection with adopting trees. For freshman that come in with mental health issues, there is a connection to nature and the center likely has something that they could do to help.

President McConnell: Thanked Hyatt, great suggestion. There is something affirming about seeing our students sitting under the trees.

Chair Doe: There is an interesting connection between this conversation and the ASCSU health initiative we were going to hear today. They will be here next month, and had ideas about meaningful ways to connect with students on mental health. Thanked President McConnell.

G. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Provost Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: Our Homecoming events kick off on Wednesday and go through Saturday. There is a “Get Your Green On” event on the LSC Plaza at 4:00pm on Friday, October 8th and the 5K Homecoming race will be on Saturday, as well as the football game.

Provost Pedersen: We have a very strong first-year student class at 5,177, which includes our summer enrollment. This is up 500 from last fall, and still a bit below our peak, which was in Fall 2018. Our total resident instruction is 27,954, which is up from last fall. We have a 25%

racially and ethnically diverse class, with 23% first-generation and about 19% are Pell grant recipients.

Provost Pedersen: Spring registration will open on October 25th. We are planning more in-person sessions for students, and will still be offering a small number of hybrid and remote sessions. We have been very good about remaining vigilant under the pandemic and reducing the spread in our community. The vast majority of employees and students are complying with CSU public health mandates. The pandemic website is updated and has information with regards to compliance.

Provost Pedersen: We had a successful forum on the Academic Master Plan this past Friday, October 1st. We engaged about 145 people, including department heads, Deans, Associate Deans, and center and institute directors. Dr. Linda Nagel, professor and department head of the Department of Forest and Rangeland Stewardship in the Warner College of Natural Resources, is chairing the Master Plan Advisory Committee with 22 other faculty and staff from across campus. Dr. Linda Dalton is our planning consultant. Both Dr. Nagel and Dr. Dalton lead our discussions. Our state demographer, Elizabeth Garner, gave a keynote speaking on the impact of population shifts on the economy in Colorado. The next step is that department heads will take this information back to their departments and work with their faculty so they can engage in these conversations. The draft materials are due November 5th to each Dean's office, and then to the Provost's Office by November 19th. There is a website where all these materials are posted. Encouraged members to check the website for more information.

Provost Pedersen: We have two Dean searches underway, for the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, and the College of Natural Resources. We have put out requests for proposals to search firms and are receiving those back now. We will be announcing the chairs of our search committees soon and we will be soliciting nominations for search committee members to get broad engagement from the campus.

Provost Pedersen: Wanted to provide some accolades. Want to first thank the faculty for their continued dedication and persistence. Want to highlight the enrollment and access teams for their extraordinary efforts in the landscape of the pandemic. The Office of the Registrar successfully went through a rewrite of all Fall 2021 classes to support the return to in-person. The included support from across campus, including the Office of Financial Aid. We have an ongoing deployment of \$25 million in emergency grant funding for the 2021-2022 academic year under the Federal American Rescue Plan. These are all important efforts to support our students.

Moti Gorin: Have a question about the Pell grant numbers. It was mentioned that 19% of our incoming students qualify for Pell grants. Wondering if there is some way to determine family income distribution. Students can get up to \$60,000, which is a little bit below the median family income in the United States. Curious about how many of these students are \$55,000 a year families or \$25,000 a year families. Interested in how many are legitimately poor families, and how many are just under the median family income.

Provost Pedersen: Can find that out. We can categorize them so it is combined data and we are not looking at individual. Will follow up.

a. CCAF Task Force Recommendations – Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Vice Provost Susan James: Will be posting the slides presented to the Provost's website next week. Wanted to provide an update on the questions posed about administrative professional evaluations from the last meeting.

Vice Provost James: The Provost's Office is working closely with Human Resources and Information Technology to develop a new process for ensuring that every administrative professional employee on campus receives an evaluation every year. We will get the system built in the next month and then do a test run and will start communicating with campus and administrative professional supervisors about the new process. One of our goals is to get consistent evaluation forms and rating scales. This year we are asking that written annual reviews be turned in in the spring, with the plan next year being to have a more comprehensive approach to performance, including mid-year conversations.

Vice Provost James: In the longer term, Human Resources is working to hire a new performance program manager who will focus on the administrative professionals and state classified. They are also working on a new enterprise-wide Human Resources system. This will take a few years to implement.

