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
March 1, 2022 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

Chair Doe: We will begin our meeting today with a report from President Joyce McConnell. Thanked President McConnell for being here today.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – March 1, 2022

A. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – President Joyce McConnell

President Joyce McConnell: Thanked Chair Doe. Expressed appreciation for those who attended the Courageous Strategic Transformation event today.

President McConnell: Expressed thanks for all the condolences over loss of mother. Received many cards and emails in sympathy for this loss.

President McConnell: The other tremendous loss CSU experienced is the loss of Mary Ontiveros, a guiding spirit for CSU. Thanked everyone who was able to go to the funeral service. Ontiveros was at CSU for 51 years and started out as a student. She was in ASCSU and throughout her career was a champion for the Latinx community on campus. She also raised the bar for diversity, equity, and inclusion on our campus.

President McConnell: We will be planning a memorial service for Ontiveros later in the semester. Her family has asked us to wait until they had completed their plans to celebrate her life. We plan to honor Ontiveros' legacy on campus through the Ontiveros Latinx Fellowship Program. It is available to undergraduate students to help fund education, research, and professional development in the area of Latinx leadership development. Through the President's Office, we have pledged to match gifts to this program up to $25,000. We have already received $14,000 in gifts in response to the match. Thanked everyone again for coming to Ontiveros' funeral, and we will be doing more to celebrate her achievements and legacy.

President McConnell: Wanted to give a quick legislative update. This is a busy time in the state legislature. Worked with the President's Alliance in Higher Education on immigration and it was the decision of the group that we probably could not get immigration reform through Congress right now. However, someone decided that we could probably get some guidance at the consular

level in other countries. That guidance has been changed so that it will be easier for international students who want to come to the United States and want to come to Colorado State University to get through the process in their home country at the United States consul office.

President McConnell: In terms of state updates, this is the busy season for budget. Nothing has changed really, except that there are some adjustments for inflation. If we hear anything about that, it depends on federal national policy. We will keep everyone updated as things develop.

President McConnell: We are moving a lot of things along, and we are hoping that we will qualify for some of the funds available for buildings. Clark is ranked high by the Capital Development Committee, which is a good sign.

President McConnell: On the federal side, we have worked hard on getting some earmarks since they have resurrected the earmark process. This means that individual Congress members can have projects they want to push through for earmarked funding. We put together a consortium in Colorado and we have two of the seven proposals going in from that consortium. We are the only institution of higher education that has more than one, and the other is University of Colorado. We have two going in. One is for the research facility on the Foothills campus, and the other is for the expansion of Power House, particularly research on hydrogen hubs for western states. Will keep everyone posted on those.

President McConnell: In terms of the budget, on the state side, as soon as we hear from the legislature about what we think the budget will be, we will be going over it with everyone in greater detail. We have been asked by the Board to do three different scenarios, and Vice President Lynn Johnson has done a wonderful job preparing those scenarios. We are always concerned with both sides of revenue and expenses, and we want to be mindful of increasing tuition and the pressure that puts on our students. We are also working to make our salaries more competitive with national standards. We are also working to increase the stipends for our graduate students. We are waiting to hear what our revenue structure will be and then will do a full revealing of the budget.

President McConnell: Thanked everyone who has participated in the Courageous Strategic Transformation process. We discussed some themes at the presentation this morning. This campus is universally committed to student access and success, sustainability, and inclusive excellence. Encouraged members to go to the Courageous Strategic Transformation website. It has the presentation we gave to the Board of Governors, mission statements, our priorities, and the metrics we will be using to measure whether we are meeting these priorities.

President McConnell: We have been having conversations with leaders around campus about Courageous Strategic Transformation and posting them to SOURCE. There is a SOURCE article every week from a CSU leader on Courageous Strategic Transformation. We spoke with Vice President Blake Naughton this past Monday about the role of Engagement and Extension in the green and gold vision for the future.

