

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

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

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
November 2, 2021 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Chair Doe: Reminded members of Microsoft Teams and meeting protocols. Requested that videos and microphones be turned off when not speaking. We will follow the “one person, one comment/question” rule. Asked that members use the “raise hand” feature when they wish to speak or place it in the chat. Reminded members that the meeting is recorded strictly for minutes accuracy and that the meeting is public.

Chair Doe: Requested that one of the discussion items be moved to the action items section, as it was inadvertently placed as a discussion item. If there is no objection, would like to move that agenda item regarding the resolution.

Chair Doe: Hearing no objections, resolution discussion item moved to action items.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – November 2, 2021

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – December 7, 2021 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm
- b. Employee Climate Survey

Chair Doe: The deadline for the Employee Climate Survey is November 19th. It is important that faculty and other employees participate so we can get as full a representation of employee needs as possible. The original email received has the link that you should use, as it is tied to each individual email. A forwarded copy of the survey will not work. Requested members get in contact if having trouble accessing the survey. Thanked members for participating in the survey.

- c. Adrianna Kezar Visit – November 8 & 9, 2021

Chair Doe: Reminded members that Adrianna Kezar will be visiting campus on November 8th and 9th. Kezar is a professor of education at the University of Southern California and is the founding director of the Delphi Project on the changing faculty and student success. Her visit is being sponsored by the Faculty Council and the Provost’s Office. The objective of the visit is to

engage in meaningful futures regarding the integration of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty across our campus. Professor Kezar's open forum will be on Monday, November 8th at 4:00 p.m. in Ballroom D of the Lory Student Center. Expressed hope that members will be able to attend. There will be a social afterward where you can speak with Kezar directly and talk with colleagues. Kezar will be meeting with several different groups while on campus.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

a. Faculty Council Meeting – October 5, 2021

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any changes to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from October 5th.

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – September 24, October 1, 8 & 15, 2021

Chair Doe: We have University Curriculum Committee minutes from September 24th, October 1st, October 8th, and October 15th. Asked if there were any items to be pulled for further discussion or consideration.

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

E. ACTION ITEMS

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

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

Chair Doe: Asked for any discussions about the candidates, Franck Dayan and Thomas Conway.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Asked in the chat how nominees are identified.

Reising: We send a call for nominations to the faculty of the College. These nominations are also open to contract, continuing, and adjunct faculty. If there are multiple nominations, an election is held, and the final nominee is reflected on the ballot brought forward.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, stated there was a motion on the floor and requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved for faculty representatives to Faculty Council standing committees.

2. Election – Graduate Student Representatives to Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the graduate student nominees for Faculty Council standing committees as shown in the agenda packet.

Chair Doe: Asked if Reising could explain how the graduate students are identified.

Reising: In the Manual, it states that the Graduate Student Association brings forward nominees for standing committees. Undergraduate representatives are brought forward by the Associated Students of CSU.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising. Asked if there were additional questions. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved for graduate student representatives to Faculty Council standing committees.

3. Proposed Revisions to Section E.15 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 moves that Faculty Council approve the Section E.15 revisions as shown in the agenda packet. These revisions are basically cleaning up the section. Since we passed revisions for Section D.4 at our last Faculty Council meeting, which had to do with Letters of Reprimand, we have taken that section out of here, which explains some of the cross-outs. There are other changes about email being a standard means of communication, having something recorded rather than a written transcript, and a few changes regarding the review committee and hearing committee and combining those into a single committee. Many colleges and departments across campus do not have enough faculty to have two committees. Stated that Richard Eykholt is also here since much of this has to do with oversight of the University Grievance Officer.

Chair Doe: We have a motion on the floor. Reminded members that no second is needed since this is coming from a standing committee. Asked if there was any discussion.

Ross McConnell: It seems that these revisions are sweeping and may have potentially far-reaching consequences for faculty rights and protections, including against revocation of tenure and access to the grievance process. Do not see this as a clean-up, and feels the brief rationales provided are not adequate for fully understanding the reasons for these changes or their consequences. Would move that these be sent back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty for more thorough explanation so we can have an informed vote.

Pedros-Gascon: Seconded R. McConnell's motion.

Chair Doe: To clarify, the motion is for this to be sent back to the committee.

R. McConnell: Confirmed. Thinks that the changes are not clean-up, and they have significant consequences for phase one and phase two. The fact that the two committees are being rolled into one committee could result in revoked tenure. We need a second set of eyes on the issue.

Legare: Feels sending this back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty would be premature without a discussion in front of Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Requested clarification from parliamentarian, Lola Fehr, on how to proceed.

Parliamentarian Lola Fehr: The motion to refer to the committee is debatable. It can be discussed and then the motion taken, and then a vote on the motion. Should the vote fail, you would go back to the original motion.

Chair Doe: Thanked Parliamentarian Fehr. Asked if there was further discussion on the motion to return this to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty.

Moti Gorin: Expressed agreement with R. McConnell. One of the changes that stood out was the change of two committees to one committee. The rationale that enough members can be hard to find is understandable, but we are talking about the committee that has the least significant power up to and including removing tenure. These are major decisions. Favor having two separate committees. If there is overlap on these committees, feels that is fine, but having only one committee make such a significant decision is a substantive change as opposed to stylistic clean-up. Expressed support for the motion to send this back to the committee.

