

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

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

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
December 7, 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 Microsoft Teams protocols. Requested cameras and mics be turned off if not speaking. Requested members use the “raise hand” feature when asking to speak or writing a note in the chat. We will have one person speak at a time and go through everyone’s comments before coming back to hear from someone a second time.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – December 7, 2021

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – February 1, 2022 – Location TBD – 4:00pm
- b. Poll – Virtual or In-Person for Spring 2022 Faculty Council meetings

Chair Doe: Our next Faculty Council meeting location is noted as needing to be determined. We will poll to get Faculty Council’s opinion on format. Requested a poll be taken.

Faculty Council members approved meetings to remain virtual for Spring 2022.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

- a. Faculty Council Meeting – November 2, 2021

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to these minutes from November. A few corrections were submitted by email.

Hearing no further corrections, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. UCC Minutes – October 22 & 29, November 5 & 12, 2021

Chair Doe: We have University Curriculum Committee minutes. Asked members if there were any portions of the minutes to be pulled for further consideration or discussion.

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

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Updated Election – Faculty Representatives to the Committee on Faculty Governance – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Steve Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, would like to move the nominations of the two faculty members listed for the Committee on Faculty Governance to fill some vacancies that are coming at the end of December. Doug Cloud is from the College of Liberal Arts and Claudia Gentry-Weeks is from the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that no second is needed since this comes from a standing committee. Asked if there was further discussion of these nominations or if there were any nominations from the floor.

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

Motion approved. Nominees approved for representation on Committee on Faculty Governance.

2. Proposed Revisions to Sections C.2.1.9.2 & C.2.1.9.5 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the passage of the revisions to Sections C.2.1.9.2 and C.2.1.9.5 of the Manual as seen in the agenda packet.

Reising: This came out of recommendations made by the Faculty Council Information Technology Task Force. Vice President Brandon Bernier indicated a desire for more faculty input in terms of institution-wide decisions on information technology. Vice President Bernier and Chair Doe consulted with stakeholders across the University. This proposed new committee attempts to increase the amount of faculty input on processes around adoption, maintenance improvements, and sunseting of information technology services on the CSU campus.

Reising: Noted that the changes in Section C.2.1.9.2 are bringing the list up to date with the most recent code changes passed by Faculty Council and the Board of Governors.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising. Commented that Vice President Bernier is also on this call if there are any questions. Asked members if there was any discussion around this motion.

Peter Jan van Leeuwen: When looking at the duties of the committee, wondering what the overlap of these duties are with the Information Technology Advisory Council and how they are different. Asked: What is the difference between this committee and the advisory council?

Reising: The standing committee membership is selected through an open process in all eight of the colleges and the Libraries. We ensure representation from the entire breadth of the academic mission of the University. This may be the case for the standing committees, but possibly not the advisory council. Asked Vice President Bernier to speak more to the advisory council.

Vice President Brandon Bernier: The Information Technology Advisory Council is largely made up of our distributed information technology leaders. What we do not have necessarily in that group is faculty representation. That was one of the key things that was shared when we began this discussion, about how we can increase faculty involvement, communication, and shared governance in information technology.

Vice President Bernier: We went to the Information Technology Advisory Council with this proposal to ensure that they had the opportunity to review and comment. This was to check that there was no overlap between the two different areas. We have the support of the distributed information technology leaders. Some of their edits and suggested are included in the proposal.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising and Vice President Bernier. Asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising and Vice President Bernier for their consideration to this important Manual change.

3. New Joint Degree: Master of Addictions Counseling in Psychology and Social Work, Plan C – University Curriculum Committee – Brad Goetz, Chair

Brad Goetz: On behalf of the University Curriculum Committee, move approval of a new Master of Addictions Counseling in Psychology and Social Work, Plan C to be established effective Fall 2022 as seen in the agenda packet.

Chair Doe: Thanked Goetz. Asked if there was any discussion about this motion.

Brad Conner: This motion is coming from Department of Psychology. Am the director of the addiction counseling program and worked on developing the proposal. Here to answer any questions about the proposal.

Sharon Anderson: Curious about the number of credits for this degree at a Masters level.

Conner: This is a combination of the Masters in Social Work and then the Masters in Addiction Counseling in Psychology program, both of which already exist. What we are trying to do is

streamline. We will have the internship double count, so the only shared credits in the entire program are the eighteen total units of internship required. The goal for both programs was the keep the number of units required streamline to keep costs at a minimum. This program is going to end up being a three-year program to get all the content done, and still having individuals earn both degrees as required by the state bodies that license the professionals. We have to both navigate the University system and the department regulatory agencies who offer the licenses in social work and addiction counselors licenses.