President McConnell: We have a CSU Leadership Fellow program for faculty and staff, and we are doing another round. Thanked those that participated this year. We could not have

accomplished all we have without them. Having faculty and staff engaged at this level is important to us and helps us with future development of leaders on campus. We are looking for leadership fellows for the 2022-2023 academic year. We are seeking them to work on key projects and service of Courageous Strategic Transformation. These will include employee wellness, improvement of the performance review process in Human Resources, communications and climate change initiatives in research, the implementation of our National Science Foundation Advance Grant in the Provost's Office, and Courageous Strategic Transformation implementation in the President's Office. Encouraged members to submit their applications and consider roles as potential leadership fellows.

President McConnell: Larimer County has been adjusting their COVID standards to follow CDC guidelines. Prior to this meeting, Larimer County sent out a letter about its new dashboard and what it is measuring in terms of a holistic picture of county transmission. CSU has weathered the Omicron surge and numbers continue to plummet. Larimer County health officials estimate that at least 90% of the population has some immunity to COVID and a high number of our CSU community are vaccinated. We have stopped mandatory saliva screening and have moved to voluntary antigen testing. Anyone who wants antigen testing can get it available in the pods, and we will still have PCR tests available in the Health Network. We are also prepared for Spring Break and are watching national trends very closely. We will be addressing how the new guidelines shift our guidelines. It is possible we will be able to lift our mask mandate, but the Pandemic Preparedness Team will need to have that conversation with Larimer County.

President McConnell: Our longtime Vice President for Advancement, Kim Tobin, has a wonderful opportunity to be the Vice President for Advancement at Michigan State University. Congratulated Vice President Tobin for helping us finished our $1 billion campaign. She leaves an incredible fundraising legacy here. We have named to interim co-vice presidents. One is Karen Dunbar, who has been responsible for many years for planned giving. The other will be Rudy Garcia, who has been around a long time as well, and has the responsibility for the budget and operations in Advancement. We will be starting a search right away using a search firm.

President McConnell: Vice President for Engagement and Extension Blake Naughton is on the agenda today to discuss the CSU Extension proposal to establish a new faculty appointment type for Extension professionals. Expressed support for this faculty conversion proposal and continued progress on the Field School. The Deans have voted in support of the proposal to convert Extension agents and specialists to the new faculty appointment type and they also voted to continue dialogue on the Field School as part of the proposal.

President McConnell: The Women's Indoor Track and Field team won the Mountain West Conference Championship. This is their fifth time wining the indoor conference championship. They also have an extraordinarily high GPA. Since 2015-2016, we have won 121 conference championships, which is the Mountain West Conference record.

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

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Asked if was possible to update the organizational chart on the President's website, because it still reflects last year and there have been a lot of changes. Does not feel it is representative of the current situation.

Pedros-Gascon: Had asked this of Chancellor Tony Frank while he was President. Would like to know how much it is costing to run the upper echelon of the institution, both when you started and now. There is a perception that there has been a mushroom in hiring of administrators at different levels and expansion of positions. Would like to have a sense of the changes happening and the impact they have financially on the institution.

President McConnell: We have only expanded the number of people in the President's and Provost's offices by one person. The others have been replacements. Asked: What positions are you pointing to?

Pedros-Gascon: Would be happy to send clarification. There is understanding that in some cases, there were consolidations of positions. In general, there is a perception that the administration has been hiring at a rate that doesn't equate to situations at other levels. Would be helpful for us to understand whether this is just perception or can be substantiated.

President McConnell: Would be happy to go over this at the next Faculty Council meeting. Is a confusing question, not aware of this kind of expansion. If the perception is that there is a problem, we will go through the organizational chart and show where there have been replacements versus new hires. Thanked Pedros-Gascon for bringing this up.

Ann Claycomb: Posted link to organizational chart in the chat.

Jane Stewart: Asked in the chat: How many Ukrainians students/post docs are here at CSU and is there a plan to help keep or hire those in need?