Pedros-Gascon: Believe that colleges can populate the second phase easily. Expressed concern of convoluting or making the same committee do both, feels this takes out a layer of protections. Would like to also address the issue of a recording having the same judiciary power as a transcript. Believe that recordings don't have same thrust as a written record.

Richard Eykholt: Will address a couple of these, starting with Pedros-Gascon. Have been told by legal counsel that recordings are preferred to written transcripts, because written transcripts are made from the recording and can include errors while typing things up. The recording is what happened, and therefore has no errors.

Eykholt: Want to also discuss the comment about the two committees. Faculty that have been involved in the Section E.15 process have been the ones objecting to two committees. For hearings about performance of professional duties, you want to be judged by fellow faculty members in the same department. You put a committee together who sees all the evidence and decides if there should be a hearing. Then a second committee is put together, which cannot overlap with the first committee for legal reasons, and that committee decides if they want to recommend discipline. Neither committee has the power to enact discipline, it is all recommendation. Many of our departments do not have enough people for both these

committees. We do populate the committees in the college from members outside the department, but people outside your discipline don't have the expertise to make judgements about whether you are performing adequately in your discipline. Commented that the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty did discuss this in detail before sending this motion forward.

R. McConnell: Pointed out that some of the disciplinary actions that are being talked about, such as bullying, don't have to do with dereliction of duty. There needs to be checks and balances on this kind of accusation, and there is no reason somebody from outside the department can't participate and provide that second set of eyes. That is what some of these changes take away. We cannot dismiss this as simple clean-up and not look at the potential consequences.

Eykholt: Stated that this is incorrect. This does not apply to bullying. This change only applies to discipline for lack of performance of duties. Bullying would be disciplined under Section E.15.2, not E.15.1, and no changes have been made there. The only changes have been made in Section E.15.1, when you want people within your own department deciding whether your performance is adequate for your field.

Pedros-Gascon: Technically, a lack of performance would be the reason for advancing any case and is something that needs to be well-documented. If the case is strong, it doesn't matter if it's internal or external. It won't matter if it is within discipline or outside a discipline, people will understand if a lack of performance is happening. The second phase is an extra level of protection. If the case is understandable from outside of the discipline, it's a strong and clear case. If not, then it is likely a subjective situation which is unable to be transmitted outside the discipline. If that is the case, it indicates that there is an issue with advancing this where we are allowing more subjective approaches to advancing disciplinary actions. Expressed concern for removing the second phase. Feels it can be revised rather than removed, and still have this second level of protection while making sure it is more equitable and representative.

Legare: Think the concern is having enough faculty members to populate these two committees.

Eykholt: Did not suggest any of these changes until completing a few Section E.15 cases. It was the faculty in these cases that wanted to see these changes. They felt that people in their own department should have decided on the recommendation for discipline, not those outside of the department who do not understand the standards in their field.

Vice Provost Susan James: Expressed opinion: Think the reason for making these changes is not about the practicality of being able to populate the committees. Want to think about the role these committees play, and whether both are needed and if there is a practical issue about being able to populate the committee in a small department, we can do what we do for tenure committees and borrow faculty from other departments. Emphasized that this was simply an opinion and suggestion.

Brad Conner: Requested a point of clarification. Believe that R. McConnell's motion was to have this referred back to the committee for better explanation, but it seems most of this discussion has been substantive around this motion. Question for Legare and Eykholt is if it is accurate to

say that the changes being proposed are clean-up language or are we recommending changes to procedure. Feels this point has not been made clear. Seems like there is some agreement around this being a change of procedure by going from two committees to one.

Eykholt: Would not say this is clean-up language. Changing from two committees to one is a change in process, as is moving from a transcript to a recording and using email instead of standard mail. Would agree that the changes are a change in process. Argument is that this should be sent back to committee for better explanation, but feels the explanation is clear. The question is whether we like what is being proposed or not. Reiterated that the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty discussed these things in detail and unanimously approved this. Main question is whether we want these changes approved or not.

Mike Antolin: Point of clarification for language under Section E.15.5., where it says “after the completion of the hearing, the hearing committee shall retire for private discussion and review. These deliberations shall remain confidential for the extent permitted by law. If there are two competing hearing committees, they should have separate deliberations and make separate recommendations.” Asked: What two committees are being referred to here? Asked if this was language that was not cleaned up.

Eykholt: Stated this has nothing to do with the two committees mentioned by R. McConnell and Pedros-Gascon. There are two types of disciplinary action in Section E.15.4. One is for performance of duties, the other is for behavior. For performance of duties, the idea is that there is a hearing committee within your department that understands the expectations of your discipline. Through behavior, the committee is chosen differently from the grievance panel and does not allow for anybody within your department. There is not a change being recommended for the behavior process. The change being recommended is for the performance of duties process so we can make sure people who understand your discipline are judging your performance of duties.