Vice Provost James: Want to turn now to the recommendations from the Continuing, Contract, and Adjunct Faculty Task Force. In the town halls from the spring, many of the same questions and concerns were coming up. The task force have categorized their recommendations from low priority, higher priority, and urgent. We will work on timelines for these various priorities.

Vice Provost James: Will focus today on some of the more urgent priorities. As part of the Courageous Strategic Transformation process, we will be looking at a new concept for a budget model. The input of this task force to the Courageous Strategic Transformation process is that we hope to achieve better alignment of the college and department budgets with our institutional commitment to greater security for faculty while also acknowledging the need for flexibility and the fact that teaching faculty do depend on enrollment and student credit.

Vice Provost James: One of the urgent recommendations was to clarify adjunct, continuing, and contract appointments. Language went into the Manual in 2018, but many are still confused, so the language here is meant to provide some clarity. We also attempted to do our first initial audit of administrative professional employees who also happen to be teaching. We found at least 196 people in this category teaching hundreds of courses, so we will be continuing to focus on that.

Vice Provost James: Related to a budget model recommendation is the idea of doing a teaching service and workload audit. This is one of the reasons we have invited Adrianna Kezar to CSU. She will help us understand national budget models, and she will lead equity and workload sessions for chairs and members of CoGen so that we can use the tools that we have already.

Vice Provost James: We will set up a strategic communication plan around these issues so that you will hear more directly from the Provost's Office around these things and everyone will get regular updates. Happy to take questions.

Norton: Have had a request to place questions that were sent to the President's Office a month ago into the chat for the record. These questions are around annual evaluations for administrative professional employees:

- How many units have not been doing AP evaluations (*as mandated the Faculty Manual*)?
- In what colleges or equivalent entities?
- For how many years has these been happening?
- About the evaluated: If some people were being evaluated, but others not within a same unit... why the discrimination of those who did from those who didn't receive evaluations? And what is the commonality of the people in those categories when it comes to gender, status, etc?
- About the evaluators: What ranks/positions hold the people who were in charge of doing those evaluations?
- If these administrators didn't do evaluations, How did they base merit increases without them?
- How is it that their supervisors didn't raise any questions about the lack of documentation to base raise exercises?
- How is it that the Provost Office, who is charged with the evaluation of APs, did not make sure that the process were being enforced? Was Provost Rick Miranda aware of this situation? Was Vice President Lynn Johnson aware of this situation?
- How does your office intend to bring accountability about this enormously impacting issue (corrections/look back and confront the problem), rather than just looking ahead and promise a better outcome next time?

President McConnell: Wanted to emphasize that some of what Vice Provost James brought up in the presentation were solutions to be responsive to these questions. We are not ignoring the questions, we just had to dig deeper. Vice Provost James is working hard to bring that forward for the Faculty Council.

Norton: Expressed appreciation. Appreciate the work trying to come up with answers for complicated questions.

Van Buren: Had a question about the budget models. Asked what that might entail.

Vice Provost James: Our current budget model underlies a lot of the issues for our continuing, contract, and adjunct faculty, so we hope to consider looking at other models. The recommendation of a new budget model is beyond the expertise of the task force. We have an opportunity coming with Courageous Strategic Transformation in considerations around the budget model and we thought it was the right time to make a recommendation to consider how changes in the budget model could help. When Kezar comes, she will help us put some things into context and show us what other universities do.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, thanked Provost Pedersen, Vice Provost James, and President McConnell for being here today and sharing their insights with us.

H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: First item is the attention to the questions posed at the first Faculty Council meeting around administrative professional evaluations. Have the greatest confidence that Faculty Council and the Provost's Office can provide meaningful evidence that tangible progress is being made on the issue around administrative professional annual evaluations. Heartened by Vice Provost James' and Human Resources' attention to this matter. This has been reported on for many years. While the questions posed in the chat today seem to allude to a particular case, they are in fact broad, with a clear connection to the value and authority of the Manual and its provisions. If we keep our focus on this broader point, the questions are not so much about a particular case or past practices as about the value of the Manual and the valuing of faculty voice around the Manual and around concerns that are relevant to employees. Reminded members that both administrative professionals and faculty annual reviews are covered in the Manual. Thanked members of the Executive Committee for keeping this at the top of our attention.