President McConnell: Responded to question in the chat about Ukrainian students. We have three students from Ukraine here. Vice Provost Kathleen Fairfax may be able to fill us in. The International Office has been proactive in reaching out to our students to make sure they know we care about them. We have also reached out to our Russian students because we understand there is a lot of strong feelings on the part of Russian citizens about the invasion of Ukraine.

Vice Provost Kathleen Fairfax: Responded to Stewart in the chat. There are three students here from Ukraine. The Office of International Student and Scholar Services has been reaching out to them to offer support and help navigate support systems.

Vice Provost Fairfax: Think that sums this up without getting into individual circumstances. We are in close contact with the Ukrainian students and working out various methods of support networks across campus. Concern about family back home is the biggest area of concern, as well as the ability to stay in the United States past the time of their visa expiring.

President McConnell: Thanked Vice Provost Fairfax. Have worked with Vice Provost Fairfax and we are working closely with our congressional delegation, and they have been very helpful.

Claycomb: Commented in the chat that CSU counseling services sent a message to all students this afternoon offering support and counseling resources per any concerns around Ukraine.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell and Vice Provost Fairfax. Asked if there were additional questions.

Rob Mitchell: Have appointments at other universities and know there are a lot more conversations going on in terms of the nature of war and the things we can do to support. Wondering if there is a collective effort that the university is thinking about doing for support efforts in this growing potential humanitarian crisis in Europe.

President McConnell: Know some faculty members have scientific research going on and coalitions with scientists that are being affected by the war. We stand in support of science and the scientists doing the work and will do everything we can to support them through this process. As part of the President's Steering Committee on the Alliance on Immigration, we do work closely with the international community to try to provide refuge for students, scientists, and faculty members who are being displaced by war. Will keep everyone updated on progress.

Emily Morgan: Have a question regarding ongoing masking for the remainder of the semester. Am speaking specifically for the dance faculty. We hope there might be a possibility, if the mask mandate is lifted, to retain it in the performing arts. The masks and the vaccine mandate are the sole reason we have been able to have close physical proximity. The faculty also have concerns about their children, who are not yet old enough to be vaccinated. Wondering if there will be some consideration of that and allow us to keep our masks on.

President McConnell: Know the Pandemic Preparedness Team is looking at exceptions to the policy. This will be important to bring to their attention. Thanked Morgan for bringing this up.

Debora Nunes: Asked in the chat: Can you be more specific about the mask mandate changes? Wondering if there is a plan to conduct a survey among faculty and staff to see if they feel safe to go back to work, and students to go back to class, without masks before changing anything through the Pandemic Preparedness Team.

Chair Doe: Directed President McConnell's attention to a question from Nunes in the chat about mask mandates and if there was a plan to survey faculty and students before making the decision.

President McConnell: We know people have strong feelings in both directions. It was not our intent to do any surveying at this point. We are in communication with people around campus regularly, so there is a feedback loop there. Those that wish to continue wearing masks are welcome to continue wearing masks. There are K95 masks available in the bookstore if you show your ID. Fully support those who wish to continue wearing masks.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell. Seeing no additional questions, thanked President McConnell for being here. Expressed appreciation for the opportunity to hear a report.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – April 5, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm
b. Harry Rosenberg Award
    1. Nominations due to Andrew Norton by March 24th, 2022. Information can be found on the Faculty Council website: Harry Rosenberg Award | Faculty Council | Colorado State University (colostate.edu)

Chair Doe: Reminded members that nominations for the Harry Rosenberg Award are due to Andrew Norton by March 24th. Encouraged members to go to the website for more information.

Chair Doe: Vice President Naughton is here for our discussion item today. In April, we will have Athletic Director Joe Parker as well as members from the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. In May, we will have our Vice President for Inclusive Excellence Kauline Cipriani.
Chair Doe: Would like to return to the subject of Ontiveros. Have invited Shannon Archibeque-Engle here to say a few words. We learned so much from Ontiveros and she educated so many.