Gorin: Hearing more about the constraints of how the committee works, starting to have a better understanding of the rationale for these changes. Earlier, Eykholt mentioned that the reason we cannot have overlap is that the first committee would be within the department and then bringing in outside people for the second committee with a fresh perspective. It was mentioned that overlap can't happen for legal reasons. Wondering if this is due to CSU legal counsel or other legal reasons, and if this is within our control.

Eykholt: This is not within our control. The issue is, if somebody sues us after this is all over, we want to think like a jury on a jury trial. The hearing committee needs to show up unbiased. You can't take someone who has been on a committee already and pretend you are starting from scratch. Since the same process basically happens in both committees, it doesn't make much sense to have two committees.

Chair Doe: Thanked Gorin and Eykholt. Believe we have exhausted the questions and we have a motion on the floor. The motion is to refer this back to committee, and we need to vote on that first. Once we do that, we can return to the original motion.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if we can make a friendly amendment to have the committee reassess the viability of the phase two with a different set of requirements. Highly concerned about idea of having a single group of people deciding everything. That could result in a subjective outcome.

Antolin: Believe the question has been called and we are voting on the motion.

Chair Doe: We have called the question. Stated that Pedros-Gascon's comments are recorded and can be integrated as feedback to the committee if this motion is approved. Requested members vote in the chat using the Microsoft Forms poll.

Gorin: Commented in the chat that the motion is consistent with Pedros-Gascon's statement.

Motion to send back to Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty failed.

Chair Doe: Noted that the vote was not unanimous, there is clear division. This may be important for the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty to note. We will now go back to the original motion, which has to do with the proposed revisions to Section E.15.

Asked: Is there more discussion to be had on the central motion?

Doreene Hyatt: Would like some clarification. At the top of the section, for dereliction of duties, none of that is discipline-linked. Asked if this was about doing what you are supposed to be doing, or teaching your class well, or teaching the class you were told to teach.

Legare: Asked if Hyatt was referring to the substantial neglect of assigned duties.

Hyatt: Confirmed. Asked what would happen if a department head requested you teach a class and you said no. Feels this would be an obvious example of not doing my job.

Eykholt: Substantial neglect of duties is somewhat department specific. Different departments will have different expectations.

Pedros-Gascon: Have an ethical and moral problem with elective duties being identified as underperformance that may be due to any number of reasons. Feels that a more unbiased group of people should be making these decisions.

Antolin: From the document, it looks like what the hearing committee is being asked to do in this case is to conduct a phase two review, which means a phase one review will have already been conducted. Asked: This means a record of lack of performance that meets the norms of this field has already been created, correct?

Eykholt: A phase one review is the five-year review we all do. If a five-year review is deficient, that triggers phase two review. It is also the case that a department head or chair can trigger the phase two review without phase one review if they feel the deficiencies are significant enough.

Antolin: Just trying to walk through the process. Asked what the possibilities are here. The other thing that is pointed out here is if path is started, the Provost can veto any decisions.

Eykholt: That is one of the unfortunate consequences of Section E.15 as it is currently written. The Provost and the President can override anything. Reminded members that these hearing processes are simply recommendations.

Antolin: What we are hearing is that this is a level of protection for a dispute to rise to a certain level. Then it must be reviewed by faculty and then eventually the President and the Provost. One of the things we are hearing here is there is a fear of a lack of protection for individuals.

Eykholt: Reminded members again that the committees are simply there to recommend. To go back to the concerns of R. McConnell and Pedros-Gascon, they want to have two separate committees. If one finds you are deserving of discipline and the other says no, reminded members that the no is just a recommendation. The President and Provost can still enact whatever discipline they want to enact, which is dictated by the Board of Governors. With the phase two review, if problems are discovered, the problems are looked at and it is determined whether a performance plan should be put together or if discipline is warranted. If discipline is warranted, a second hearing starts and decides what the discipline should be. New language is suggesting that we see what discipline they think is warranted and have them make the recommendation rather than going through the whole thing again with a committee that might be from outside of the department. Reminded members that this is all based on feedback given from people who have gone through the process.

R. McConnell: It is not true that the President has total authority. The idea of tenure is that university administrations don't have unilateral authority to fire tenured faculty members. This does not mean they can't be fired; it just means the determination must be made by committee. Feels this is weakening those protections.

Eykholt: That is not true. You must have an internal process, which we do. That internal process is to make a recommendation, and then the President can make whatever decision they want. Referred to Ward Churchill case in Boulder.

R. McConnell: This will bring national attention to the University and put it on AAUP censure list.

Eykholt: That may happen, but it is correct that the President can make whatever decision they see fit once the process is complete.

Pedros-Gascon: Would rather have a second committee that makes the decision rather than people from the same department who punish. Feels this is a perverse situation and would rather see a second committee, even if they need to hear the situation from the start. Would rather not have faculty being the ones punishing their own colleagues and create a toxic and unhealthy academic environment.

Andrew Norton: Seeing this from a different perspective. Not necessarily seeing this committee as punishing, but perhaps defending the faculty member. Would likely rather have one committee from within department, rather than one committee that is only making decision of

whether it is worth having another committee. Sympathetic to argument that a single committee is better and would rather have that committee be in my department.