Anderson: Asked: Can people who complete this degree sit for licensure for both?

Conner: Confirmed. Can sit for licensed social worker and licensed addiction counselor. They will have all the education they will need, although they may not be able to get all the hours that are required. Social work candidates have to get post masters degree hours before they get licensure and addiction counselors have to complete a total of 3,000 face-to-face hours before they can receive licensure here.

Anderson: Asked: Was there conversation between the two departments about how someone with that number of hours could go for a doctorate if they wanted to?

Conner: They probably could. There is not currently a PhD in addiction counseling and psychology here at CSU. There is a PhD in social work. We did not have a specific conversation about whether credits could count because this is seen as a terminal degree.

Marie Legare: Was unclear how this degree program is being housed.

Conner: There is a Memorandum of Understanding that denotes it is housed equally between the School of Social Work and the Department of Psychology.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Asked: How many credits did each of these degrees take originally? It looks intensive for three years.

Conner: The Masters in Addiction Counseling in Psychology was 42 credits and the social work one is 64. We shaved off about twenty credits.

Goetz: Have a question about the title. In the title that is proposed, there is an “s” after “addiction” and in the catalog copy, the word “addiction” doesn’t have an “s” following it. Believe we can amend that depending on how it’s wanted.

Conner: It should not have an “s” after it.

Chair Doe: This is an editorial change. It does not require us to amend the motion, we can just take care of that. Asked if there was any other discussion.

Conner: This is the first of the joint degrees that are being made available. It shaves off a year for individuals who want to get both a Masters in Addiction Counseling and a Masters in Social Work. Previously, they would have had to be in school for a minimum of four years. By creating

these joint degrees and having the internship count in both programs, we can shave a year off that time.

Sybil Sharvelle: Asked how they are assessing the demand for this degree. May answer some of the concerns about number of credits if we can understand how much demand there is for this type of dual degree.

Conner: There is roughly a 30% to 35% workforce shortage for addiction counselors in Colorado. That number existed pre-COVID. Many have left workforce, so it may be the workforce shortage has increased. The initial Masters in Addiction Counseling program was designed primarily to serve just addiction counselors. As we have developed the program more broadly, students have indicated they want to treat more than just addictions. The School of Social Work offers a generalist degree. If students get both, it makes them more marketable in a saturated market. Ours is the only Masters in Addiction Counseling in Psychology program and there is a significant need for social workers to become specialized, especially to treat addictions to build competency. That is why we brought the two programs together.

Anderson: Asked in the chat: Is there information about earning/salary after licensure?

Conner: The earning potential is unclear, as there is no other program in the country for a joint Masters in Addiction Counseling. Currently, the Masters in Addiction Counseling program has graduated three cohorts of students, and we have 100% employment post-graduation in the field, with 80% already having achieved their licenses. Cannot speak to the Social Work side or answer about earning potential since joint degree program doesn't exist anywhere in the country.

Andrew Norton: Wondering if there is a value to the students to have two separate Masters degrees as opposed to the joint degree.

Conner: As part of the historical context around this, was part of an ad hoc committee that was put together by the Graduate School to develop both dual degrees and joint degrees at CSU. The reason we put this forward as a joint degree instead of a dual degree is because of the number of units being shared. By having the students essentially share an entire year across the two programs made this seem much more like a joint degree. There was discussion about the joint degree and that it would show the two education platforms as significantly linked.

Conner: The primary reason the units are as high as they are is due to the requirements at the state level for licensure for each of the two separate licenses. This has been tricky to navigate, both the University system and the way we offer classes and their requirements at the state level. Wanted to remind everyone that we have two entities we are trying to speak to here. One of them is the department regulatory agencies at the state level and the other is making sure this works within the University system.

Dean Mary Stromberger: Commented in the chat. Believe this is correct, that the joint was selected to emphasize the integration of the two programs at a very high level, throughout the three-year program.

Chair Doe: Thanked Conner. Asked if there were any further questions or comments regarding this motion. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

4. Late W Motion – Committee on Scholastic Standards – Karen Barrett, Chair

Karen Barrett: The general belief on the Committee on Scholastic Standards, as well as through discussions with the Academic Policies Review Committee, was there were some advantages of having a later course withdrawal deadline. Before, it was at eight weeks, and many times the students in courses do not have enough information to decide about withdrawing from a course. Many other universities offer a later course withdrawal period.