Chair Doe: Second item is about Section C items on shared governance that were turned back. These were approved by Faculty Council meeting in May. We received a recommendation for language from the Office of General Counsel. This has been sent back to the Committee on Faculty Governance, who will review the recommendations that were initially recommended, as well as the suggestion proposed by the Office of General Counsel and the Provost's Office as a potential substitution. In the Colorado Statutes, the description of faculty is described as having the responsibility for making academic policy and governing the academic affairs of Colorado State University. One of the questions we need to ask is whether our definition of what responsibility means and what shared governance means are adequately supplied in the Manual. The Committee on Faculty Governance will give this more consideration.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Smith: Will have a written report provided next month. Was unable to have it included this time due to time constraints between the Board of Governors meeting and when the agenda needed to go out. Also wanted to thank President McConnell for the kind words and for the support of Faculty Council in this position.

Smith: Have a few updates from the Board of Governors meeting. The state budget is looking very positive, and that bodes well for hopefully good investment in higher education in the fiscal year 2023. Reiterated that there was a 3% increase in state classified and graduate student salaries. This is great and will continue to acknowledge the work that graduate students do and the need for higher compensation. The faculty and administrative professionals are getting an increase in salary equivalent to 1.5% in fiscal year 2023, which is the second half of the 3% increase that will begin on January 20, 2022. There was also recognition that the administrative

professional salaries are under market and there are a number of vacancies that need to be filled, so steps are being taken to address this.

Smith: During the Chancellor's report, Dr. Sandy Baum from the Urban Institute gave a great presentation on student debt. Will have a few key highlights on this in the written report for next month.

Smith: We also received the Ag report given by Dean James Pritchett. There were two initiatives presented. One of them is a new infrastructure between CSU and the USDA, which they are calling Ag Cares. This could support research in agricultural resiliency in climate change.

I. DISCUSSION

1. Vision Zero Task Force – Fred Haberecht, Facilities Management; Aaron Fodge, Parking and Transportation Services; Erika Benti, Parking and Transportation Services

Erika Benti: Thanked Faculty Council for having the group. The President's Vision Zero Task Force is charged with the examination of mobility and safety of all modes of transportation on the CSU campuses. We initially convened after the fatality of a student pedestrian on campus in August of 2019. We made some initial recommendations and then our name evolved to the Vision Zero, in reference to an international movement to end traffic fatalities and serious injuries.

Aaron Fodge: Thanked the Faculty Council for their service to campus. Our task force created five subcommittees, who created charging statements to deliver the milestones as shown in the packet. They have created action plans and requested budgets to uphold this Vision Zero effort.

Fodge: This task force is also interdisciplinary, with membership from across campus along with the City of Fort Collins. It is common for us to work with the City of Fort Collins on campaigns and planning initiatives. We are also part of a larger stakeholder engagement effort. We have visited many entities across campus, including the Executive Committee of Faculty Council. We wanted to be as inclusive as possible through the planning process.

Fodge: The next steps are that we are advancing a memorandum through Marc Barker and a resolution that has been reviewed to adopt Vision Zero at the University. Provided some language for Faculty Council to consider in support of this task force.

Chair Doe: Thanked the group for being here and the steadfast work on making our campuses a safer place. Can tell there is a lot of work involved. A question that comes to mind is how much will this cost.

Fodge: Like many things in higher education, it is iterative. With educational programs, we might be looking at \$10,000 to \$30,000, whereas streetscape or intersection improvement will be in the millions of dollars. Our task is to come up with a fair and transparent process to propose

safety projects to the University, to try to have as many voices as possible to determine what the safest improvement is that we can make.

Chair Doe: Thanked Fodge. Asked about the sidewalk improvements, feels much safer on the sidewalks when intersecting with cyclists.

Fodge: There are many dedicated folks on the campus that have spent a large amount of time during the pandemic to improve sidewalks and trails. There are some extensions of separated trails and widened trails on campus. We had been awarded three grants during the pandemic to focus on safety, so those were the projects across campus.

President McConnell: Wanted to take this opportunity to thank Fred Haberecht, Benti, Fodge, and the task force for all their work. They were charged early in Presidency, after the fatality. The loss of life was horrific, and the team has stuck with their charge.