Hyatt: Asked in the chat if this would require a change to departmental manuals as well. Most departmental manuals state the current policies and point to the Faculty Manual.

Karen Barrett: Commented in the chat that the department head has ultimate power in the department, so members of the department may feel unable to oppose department head's view.

Eykholt: Want to mention that the points being brought up by Pedros-Gascon and R. McConnell are valid. Believe that there is an assumption being made that if there are two committees and one says yes and the other says no, that the no wins. Suspect that if the administration goes forward with the Section E.15 process, they may look at the yes as a good way to go forward.

Hyatt: Another concern would be allowing favored faculty to not be disciplined when they should be. Having a single committee made up of departmental colleagues could make it biased towards the person.

Jason Bernagozzi: Have a similar concern to Hyatt's. Have concerns about what will happen within smaller departments. Not saying there may be a conspiracy against a candidate, but the second committee can make sure that the checks and balances are there.

Lisa Langstraat: Stated agreement with Bernagozzi. Very concerned as we are looking at nationwide changes in administrative power at universities and the post-COVID squelching of faculty voices. The way in which there is a single process of vetting complaints against a faculty member can be problematic. In small departments, it seems wise to have at least one external member of the committee. May be the case for larger departments as well. Think it is important to diversify who is looking at cases to reduce the possibility of group thinking.

Eykholt: Some of these changes that are causing concern can be discussed but wanted members to keep in mind that they will go against AAUP recommendations. AAUP recommendations are that these be done within departments by faculty who are knowledgeable. We could say we do not agree with these recommendations. It is not something we have discussed.

Vice Provost James: That is an interesting observation. Glad we are having this discussion, as we often don't think about this part of the Manual. When it comes to giving tenure, the department committee is by far the most important voice. It doesn't mean the President can't ultimately overturn tenure, but if any administrator above the department committee wants to disagree with a vote of a tenure committee, there needs to be a compelling reason. Personal point of view is that it makes sense for it to be a department committee at the other end as well, which sounds like what the AAUP recommends.

R. McConnell: Requested clarification on the AAUP recommendations mentioned by Eykholt. Understand that they recommend tenure decisions be made within the academic unit, but unaware of anything the AAUP has to say about disciplinary actions being conducted within the academic unit.

Eykholt: Unable to quote the document. Was on the committee at the time and informed of this by Stephen Mumme, who was the head of the AAUP unit here at the time. Not an expert on AAUP documents, so unsure where this is stated.

Anders Fremstad: Commented in the chat that members are welcome at Avo's this coming Thursday for an AAUP session. They also happen on the first Thursday of every month.

Bernagozzi: Expressed concern in the chat that making decisions for the sake of efficiency leads to the increasing corporatization of the University.

Antolin: Asked in the chat: Can we call the question?

Chair Doe: Antolin has called the question, which means all discussion now needs to move toward a vote on the motion on the floor.

Parliamentarian Fehr: Stated that a vote will need to be taken on the motion to call the question, which requires a second and then a 2/3 vote.

Antolin: Repeated motion in the chat to call the question.

Conner: Seconded Antolin's motion to call the question.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved in favor of calling the question.

Chair Doe: With approval of calling the question, we return to the main motion. Requested a vote on that motion in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion to approve proposed revisions to Section E.15 failed.

Chair Doe: Thanked the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty for all their work. There is a lot of food for thought here. Expressed appreciation for the discussion. Asked if there were any final comments.

Legare: Thanked Faculty Council for the feedback. The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty will re-address the question.

4. Motion on Extending the Completion for the AUCC 3E to 1C Curriculum Transition – Executive Committee to the Faculty Council

Chair Doe: We have a motion on extending the completion for the AUCC 3E to 1C curriculum transition. Stated that this motion is coming from the Executive Committee. This motion, as explained in the rationale, is strictly for the purpose of providing more time for 1C to be completed. This does not forestall departments/units that wish to move ahead and go through

curricular processes from doing so. This is to give more time for this curricular change to take place. In May 2020, Faculty Council approved the shift from 3E to 1C. The pandemic disrupted everything, including the ability to adequately address this curricular change.

Chair Doe: The Executive Committee is aware of the need of considerable faculty involvement in the planning and execution of this initiative. An ad hoc faculty committee is being formed as we speak, and they will address this curricular move. The question here is not debating the merits of 1C or the creation of 1C. This motion is simply asking for more time. The request is for a completion in Fall 2024 or Spring 2025, while acknowledging the progress that has been made. There are pilot courses underway, with a lot of learning happening through these pilots.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any questions or discussions about extending the deadline. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved to extend deadline for completion of AUCC 3E to 1C curricular move.

5. Resolution Regarding Graduate Student Compensation and Fees
– Melinda Smith, Sybil Sharvelle, Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Moti Gorin, & Ramaa Vasudevan

Melinda Smith: On behalf of the Faculty Council Executive Committee, move to approve the resolution regarding graduate student compensation and fees as seen in the agenda packet.