Barrett: The question was around when the course withdrawal should be. The discussion revolved around the benefits and the risks. Going beyond the eight weeks seemed to have benefits, as courses would have done some major assignments. In the discussion, it seemed having the course withdrawal deadline be three-quarters of the way through seemed reasonable. We also discussed what would happen if the course withdrawal was the last day of class, which could result in students not participating. This could be problematic for group assignments.

Barrett: It was determined that doing it sooner than the last day was desirable, so we discussed being three-quarters. We also felt it important to figure out the financial implications. We did some research and for most students, they will not lose money beyond withdrawing from the class and needing to take it again. If a student is attending on the census date, that level of credits is considered to be their load, and this will not penalize students financially other than them having to retake the class.

Barrett: One thing we heard that was not positive was concerns from advising that this is a busy time for advising and that they may have a hard time meeting the needs of students wanting to make this withdrawal. Despite this, the Committee on Scholastic Standards still recommends moving the withdrawal date to three-quarters through the semester. We also had data collected on the impact this would have on student persistence and success, and a late withdrawal impact both in a positive way. This could be beneficial to students.

Barrett: The Committee on Scholastic Standards moves that the course withdrawal period be changed from the middle of the semester to three-quarters of the way through the course.

Chair Doe: Thanked Barrett. Asked if there were questions from the membership.

Shawn Archibeque: Stated that the Committee on Teaching and Learning is in full support of this motion. We worked in tandem with the Committee on Scholastic Standards on this topic.

Jose Luis Suarez -Garcia: Commented in the chat that professors and instructors can help with recommending later withdrawals, so it is not only advisors taking time to advise.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any further questions or comments from members. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

5. Academic Calendar, Fall 2026 – Summer 2028 – Andrew Norton, Vice Chair

Norton: One of the duties of the Vice Chair of Faculty Council is to create this calendar for two years, and we do it every other year. The events listed were copied from previous calendars to allow for the required 79 days. This was sent to the Registrar's Office for comments, and they came back with edits which are incorporated. Move that the Academic Calendar for Fall 2026 through Summer 2028 be approved by Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Thanked Norton for all the work on this calendar. Asked if there were any questions.

Melinda Smith: Asked: Given what we just approved about the late withdrawals, are the late withdrawal periods correct on these calendars?

Norton: The late withdrawal periods are not correct on these calendars. Once the Board of Governors approves the motion that we just approved, then we will need to amend this calendar as well as others. This may need to be taken under consideration by Executive Committee and Faculty Council, but by virtue of approving that, don't think changing the calendar is something that would be controversial.

Chair Doe: Thanked Smith and Norton. Asked if there were any other questions. Hearing no further discussion, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

6. Resubmission of 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: Would like to move for approval of Section D.4 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual as revised. The previous time we saw this at Faculty Council, we approved the amendments made to it. We submitted them to the Office of General Counsel, who came back with a suggestion that we remove the sentence about counseling, stating that the upper administrator or department chair did not have sufficient expertise to require counseling. We made that change, and it is reflected here.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Asked if there were any additional questions about this change. Reminded members that these were revisions that were already approved and upon General Counsel reviewing the item, there was a bit of concern over some wording. They are recommending a very small change, which has been brought before us.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

7. Resubmission of 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

Legare: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that Section E.15 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual be revised as seen in the agenda packet.

Legare: We discussed this at our last Faculty Council meeting. Most of the opposition was around the edit of combining the two committees into one committee for a few reasons. Following our discussion at the last Faculty Council meeting, we brought this back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty and ended up removing that section of the document. Commented that University Grievance Officer Richard Eykholt is here, and we can answer any questions members may have.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare for discussing the context of bringing this item back. Asked members if there were any questions or discussion around this motion.

van Leeuwen: Asked if more explanation could be given around the administrative duties of faculty members on the committee. Wondering what that is about.

Legare: Believe this refers back to Section K.11, where administrative duties are described. Asked Eykholt to speak to this.

Richard Eykholt: This is not something being changed. If the administration is trying to discipline a faculty member, you don't want administrators making the decision, so whenever we put together faculty committees for discipline or grievance, they cannot include administrators. Administrators are defined in Section K as people who supervise others.