Shannon Archibeque-Engle: Thanked Chair Doe. Expressed appreciation for ability to say a few words about Ontiveros. Ontiveros retired in December 2020 after over fifty years at Colorado State University. She arrived in 1969 from Pueblo, Colorado as a first-generation college student. Ontiveros was engaged and committed to social justice. As a student, she was politically active. Ontiveros loved CSU and her commitment to the University and the tangible changes she made to the institution continued when she transitioned from student to employee. She was part of the team that brought the cultural resource centers to CSU and part of the team that brough the first trio grant to the University. Ontiveros was responsible for changing the admissions form so that students who had less than four letters in their last name could apply to Colorado State University. She was behind the creation of the first-generation scholarships, the first-generation University initiative, the Alliance Partnership, the Native American Legacy Award, the Community for Excellence, the Principles of Community, and so much more. Much of what defines Colorado State University regarding diversity and access can be traced back to Ontiveros and for that, Colorado State University will be forever grateful.

Archibeque-Engle: What comes up most is who Ontiveros was rather than what she did. Ontiveros was known for her honesty, authenticity, work ethic. She told the truth, she was consistent, and was transparent in the work she did. She brought people together and listened. Ontiveros never stopped trying to make Colorado State University live up to its promise to our students, the state of Colorado, and to each other. Thanked President McConnell and the CSU Police Department for making the final loop around the Oval for her service happen. It was a most fitting honor to a woman who gave so much of herself and helped shape the best parts of our value system at Colorado State University. Thanked everyone.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque-Engle.

C. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

a. Faculty Council Meeting – February 1, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to these minutes.

Hearing none, minutes considered approved by unanimous consent.

D. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – January 21 & 28, February 4 & 11, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any items that needed to be pulled for further discussion from this consent agenda.

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

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. Election – Faculty Council Chair – Committee on Faculty Governance – Leo Vijayasarathy, CoFG Representative
   a. Candidate Statement – Sue Doe

Leo Vijayasarathy: Asked if there were any nominations from the floor.

Hearing none, nominations closed by acclimation. Congratulated Chair Doe for re-election as Chair of Faculty Council.

2. Election – Faculty Council Vice Chair – Committee on Faculty Governance – Leo Vijayasarathy, CoFG Representative
   a. Candidate Statement – Steven Reising

Vijayasarathy: Asked if there were any nominations from the floor.

Pedros-Gascon: Would like to nominate Dr. Melinda Smith.

Mike Antolin: Seconded Smith's nomination in the chat.

Vijayasarathy: Confirmed that Smith was a member of Faculty Council and willing to serve.

Melinda Smith: Yes, am willing to serve.

Vijayasarathy: Directed members' attention to the ballot in the chat for voting.

Vijayasarathy: Announced Smith as the new Vice Chair. Congratulated Smith.

3. Election – Faculty Council Board of Governors Representative – Leo Vijayasarathy, CoFG Representative

a. Candidate Statement – Andrew Norton

Vijayasarathy: Asked if there were any nominations from the floor.

Vijayasarathy: Hearing none, nominations closed by acclimation. Congratulated Andrew Norton.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vijayasarathy for running the elections and for everyone's participation. Thanked Steve Reising for standing up for election for Vice Chair and congratulated Smith and Norton, looking forward to continuing the work.

4. 2022 CIOSU Biennial Reviews – Committee on University Programs – Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia, Chair

Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia: The recommendation from the Committee on University Programs is the continuation of 34 centers, and two centers are recommended for termination based on the requests made from the directors of each center. The process considers different steps. The job of the committee was easier this year due to the digital platform and the work of Dinaida Egan.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. Asked if there was any discussion of this report.

Chair Doe: Hearing none, report accepted and placed into the record.