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

Kelly Konrad: First year composition GTA. Wanted to share a bit about experiences. Moved here from Charlotte, North Carolina. Moving costs are expensive, and GTA stipend only really covers rent and utilities. Current rent and utilities total \$1400 a month, leaving only \$200 for everything else. This is not enough and given that a GTA contract requires that you are a full-time student and many hours are spent working as a GTA, there is little time leftover to get another job to help make ends meet.

Danielle Parker: Thanked Faculty Council for bringing this motion to the floor. First-year GTA and first-generation student. Do not have support other than what is being made as a GTA, so have had to find time to take on other part-time work through the University to make ends meet. Realistically can only cover rent and utilities with the GTA stipend and not much else. Considering the workload that GTAs put into their teaching assistantship and preparing materials for students, more compensation would be very helpful.

Pedros-Gascon: Spoke in support for this document that is being advanced. This will help people understand the poor salaries being offered to GTAs and how this is having an enormous impact on our competitiveness in the market. Stated that as a previous international student, was unable to take a second job outside of the institution. We had an exclusive agreement with the state. Expressed hope that everyone understands how precarious the situation is for everybody at all levels of the institution. Feels this is an area that needs to be addressed immediately.

Debora Nunes: Secretary of the Graduate Workers Organizing Cooperative. We have been discussing this issue for a long time. Expressed appreciation for it being discussed here at Faculty Council. Thanked the graduate students for sharing their stories. Have been collecting testimonies for some time. This is only a first step towards improving our lives here at the University, and a very important one. Placed information about the [Graduate Workers Organizing Cooperative](#) in the chat, as well as their email: colostate.gradworkers@gmail.com.

Antolin: Spoke in favor of this. Wanted to provide some historical perspective from data being collected from department relative to peer institutions. From information from peer institutions, the best we were ever able to do for GTA compensation was to be in the middle of the pack of the eleven universities. It was a financial strain for us to stay there and believe we have fallen behind from even that. Fees have increased dramatically as well. There have been some improvements over time, such as more affordable healthcare for graduate students. However, believe we have gotten to the point that we are not able to attract top-level graduate students.

Siwook Hwang: Also a member of the Graduate Workers Organizing Cooperative. In the past few months, have had the pleasure of speaking with other graduate students about the fees and have taken on the role of talking about graduate student finances to incoming students. One thing that stood out was that many people are not aware of the financial situation coming in and it was not made clear. Then they are here, and they are then faced with the reality of getting underpaid and paying a lot of fees. This [resolution] helps students already in the program, as well as providing financial information for prospective students in a more honest manner.

Fremstad: Work with a bunch of graduate students who help teach courses to hundreds of undergraduates every year. Feels it is important to compensate people appropriately for the work they do and helping provide education to undergraduates.

Shawn Archibeque: Spoke in strong support of this. Did have a question about some of the language as it is written. It states that CSU will increase the minimum stipend nine-month effective income to that of our aspirational peer institutions, adjusted for cost of living. Asked: At what level is that cost of living being brought in and is it appropriate for this area? Asked: What peer institutions are we adjusting to? Feels this should be more clearly defined in the language of this motion.

Smith: We wanted to avoid putting any hard numbers into this resolution, because we don't want to lowball it or set an upper limit. That was our rationale for not necessarily putting in a particular value or number. In the compensation proposal put forward by Dean Mary Stromberger, our aspirational peers are defined there, and these are referred to throughout the University. Referring to that proposal will help clarify who those aspirational peers are.

Pedros-Gascon: We were trying to avoid the situation in which by using numbers, we may end up stuck only discussing the numbers. We used the documents provided by the Graduate School and it is referred to here. With past resolutions, the use of data has been cherry-picked as a way of complicating the movement forward. For that reason, we decided to go with the four principles but with clear expectations about peer institutions.

Bernagozzi: Expressed support of everything students are trying to do. Expressed concern with the University not having more specific language. Feels this may work better in our favor.

Sybil Sharvelle: Will echo what Pedros-Gascon and Smith have said with respect to inclusion of data. It could come under a lot of scrutiny. Wanted to clarify that the cost-of-living adjustments that are referenced are referencing the City of Fort Collins. We were thinking of our peer institutions, but also considering the ever-increasing cost of living here.

Smith: We do this with faculty hires, to account for the cost of living, so it is appropriate that we do this with graduate student stipends as well.

Antolin: Commented in the chat that cost-of-living is based on the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics. This was discussed by Executive Committee as a possible data point to work with.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for the conversation. We do have a motion on the floor to approve the resolution that would then become a resolution of Faculty Council. Seeing no further discussion, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved. Resolution will be posted to the Faculty Council website and sent forward.

Smith: Thanked the graduate students for coming to the meeting and presenting their perspectives. Thanked the representatives from the Graduate Workers Organizing Cooperative for being here as well.

F. PRESIDENT’S REPORT – President Joyce McConnell

President Joyce McConnell: Thanked the graduate students for being here and sharing stories. Commented that graduate student stipends were increased last year, and we are making sure that is being done in this year’s budget as well. Acknowledged there is a long way to go.