Legare: This is not referring to someone who serves on Faculty Council or serving an administrative role on a committee and in the department. This is referring to someone like a department head or someone with a supervisory role.

Ali Pezeshki: Requested clarification. Following the discussion last week about the committees, the change has been reverted to what we had before. Asked: Is that the idea?

Eykholt: Almost. When we re-wrote Section E.15, we suggested the combining of the two committees. That has now been removed. There are still a few changes there, mainly to correct an oversight. When we put these committees together, they are supposed to consist of faculty of rank at least as high as the person involved. This language was somehow omitted. There was also something that has always been in there about the Provost being able to overturn things, and we

put a time limit on that because otherwise it is open-ended. To answer the original question, the language combining the two committees has been removed, and the language has been reverted to what it originally was.

Pedros-Gascon: Have a question about Sections E.15.4.3 and 15.5. These sections indicate that the University Grievance Officer should be present at all the discussions. Asked why this is.

Eykholt: This has always been the practice but has not been indicated in the Manual. The University Grievance Officer manages the E.15 process. They need to be present for all parts of the process. It is now just explicitly stated in the Manual language.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if this meant the University Grievance Officer would be present in meetings with lawyers or similar individuals.

Eykholt: Sometimes University Counsel is present at meetings. In discussions, it is usually just the University Grievance Officer. Stated that the University Grievance Officer does not vote or testify and is not part of the hearing committee. The University Grievance Officer is there to ensure that processes are being followed.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern about the impact that legal counsel's presence may have on shutting down conversation. Concerned about their presence in a discussion. Feels it should first be a discussion with only the faculty and the University Grievance Officer.

Eykholt: Clarified that the University Grievance Officer and legal counsel are only present during the hearing process. That has always been the case. That is the case for grievances as well. The Board is insistent that legal counsel be present so that hearing committees aren't doing things that violate the law. Hearing committees do not make rulings. If the suggestion is that legal counsel not be present during the hearing, that could be problematic. Legal counsel is not part of the early conversations. If there is concern about legal counsel having any authority in the hearings, they do not have authority. They are there to advise as requested by hearing committee.

Norton: Asked: Does this motion change any of that status of legal representation's participation in the process? Asked if this would be a separate motion we would need to consider.

Eykholt: No, that is separate. Nothing is being changed about the role of legal counsel.

Suarez-Garcia: Have a question about the composition of the committees. Asked: Are there any concerns about who is appointing these committees, or are there any issues with having people from the same department who may retaliate due to some conflicts in some departments and people who may be intimidated by these processes?

Eykholt: Reiterated that none of that is being changed except to say that everyone must have a rank as high as the faculty member being judged. To answer the question, there is language about conflicts of interest and that people can be challenged if they feel there is a conflict of interest. People can be removed from the committee. In practice, challengers are taken very seriously. We do not put a high burden of proof there. For Section E.15.4, which is about performance of

duties, the faculty are from the same department as much as possible because they are judging whether your performance fits with your profession. That is not being changed. In Section E.15.4.2, where it's behavior, faculty are chosen from outside the college, and that is because there isn't a need to judge the discipline.

Mary Van Buren: Want to reiterate the concern expressed by Pedros-Gascon about the presence of the University Grievance Officer and University Counsel at the hearing. Commented that the University Counsel does not represent the hearing committee, it represents the University.

Eykholt: Believe there may be some misunderstanding. Neither the University Grievance Officer nor University Counsel do any testifying at these hearings. They do not express opinions. They are simply there to manage the process and ensure things are going in the right order. General Counsel advises when requested by the hearing committee, so they are representing the hearing committee. Nothing about this is being changed from what is already in the Manual.

Ross McConnell: These are rules that cover procedure for revoking a faculty member's tenure. Expressed concerns about the presence of attorneys in confidential deliberations. One of the items allows the University Grievance Officer to be present for confidential deliberations. Believe this is something new. Move to amend the proposed changes.

Chair Doe: Clarified that the amendments being shown are strikeout amendments.

R. McConnell: Confirmed. Amendment is suggesting we strike the provision that allows the University Grievance Officer to be present for the phase of the hearing where the committee retires to deliberate. Feels there should be constraints on what kind of influence the University Grievance Officer has on what can be said in those deliberations.

Chair Doe: Thanked R. McConnell for the explanation. We will need a second for the motion on the floor.

Van Buren: Seconded.

Chair Doe: Thanked Van Buren. Asked if there was any further discussion on this motion.