Van Leeuwen: Asked if the Foothills campus was also part of this plan.

Fred Haberecht: Confirmed that the Foothills campus is part of this plan. There has been extensive outreach, and the Foothills campus has been one of the top topics for access and safety.

Jim Ippolito: Asked in the chat: How do we bring up on-campus safety issues that we have seen over time to this committee?

Fodge: Responded to Ippolito's question from the chat. In the interim, before we adopt Vision Zero, encouraged members to contact the group here, or use Facilities Dispatch. Known issues can be submitted on their website. One of the subcommittees is working toward an assessment process where we have some sort of engagement tool. Considering an app, where anyone on campus can easily report a known issue or safety concern to us for evaluation and then potentially be prioritized for future funding.

Chair Doe: Asked: What will this look like after Vision Zero is adopted, if it is?

Fodge: We have a proposal for these five subcommittees that will then go into action. There are some committees that will advance forward. One of them is assessment, where we will evaluate known issues on campus using our safety data that we collect. We will then have a prioritization process in place so we can bring potential improvements forward. We will also have a crash evaluation group that we will be dispatched to crash sites and will decide of whether there is something we can do better from an education, enforcement, or infrastructure standpoint. Vision Zero would provide us an umbrella to enact and move forward different initiatives supported by the University and administration.

Chair Doe: Thanked Fodge. Asked if there were any other questions from the body. There is some indication in the chat about students being stopped and keeping people safe.

Fodge: We do have a campaign that Benti leads, where we stand at stop signs and dismount zones and have some friendly encouragement for people to dismount or stop. We have also had our officers out there to ensure people are following the rules of the road.

Benti: Students, if they stop, may even win \$5 in Ramcash, so we do reward them.

Chair Doe: Thanked the group. We will look at this language for the recommendation of support and will report back to the group. It looks like this has strong endorsement from the University community. We look forward to talking more about this. Expressed appreciation for the presentation and bringing this information to Faculty Council. Thanked them for all their efforts and attention to safety.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions or comments for the Vision Zero group, requested a motion to adjourn.

Norton: Moved.

Smith: Second.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

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

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING
2021-2022

Chair: Sue Doe **Vice-Chair: Andrew Norton**
Executive Assistant: Amy Barkley **BOG Representative: Melinda Smith**
Professional Registered Parliamentarian: Lola Fehr

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2022
Jennifer Martin	Animal Sciences	2024
Jane Stewart	Agricultural Biology	2024
Kelly Curl	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2022
Jim Ippolito	Soil and Crop Sciences	2023
Steve Fonte	College-at-Large	2023

(substituting for Marco Costanigro, on sabbatical 2021-2022)		
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2022
Andrew Norton	College-at-Large	2023
Health and Human Sciences		
Ruoh-Nan (Terry) Yan	Design and Merchandising	2024
Raoul Reiser	Health and Exercise Science	2022
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2022
Lisa Daunhauer	Human Development and Family Studies	2023
Bolivar Senior	Construction Management	2023
Jennifer Weaver (Fall 2021)	Occupational Therapy	2023
(substituting for Aaron Eakman, on sabbatical Fall '21)		
Sharon Anderson	School of Education	2024
Elizabeth Kiehne	School of Social Work	2022
(substituting for Shannon Hughes)		
Karen Barrett	College-at-Large	2024
Business		
Bill Rankin	Accounting	2023
<u>Stephen Hayne</u>	Computer Information Systems	2024
John Elder	Finance and Real Estate	2022
Rob Mitchell	Management	2024
Jonathan Zhang	Marketing	2023
Engineering		
Peter Jan van Leeuwen	Atmospheric Science	2024
Margarita Herrera-Alonso	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2022
<u>Hussam Mahmoud</u>	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2024
Ali Pezeshki	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2022
Kirk McGilvray	Mechanical Engineering	2023
Thomas Bradley	Systems Engineering	2023
Sybil Sharvelle	College-at-Large	2023
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2022
J. Rockey Luo	College-at-Large	2022
Liberal Arts		
Mary Van Buren	Anthropology & Geography	2023
Jason Bernagozzi	Art	2022
Martin Carcasson	Communication Studies	2022
(substituting for Ziyu Long)		
Anders Fremstad	Economics	2024
<u>Tony Becker</u>	English	2023
Albert Bimper	Ethnic Studies	2022
Maria Del Mar Lopez-Cabrales	Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	2022
Jared Orsi	History	2023
Michael Humphrey	Journalism and Technical Communication	2023