President McConnell: Want to begin by talking about philanthropy. Wanted to celebrate what faculty and staff have done during the pandemic. In 2020 and 2021 combined, nearly 3,000 faculty and staff donors provided funds for Rams Against Hunger, Rams Made and CSU Cares. Expressed appreciation for everyone stepping forward. Stated that Giving Tuesday is coming up on November 30th, following Fall Break. Encouraged everyone to give what they can, as the needs continue, and these funds make a difference.

President McConnell: Brief budget update. There is not a lot of detail, since the Governor came out with the budget yesterday afternoon. Noted that this is the beginning of a very long budget process. Once the Governor sends the budget out, we begin the work that is done with the legislature. This year’s budget from the Governor has a 4.6% increase for higher education and a 3% raise built in for classified staff, but no raises for any other category. There is a cap on resident tuition, so the only way we would be able to increase resident tuition would be to ask for an exemption. We will need to go through our budget carefully. When we have a budget to present to the Board of Governors, we will also ensure we present it to the Faculty Council, so you are aware of what is going forward. On the Department of Higher Education website, there

is a summary of the budget. What will take some work is that the 4.6% increase won't make up for increased costs or higher salaries, as well as higher graduate stipends. For those new to this process, Colorado only supports higher education at a minimum. We will update Faculty Council as we work through this. Will continue to advocate for higher education, salary increases, graduate student increases, and all the services we provide.

President McConnell: The Office of Engagement and Extension is hosting an annual forum to deepen connections and engagement. It is scheduled for November 8th through November 10th on the Fort Collins campus. It is going to focus on cross-discipline, University engagement. Have been traveling the state with Vice President Blake Naughton on the Ram Tour. There is a [SOURCE story](#) on our travels as part of the Ram Tour. We will continue to explore how we can engage with these communities and help meet their needs.

President McConnell: In Human Resources updates, our operational offices are down in numbers of employees, and we are having a hard time recruiting them due to salaries. This is not unique to us; it is a national issue. Our low salaries are hurting our ability to attract talent, particularly in basic operations. We have openings in procurement in Human Resources and about 100 other openings in Housing and Dining, as well as other areas. Will be sending out a request next week to Vice Presidents and Deans to submit numbers to we have a better view of the entire impact that these openings are having on the institution.

President McConnell: Human Resources will also be customizing invitations and be able to do orientation for new employees that is more flexible and targeted than it has been done in the past. Reported that state classified employees will now have a 30-minute presentation from COWINS at their orientations. This will give them an opportunity to hear from the organization that represents them.

President McConnell: Thanked Robyn Fergus and Human Resources, who are doing an amazing job trying to take care of our employees despite their staffing challenges and a huge need for Human Resources expertise across the University. Commented that Fergus is aware of the hurdles in the Human Resources system, and they are being worked on as part of the Courageous Strategic Transformation.

President McConnell: We have had extraordinary employee compliance levels with vaccines. We have 89 employees remaining, most of which are new and have not yet had time to submit vaccination information. Congratulated the Pandemic Preparedness Team and Human Resources for their work ensuring employee compliance. They are really working on accountability.

President McConnell: Wanted to give a shout out to our new Vice President for Inclusive Excellence, Kauline Cipriani. Vice President Cipriani and her team have been doing a lot. The Employee Climate Survey went out, with responses due by November 19th. Last week, we had the Diversity Symposium. There are session recordings.

President McConnell: If members were unable to attend the Inclusive Excellence Drafting Group open forum, [a video](#) of that is also online. The drafting group is looking for faculty feedback on the progress thus far. Expressed hope that members will watch and provide feedback.

President McConnell: Want to talk about leadership structure, as we are making a big change as part of what we are doing with Courageous Strategic Transformation to bring a more inclusive group of people into shared governance. Our operations team meets once a week, and we try to make decisions in that group about operations and other items that require quick decisions. The Council of Deans is led by Provost Mary Pedersen, and they meet to discuss academic matters. The Executive Leadership Team meets monthly for an hour. This is a greatly expanded group, which includes all members of the operations team, Deans, General Counsel, President and CEO of the Foundation, Vice Provosts, and Employee Council Representatives. Wanted to note that this is the first time State Classified staff and Administrative Professional Representatives have a seat at the table in a leadership team. Then we have a campus leadership meeting, which will be held once a semester. This includes not just our top leaders, but department chairs and other unit leaders within units. This is part of our work to share leadership on campus more broadly.

President McConnell: The Deans wanted a representative on the operations team, so there are two rotating Deans. The current representatives are Dean James Pritchett from the College of Agriculture and Dean Beth Walker from the College of Business.

President McConnell: The Mountain Campus has had a difficult time in the past couple years. There was the pandemic, as well as two fires that came within inches of structures. We have partnered with Odell Brewing, and they have agreed to do a limited special release beer with a unique label as part of a fundraising campaign for the Mountain Campus. Stated there was a fundraiser at Odell's from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 3rd if members wished to attend.

President McConnell: Brief update on research. At the August Board of Governors meeting, the Vice President for Research's office announced a \$2,000,000 endeavor funded by the Anschutz Foundation. It will fund three key areas: research grants, graduate fellowships, and bio cyber-security. There will be a SOURCE story coming out soon about this.