5. CIOSU Proposal recommendations – Committee on University Programs – Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia, Chair

Suarez-Garcia: We received two different CIOSU applications this year and the Committee on University Programs felt strong support for one of them, the Food Systems Institute for Research, Engagement and Learning. This institute is not completely new and has been operating for a few years. The potential of this institution is huge to the University. Explained the application and the organizational chart, as well as mission and objectives of the institute. Invited the director of the institute, Michael Carolan, here to speak.

Michael Carolan: The Food Systems Institute was a food systems network for a number of years. The origin story dates back to around ten years ago when we started as a result of some visioning sessions out of Engagement and Extension. It has been an organic and intentional organization of faculty and graduate students across just about every college, totaling in excess of twenty faculty who were engaged in the food systems network. We would be reporting to a handful of Deans as well as two Vice Presidents. We were able to secure some funding from the Provost.

Carolan: We will be doing a needs assessment and identify food systems, classes and faculty that are involved in the food system space. We will also identify student organizations and clubs that are active in this space. If this vote is successful, we will begin to meet with identified faculty and continue to engage and reach out to various colleges. Can answer any questions.

Chair Doe: Thanked Carolan. Asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, requested a motion for this new center.

Suarez-Garcia: Move for the approval of the Food Systems Institute for Research, Engagement and Learning as a new institute at the University.

Pedros-Gascon: Second.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further discussion, requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved with one member abstaining due to involvement with the new CIOSU.

Suarez-Garcia: The second application we have for consideration is from the Center fort Artistic Books and Inclusive Narratives (CABIN). The Committee on University Programs felt this application did not meet our guidelines. We contacted the director to see if we could improve the application and we have not received an answer. Therefore, the committee felt we could not recommend this as a CIOSU.

Suarez-Garcia: Move that Faculty Council follow the recommendation made by the Committee on University Programs.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. Asked if there was any discussion about this motion.

Jason Bernagozzi: Had helped the CABIN group put together this application. Asked which chair had been contacted regarding these recommendations.

Suarez-Garcia: Was in communication with the chair of the Art Department. We had an exchange of communication and when they found out they did not need to apply for CIOSU status and could continue on as they had been, they determined they maybe needed to remove the application from the Committee on University Programs. There is nothing preventing CABIN from continuing to operate, but for recognition at the University level, it needs to follow the guidelines and that means involving more than one or two units. Had recommended additional support, maybe support from the Deans office. This application may have future potential, but right now, we cannot recommend it.

Chair Doe: Thanked Suarez-Garcia. We have a motion on the floor to approve the recommendation of the Committee on University Programs. Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved.

6. Proposed Revisions to Section E.5.3 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Marie Legare, Chair

Marie Legare: This was brought to the attention of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty from the Graduate School for a better definition of advising and mentoring going forward. We felt that clarification was needed within the Faculty Manual. Advising and mentoring is now an added component to annual reviews. The Committee on

Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty propose that Section E.5.3 be revised as shown in the agenda packet.

Smith: Moved.

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

Doreene Hyatt: Wondering about whether it was always in these guidelines about office hours being required.

Legare: If there is no strikethrough, then that language was in there before. Believe we made that change several years ago. We had written it so that office hours had to be amendable to both individuals. The office hours should be convenient.

Hyatt: Wondered because with the pandemic, have had office hours arranged by appointment.

Legare: Think the first part of that sentence takes care of that. We are expected to make time available for student conferences and advising. Also did appointments via Zoom. So long as you are making time, that is considered office hours.

Chair Doe: To keep us on the motion, anything not struck through is nothing new, as Legare has explained.

Silvia Canetto: Have a question about the changes, distinguishing mentoring from advising. Wondering what this distinction refers to and if there is a way to provide definitions of one versus the other, given that the performance of faculty is going to be evaluated in these two distinct categories.