Wes Kenney	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2023
Moti Gorin	Philosophy	2022
Marni Berg	Political Science	2024
Tara Opsal	Sociology	2022
Ajean Ryan	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Antonio Pedros-Gascon</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Emily Morgan</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2023
Lisa Langstraat	College-at-Large	2024
Allison Goar	College-at-Large	2024
Abigail Shupe	College-at-Large	2024
John Carlo Pierce	College-at-Large	2024
Natural Resources		
Randall Boone	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2023
Chad Hoffman	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2024
Yoichiro Kanno	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2024
William Sanford	Geosciences	2023
Alan Bright	Human Dimensions of Natural Resources	2023
Natural Sciences		
Olve Peersen	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	2022
Mike Antolin	Biology	2021
Rob Paton	Chemistry	2023
Ross McConnell	Computer Science	2022
Emily Hardegree-Ullman	Physics	2024
<u>Silvia Canetto</u> (excused) (on sabbatical Fall 2021)	Psychology	2022
Ann Hess (substituting for Mary Meyer, on sabbatical 2021-2022)	Statistics	2022
<u>Yongcheng Zhou</u>	Mathematics	2023
<u>Alan Van Orden</u>	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Anton Betten</u>	College-at-Large	2022
Brad Conner	College-at-Large	2022
James Liu	College-at-Large	2023
Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences		
DN Rao Veeramachaneni	Biomedical Sciences	2022
<u>Kevin Haussler</u>	Clinical Sciences	2022
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2023
Traci Kinkel (substituting for Tony Schountz)	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
Candace Mathiason	College-at-Large	2022
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2023
Doreene Hyatt	College-at-Large	2022
Seonil Kim	College-at-Large	2022

(substituting for Christianne Magee)

Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2023
<u>John Rosecrance</u>	College-at-Large	2023
Sheryl Magzaman	College-at-Large	2023

University Libraries

Linda Meyer	Libraries	2022
--------------------	-----------	------

Ex Officio Voting Members

Sue Doe	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2022
Andrew Norton	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2022
Melinda Smith	BOG Faculty Representative	2022
Steven Reising , Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2022
<u>Shane Kanatous</u> , Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2022
<u>Jerry Magloughlin</u> , Chair	Committee on Libraries	2022
Jenny Morse , Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Marie Legare , Chair	Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty	2022
Melinda Smith , Chair	Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education	2022
Karen Barrett , Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2022
James Graham , Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2022
<u>Shawn Archibeque</u> , Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2022
<u>Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia</u> , Interim Chair	Committee on University Programs	2022
Brad Goetz , Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2022
<u>Susan (Suellen) Melzer</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
Christine Pawliuk	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
<u>Ashley Harvey</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
<u>Jamie Neilson</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
TBD	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Leslie Stone-Roy	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Mary Van Buren	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
Joseph DiVerdi	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Steve Benoit	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Sean Bryan	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Pinar Omur-Ozbek	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023

Ex Officio Non-Voting Members

Joyce McConnell	President
Ann Claycomb	Chief of Staff
Mary Pedersen	Provost/Executive Vice President
Blake Naughton	Vice President for Engagement & Extension
Leslie Taylor	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
Diana Prieto	Vice President for Equity, Equal Opportunity & Title IX
Susan James	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Kauline Cipriani

Brandon Bernier

Alan Rudolph

Jenelle Beavers

Blanche M. Hughes

Kelly Long

Kim Tobin

Yolanda Bevill

Lynn Johnson

James Pritchett

Beth Walker

David McLean

Lise Youngblade

Mary Stromberger

Ben Withers

Karen Estlund

Jan Nerger

Mark Stetter

John Hayes

Sarah Olson

Vice President for Inclusive Excellence

Vice President for Information Technology

Vice President for Research

Vice President for Strategy

Vice President for Student Affairs

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs

Vice President for University Advancement

Vice President for University Communications

Vice President for University Operations

Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences

Dean, College of Business

Dean, College of Engineering

Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences

Dean, Graduate School

Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Dean, Libraries

Dean, College of Natural Sciences

Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources

Chair, Administrative Professional Council