Eykholt: Will leave this up to Faculty Council to decide. Not sure how the hearing committee will know what they are and are not allowed to do. Clarified that the University Grievance Officer is not the judge and does not make any decisions or ruling. They are just there to ensure the Manual language is being followed.

Moti Gorin: There seems to be two things in this amendment. There is a delineation of the role and then the striking out the lines that allow the University Grievance Officer to be present. If the analogy to a judge is not correct, wondering if we are just trying to understand the role of the University Grievance Officer. Seems like the University Grievance Officer is just there to ensure the rules are being followed, and they do not participate in the discussions. Compared this to a hiring committee, where the Office of Equal Opportunity representative is there to ensure Title IX is being respected and not running afoul of the law.

Eykholt: It is akin to that. It is correct that the University Grievance Officer does not express opinions and does not comment on the validity of things. The University Grievance Officer is there because Section E.15 and Section K processes are very complicated. The faculty on hearing committees are not generally experts on everything in these sections, and the University Grievance Officer is charged with managing the processes and making sure procedures are followed. They handle the logistical aspects.

R. McConnell: Know there has been at least one instance in the past where an attorney was invited to confidential deliberations, and not part of the hearing. Felt this was not appropriate.

Eykholt: This is separate from the motion. Clarified that counsel are not present at confidential deliberations, ever. Cannot speak for previous University Grievance Officers. There is no language anywhere that states that the University attorney is allowed to be present. Not sure what is being referred to here. The private deliberations are just the hearing committee and the University Grievance Officer, and the University Grievance Officer is not involved in those deliberations unless they are asked questions about procedures by the hearing committee.

Norton: Proposed that we vote on the amendment.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for the discussion.

Motion on the amendment failed.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone. Motion on the amendment has failed, so we will return to original motion on the floor.

Anders Fremstad: Move to amend the proposed changes to Section E.15. This issue came up last month. Expressed agreement that the hearing should be recorded. Agreed as well with colleagues that working from a recording is more difficult than working from a transcription. At a faculty member's request, feel a transcription should be provided of the recording.

Chair Doe: Thanked Fremstad. Will need a second on this motion.

Marni Berg: Seconded.

Chair Doe: Asked if there was any discussion on this second amendment.

Eykholt: When this says, "requested transcription", wondering who can request this. Asked: Could this be everyone, or does it have to be someone involved with the hearing or the faculty member?

Fremstad: Was thinking a transcription as requested by the faculty member. Could clarify this in both portions of the amendment.

Edits were suggested to indicate the transcription could be requested by the faculty member.

Eykholt: If the faculty member requests this, have no objection. Wording should state “a transcription if requested by the faculty member.”

Legare: Believe this is a minor change, and this would be fine as an amendment.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone. If there is no objection, we can move forward with the language as proposed, “a transcription if requested by the Tenured Faculty Member.”

Pezeshki: Requested clarification on transcription statement. Wondering if there would be situations where the University provides the transcription but not the recording. Asked: Would you have to request the recording?

Fremstad: Agree that if you request the transcription, you will want the recording to ensure the two line up correctly. Was trying to clarify through this amendment that if you wanted a transcription, you should be able to get it.

Pezeshki: Think we should remove the option of providing either a recording or a transcript. The transcript can be provided upon request, but we don’t want to remove the option of the University not providing the recording in the first place.

Gorin: Stated in the chat that we should keep the “verbatim” language just to be precise.

Discussion continued with suggestions for specific edits to clarify amendment. Members worked with Amy Barkley to confirm wording.

Smith: Think it is time to call the question.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for the discussion. Requested a vote on the amendment in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion to approve the amendment approved.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone. Amendment has passed. We can return to the original motion. Asked if there was any discussion on the original motion. Hearing none, requested a vote on the motion as amended in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

F. PRESIDENT’S REPORT – President Joyce McConnell

Due to length of debate on Section E.15, President Joyce McConnell had to leave for another obligation before providing report.

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

Provost Mary Pedersen: Want to start by thanking everyone. Has been successful and we have been able to offer a robust residential learning experience for our students. Expressed appreciation and hope that finals go well for everyone.

Provost Pedersen: Short update on student success. We have six groups working and we have begun to allocate some of the funding. Some still has to be allocated. Of the \$1.4 million we have allocated to date, a million has been for financial aid. We are hearing proposals from the colleges and different groups. Some of the initial proposals are a learning assistance programs in Chemistry and Biology. We have also been developing dashboards on student success to provide data, which will be ready in January. We have two teams of fifteen faculty that will be engaged in our student success analytics certificate programs that will also begin in January.