President McConnell: Want to end with an update on Courageous Strategic Transformation. We are getting tremendous interest in the website. The full schedule is posted on the [Courageous Strategic Transformation website](#) for the open forum sessions. The drafting groups are showing their work and seeking greater participation among faculty, staff, and students on what is being proposed by each group. There are also recordings available for each open session. More than 350 people have attended these open forums. The goals are published on the website. Stated that Vice President Jenelle Beavers and team will be workshopping goals with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council on November 16th. Will report back on what we learn. Wanted to thank everyone for their participation. We have received over 100 inspiration proposals. Thanked Vice President Beavers, Scott Shrake, and Andrea Duffy for their work on the Courageous Strategic Transformation process. Encouraged members who have questions to reach out.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell in the chat. Requested that members send any feedback they wish to share with the Executive Committee for their Courageous Strategic Transformation workshop on November 16th.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell. Hearing no questions, report concluded.

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

Provost Pedersen: Thanked everyone for the robust discussions on many topics and the graduate students for being here. Felt their comments were extremely valuable. Expressed appreciation for everything that is being done and the difference faculty and staff are making for our students.

Provost Pedersen: Will focus today on faculty focus priorities and student success.

Provost Pedersen: We have been continuing to make progress in the Academic Master Plan. Reminded members that this is a major component of the Courageous Strategic Transformation. Information about the Academic Master Plan can be found on the Courageous Strategic Transformation website. We had forums in October, where there was good participation and high engagement. The Planning Advisory Committee will be meeting this week and discussing how we will be doing the work of correlating the draft templates that will be coming in from the different departments, programs, centers, and institutes. Then the Deans, Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, and supervisors will be creating a high-level summary brief that is due November 19th to the Provost Office.

Provost Pedersen: Phase two of the planning will start in spring semester. We will be focusing on demographics and emerging opportunities for teaching, research, and engagement. We will have our second large forum on February 11th. We will continue to update everyone on what is happening with our Academic Master Plan.

Provost Pedersen: For student success, we are focusing on increasing our retention rates for our first-year, first-time students. This will result in increasing graduation rates for all students while eliminating equity gaps.

Provost Pedersen: We are also gearing up for our reaccreditation efforts. We received a request for dates for our site visit, which we will work on over the next few weeks. We are forming a University Steering Committee to help come up with a detailed plan and timeline. We are in the process right now of hiring a Director of Assessment, which will work toward the assessment of student learning, institutional learning outcomes for our core curriculum, as well as supporting our programmatic learning outcomes. Will be a broad supportive structure.

Provost Pedersen: Reminded members that a [leadership fellow opportunity](#) is open in the Provost Office to support the accreditation process. We are looking for a fellow that has an interest and will coordinate and pull material together for our reaccreditation. Information about this opportunity was emailed in October. The report for reaccreditation will need to be completed in Summer 2023, so we have a short timeline. We have submitted dates and are waiting to hear back from the Higher Learning Commission on the dates they select.

Provost Pedersen: We have National First-Generation Day coming up next week, on Monday November 8th. More than one in five of our first-year Fall 2021 students are first-generation.

Encouraged members to acknowledge this in their classes next Monday, November 8th. There will be a celebration on the Lory Student Center Plaza between 11:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., with games and a keynote speaker of first-generation identity.

Provost Pedersen: The CSU free application day received a record number of applications. We extended the deadline for submissions to a few more days and received 10,824 submissions. We had more diverse and first-generation students than have ever applied before. Thanked enrollment and access division and admissions staff for all their hard work.

Provost Pedersen: Would like to provide some accolades and announcements.

- We had a contingency of CSU students and professors that were attending the United Nations Climate Summit in Glasgow. The summit opened October 31st and is running through November 12th. There is a SOURCE story about this.
- We have our graduate student showcase from November 8th to November 10th. It will be a virtual platform in which CSU graduate students will present their research, creative work, and entrepreneurship. These students will be competing for more than \$19,000 in scholarships and for a potential position as the Vice President for Research Graduate Fellowship. More information can be found on the Graduate Student Showcase website.
- A program called Inflection Point, developed by the Department of Mathematics, have been focused on improving the student experience. A council was formed to center the voices of students of color, first-generation, and low-income students. Goal was to identify and address gaps in student support within the math department. Inflection Point provides a learning space for these students taking math classes, and students who join are expected to help their peers.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Hearing no questions, report concluded.

H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: Provided [written report](#) in lieu of verbal report in interest of time.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Report included as part of agenda packet. Nothing further to report.

I. DISCUSSION

1. Resolution Regarding Graduate Student Compensation and Fees – Melinda Smith, Sybil Sharvelle, Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Moti Gorin, & Ramaa Vasudevan

Moved to action item section with approval of Faculty Council.

2. Late W Recommendation – Committee on Scholastic Standards
– Karen Barrett, Chair

Karen Barrett: During COVID, we had a later deadline for course withdrawal. Normally, you cannot withdraw from courses after the middle of the semester, so about eight weeks into the course. During COVID, we enabled students to drop courses as late as the last day of the semester. What we found is that it improved their persistence at the University and their success. With the earlier withdrawal date, many students had not yet done their biggest assignments.