Provost Pedersen: We have three other initiatives. We have one for student experience and culture. They have thirty-two members dividing into five areas, looking at financial needs, commonwealth and sense of belonging, mental health and well-being, purpose and understanding, and academics. Many of these initiatives overlap, so we meet once a week to discuss and coordinate. Our fifth initiative is around financial aid. We are working on identifying where we can support students as identified in the admissions process.

Provost Pedersen: For the Academic Master Plan, in the fall semester we focused on departments, colleges and centers submitting their plans for the academic future of disciplines and colleges. These reports are being reviewed. We are also preparing our spring workshop, which will happen on February 11th. We will be focusing on demographics and emerging opportunities for teaching, research, and engagement. All this information is posted on our website if members wish to look there for more information.

Provost Pedersen: We heard from the Higher Learning Commission, and we will have our site visit on September 18th and 19th in the Fall of 2023. At the beginning of spring semester, we will be pulling together a task force and developing a comprehensive campus-wide engagement in our reaccreditation. We will have more to share in January about how we are moving forward.

Provost Pedersen: Want to thank Chair Doe and Faculty Council on the progress of the all-core curriculum. Chair Doe has been hard at work putting together a 1C Task Force, who are currently working on outcomes criteria. This is something we will be looking at more in the spring semester as well.

Provost Pedersen: With our Deans searches, we have hired a search firm, Isaac and Miller search firm, to conduct the searches. Search committees have been created and are underway developing position descriptions.

Provost Pedersen: Acknowledged the work by Chair Doe and Vice Provost Sue James to bring Professor Adrianna Kezar to campus. There is a video of her plenary talk from November 8th posted on the Provost's page. There was also a SOURCE story that was written. Really invaluable information and some action items resulted due to her visit.

Provost Pedersen: Vice Provost James will be hiring a Presidential Fellow to assist with the CCAF Task Force recommendations so we can keep those moving forward. They will look at issues such as evaluating faculty workloads, enhancing communications to the whole campus, improving faculty onboarding. Vice Provost James will also be working with our new tenure and promotion workflow system to develop a process and protocol. Dean Jan Nerger is leading a task force to roll this out in a systematic way.

Provost Pedersen: Vice Provost James is also leading the Advanced Grant, and they are currently interviewing for a program manager. It was decided that all the initiatives that come out of the Advanced Grant should provide support for all colleges and departments, beyond just women in STEM. We will be expanding it so every department and all groups will be able to benefit from the work that comes out of this. Will be hearing more about this next semester.

Provost Pedersen: Want to acknowledge Bernie Rollin. Many of you had the wonderful opportunity to know Rollin, was quite the remarkable individual. Hard to quantify his impact on the institution and on humanity in terms of his research on animal ethics. Rollin was at CSU since 1969 and taught the nation's first veterinary medical ethics course in 1978. In 2016, he achieved a lifetime achievement award for excellence in research. His wife, Linda Rollin, also taught at CSU and they retired in December of 2020 after a combined 99 years of service. Encouraged members to read the SOURCE story.

Chair Doe: Rollin was near and dear to many people in this meeting and served as a true example to many. Cannot overstate the importance of his impact on animal ethics.

Linda Rollin: Expressed appreciation for the kind words.

Provost Pedersen: We have a few accolades.

- We have a NASA Earth Science Mission to be led by CSU atmospheric scientist Susan van den Heever. They will study storms in the tropics.
- The College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences was awarded a \$2.47 million grant from the NIH maximizing student development programs, and these are training programs for PhD students in translational medicine led by John Gilbert, Mark Zabel, and Jani Cross.
- Members of the CSU Chapter of the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers received the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers National Chapter of the Year Award in Orlando, Florida on November 14th.
- Both Professor V. "Chandra" Chandrasekar from the College of Engineering and Vice Provost Sue James were named Fellows of the National Academic of Inventors.

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any questions for Provost Pedersen.

Pedros-Gascon: Was interested in hearing from the President regarding the new football coach. Feels the payments are creating an expensive parachute departure. There were cases of questionable proceedings surrounding some of these. Wondering about the leadership that identify these people working for us. Wondering also where the money is coming from. They are significant funds that could help with the academic mission of the University.

Provost Pedersen: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Will pass along this information. Cannot answer these questions but know there is a lot of money associated with Athletics in a lot of different ways. Will pass this information along and will share these comments.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Will look for more explanation in February.

Van Buren: Expressed appreciation for Professor Kezar's visit. One of the things that became clear during the plenary session was that budget was an important factor in salaries. Wondering if the University is considering any budgetary reforms that will enhance our ability to pay non-tenure track faculty at a fair rate.

Provost Pedersen: One of the top priorities we have, and we have pulled a committee together for, is looking at CCA faculty salaries, as well as for our graduate students and administrative professionals. We are pulling the information together and looking at the data internally and externally. We're looking across campus for equity but looking at external benchmarks. This is a top priority for us.

Debora Nunes: Was curious about the committee mentioned. Wondering if there is more information on who is on this committee and who is represented.

Provost Pedersen: It is not a formal committee. We are pulling together the data, and we have leadership from Human Resources and Institutional Research. Vice President Robyn Fergus has been leading a report that will be done soon. It will review all administrative professional salaries and do benchmarks. This is not a formal committee and has not been charged. We just pulled people together on this because many have been working in isolation. Wanted us to work together so that each group is taken care of. We are just beginning to meet and as we gather more information and move that work forward, we can provide more information to everyone.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions, thanked Provost Pedersen for joining us.

H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: With the Professor Kezar visit, several things became clear. One of the things we discussed was compensation. There are compelling needs to protect our graduate students and our non-tenure track faculty. Expressed appreciation for the large effort at looking at compensation across all categories. Other issue that came forward was around contracts. Professor Kezar spoke about the importance of contracts. Have undertaken an effort with the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty to obtain contract language from other institutions in the state to see what they look like and how we may jumpstart the use of contracts in our own local setting.

Chair Doe: Want to acknowledge the work of Joseph DiVerdi, who has been leading the Retirement Committee for a few years. Hard to quantify the number of hours this committee has worked on behalf of all of us. The group is completing their work and presenting a

recommendation soon. Wanted to acknowledge the extreme effort. Expressed hope there will opportunity to hear more about this in the future.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Smith: The Board of Governors meeting was last week. Will have a written report for February's meeting. The next Board of Governors meeting will be on February 2nd-4th.

Smith: The governor has increased investment in higher education to \$42.6 million. He has asked that there be no increase in resident undergraduate tuition rates. There was also increased investment in financial aid as well as capital maintenance and construction projects. There were three scenarios presented by Vice President Lynn Johnson. The first was flat tuition that results in a \$13 million shortfall. The two other scenarios were presented with either increasing non-resident tuition and graduate tuition, resulting in a \$7.4 million shortfall, or increasing tuition across the board that would result in a \$4.1 million shortfall. The budget indicates there is a 3% increase for graduate student compensation, but not clear if there is any increase for faculty compensation. Will keep everyone updated.

Smith: Will continue to advocate for faculty and will advocate for a 3% raise for faculty compensation.

Smith: Chief Academic Officer Rick Miranda spoke about Todos Santos, which is a CSU System asset. It tends to have a shortfall every year. The goal is to revamp the way in which Todos Santos is run and convert the curriculum in a way that would accommodate approximately forty students per trimester, which will be thirteen credit hours of coursework per semester. The presentation gave a quick timeline for this, for next year in FY 2023. Will keep an eye on this.

I. DISCUSSION

Chair Doe: Asked if there was anything else for the good of Faculty Council. Hearing none, called the meeting adjourned.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

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

<u>Kirk McGilvray</u>	Mechanical Engineering	2023
<u>Thomas Bradley</u>	Systems Engineering	2023
Sybil Sharvelle	College-at-Large	2023
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2022
<u>J. Rockey Luo</u>	College-at-Large	2022
Liberal Arts		
Mary Van Buren	Anthropology & Geography	2023
Jason Bernagozzi	Art	2022
Martin Carcasson (substituting for Ziyu Long)	Communication Studies	2022
Anders Fremstad	Economics	2024
Tony Becker	English	2023
<u>Albert Bimper</u>	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
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2023
Emily Morgan	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Lisa Langstraat</u>	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
<u>Chad Hoffman</u>	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	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
<u>James Liu</u>	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> (excused)	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
<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
<u>James Graham</u> , Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2022
Shawn Archibeque , Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2022
Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia , 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

Thomas Conway	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
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	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