Barrett: When we looked at the data, it suggested that having the late course withdrawal was associated with greater persistence and lower failing grades. In Spring 2020 and Fall 2020, there was a 30% increase of students who withdrew from at least one course. People did avail themselves of the course withdrawal, but during those same semesters, students were less likely to earn D's, F's, or even U's than during 2019, as a comparison. Students who did that were more likely to stay at CSU than those who had done University withdrawals in prior years.

Barrett: We also found that full University withdrawals decreased when students found this opportunity to withdraw from individual courses to be preferable to University withdrawal. The data suggested that this withdrawal helps with overall persistence. Referred to data as seen in the slides in the agenda packet.

Barrett: What the Committee on Scholastic Standards is proposing is that the withdrawal deadline be moved to three-quarters through the semester, rather than halfway. If you wait until the final day of the semester, there could be downsides, such as with group projects.

Chair Doe: Thanked Barrett for that information. Asked if the membership had any questions or thoughts on this. Clarified that we are not voting on anything today, simply a discussion item. This is an opportunity to provide feedback to the Committee on Scholastic Standards.

Emily Hardegree-Ullman: Asked in the chat: Is there a limit to the number of W grades a student can accumulate while at CSU?

Barrett: That is a good question. Not sure of the answer.

Nunes: Asked in the chat: Do you have any way of measuring how much of staying in the University is an effect of being able to drop classes later, and how much is just because job market opportunities are terrible right now, so that interruption in education is not as attractive?

Barrett: We do not have the reasons for it. We just have the data, but as it turns out, there are more positions open than in the past that are looking for students who do not have a bachelor's degree yet. Unfortunately, we do not have the statistics on the reasoning behind people staying.

Chair Doe: Asked Brad Goetz and Ryan Barone if they were aware of a policy regarding number of late withdrawals allowed.

Brad Goetz: Unaware of such a policy.

Ryan Barone: Agreed, unaware of this policy.

Vice Provost Kelly Long: Confirmed, don't believe we have this stipulated.

Barrett: Stated that entry-level construction is offering \$45 an hour and have a lot of programs for training people without bachelor's degrees than they used to because there is such a worker shortage.

Chair Doe: Asked Barrett what the next steps are for this.

Barrett: Requested members send any additional comments. Next step would be to create a motion and put it up for a vote.

Chair Doe: Thanked Barrett. Can look forward to a motion at Executive Committee. They will then decide if it is ready to stand debate on the floor of Faculty Council. May see this in December at our meeting. Thanked Barrett and the work of the Committee on Scholastic Standards for their work on this.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked in the chat if this motion would be for a temporary change or a forever change.

Barrett: We are proposing this change as a permanent change. Noted that no change is truly permanent, and this can be changed back if there are unforeseen consequences. We are not proposing this as a COVID-related thing, but a more permanent change.

Chair Doe: Thanked Barrett for the clarification. Asked if there were any additional questions or comments. Hearing none, thanked Barrett for bringing this forward.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further business, requested a motion to adjourn.

Hyatt: Moved.

Bernagozzi: Second.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

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

Kirk McGilvray	Mechanical Engineering	2023
Thomas Bradley	Systems Engineering	2023
Sybil Sharvelle	College-at-Large	2023
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2022
J. Rockety Luo	College-at-Large	2022
Liberal Arts		
Merrill Johnson	Anthropology & Geography	2023
(substituting for Mary Van Buren)		
Jason Bernagozzi	Art	2022
Martin Carcasson	Communication Studies	2022
(substituting for Ziyu Long)		
Anders Fremstad	Economics	2024
Tony Becker	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		
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2023
Emily Morgan	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
Silvia Canetto (excused)	Psychology	2022
(on sabbatical Fall 2021)		

Ann Hess	Statistics	2022
(substituting for Mary Meyer, on sabbatical 2021-2022)		
<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
Tony Schountz	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
<u>Candace Mathiason</u>	College-at-Large	2022
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2023
Doreene Hyatt	College-at-Large	2022
<u>Seonil Kim</u>	College-at-Large	2022
(substituting for Christianne Magee)		
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2023
John Rosecrance	College-at-Large	2023
Sheryl Magzaman	College-at-Large	2023
University Libraries		
Linda Meyer	Libraries	2022
<i>Ex Officio Voting Members</i>		
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, Chair</u>	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2022
<u>Jerry Magloughlin, Chair</u>	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
Shawn Archibeque, 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
Ashley Harvey	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
<u>Mary Van Buren</u> (excused)	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	Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
Brandon Bernier	Vice President for Information Technology
Alan Rudolph	Vice President for Research
Jenelle Beavers	Vice President for Strategy
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Kelly Long	Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
Kim Tobin	Vice President for University Advancement
Yolanda Bevill	Vice President for University Communications
Lynn Johnson	Vice President for University Operations
James Pritchett	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
David McLean	Dean, College of Engineering
Lise Youngblade	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Mary Stromberger	Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Karen Estlund	Dean, Libraries
Jan Nerger	Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Mark Stetter	Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
John Hayes	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Sarah Olson	Chair, Administrative Professional Council