Legare: At times, mentoring and advising greatly overlap. Most of us who advise are also good mentors, so we see it as one in the same. But there are changes, particular in the undergraduate world, where we have an individual doing a lot of the academic advising, whole faculty are now more involved in the mentoring of these students. There is some distinction where faculty mentor but do not necessarily advise. Depending on the job criteria and duties of the individual faculty, they may be doing a lot of mentoring, but not a lot of official academic advising.

Canetto: Wondering if we could put some language there that articulates what the distinction is and why it is there. This has consequences for faculty at work and faculty evaluations.

Legare: See where you are coming from. This was originally presented to us from a subcommittee within the Graduate School. This is the language they felt would be most appropriate to be included in the Manual, as this would differ between different departments.

Andrew Norton: Commented that the next motion has an entire paragraph distinguishing between mentoring and advising.

Chair Doe: Thanked the members. Asked if there were any other questions or comments. Hearing none, there is a motion on the floor. Requested a vote.

Motion approved.

7. Proposed Revisions to Section E.12.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Marie Legare, Chair

Legare: As Norton mentioned, this does go into a bit more detail. Move that Faculty Council approve the changes made to Section E.12.1. The major changes occur later in the document and they have more descriptors as to what these involve.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Asked if there were any questions.

Morgan Johnson: Commented in the chat that Communication Studies is having discussions about the types of mentorship that constitute teaching and the kinds that align with more service contributions, such as recruitment and retention of students. Asked: How or would this codification affect such departmental decisions?

Legare: Our goal is to help clarify those distinctions so departments can better go forward when doing their evaluations of individual faculty.

Morgan: Was wondering what the distinction between advising and mentoring are here and why mentoring is still evaluated as part of teaching as opposed to service. Wondering how mentorship that requires retention of students, for example, the kinds of mentorship that faculty of color are disproportionately asked to do, might actually speak to service requirements.

Legare: There is a bit of distinction within the mentorship category. We had a discussion on the mentoring of other faculty members, for instance, and it is not really under service. This is all part of teaching, advising, and mentoring, and not necessarily the service component.

Chair Doe: Thanked Legare. Seeing no further discussion, requested a second for motion.

Wes Kenney: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved.

8. Motion Regarding Repeat/Delete Policy – Committee on Teaching and Learning – Shawn Archibeque, Chair

Shawn Archibeque: On behalf of the Committee on Teaching and Learning, we move that the Repeat/Delete policy be renamed to “Repeat/Repair”. This was brought to us by the Academic

Success Coordinators, who indicated that there was some confusion by students using the policy. They were under the impression with the name Repeat/Delete that it would not be present on their transcripts anymore, and that is not the case. When they use this policy, the grade is not impacting the GPA, but it will remain on the transcript, and it remains a part of the permanent record. We are not changing any parts of the policy, just changing the name to help students better understand what occurs when they use this policy.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. Asked if there was a second for this motion.

Peter Jan van Leeuwen: Second.

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

Suarez-Garcia: Asked: Are you aware that the word "repair" has a negative connotation?

Archibeque: We did discuss that. The Academic Success Coordinators brought this language before us, and they felt that this was the most applicable term. We talked about "replace" again as well, but this would not be replacing the original grade, because the original grade would still be there. It will show that they had a negative outcome from the course the first time they attempted it.

Suarez-Garcia: Suggested using the word "revise" instead. Would be a synonym and does not have a negative connotation.

Archibeque: Not disagreeing. This is the language brought to us and that we are bringing forward.

Chair Doe: Seems like there is an effort here to represent the truth, which is that the transcript goes forward with this information still on there, rather than the pretense of it not being there.

Suarez-Garcia: Just concerned that with the evaluations we do of the transcript, if we see five courses that have "repair" next to it, it may raise some flags. The connotation of the word "repair" is negative, but it is realistic in this case.

Archibeque: To that point, this would not be changing what is on the transcript. This would just be for our internal communications in the University as students are accessing this policy as it is listed on our website and as the students are communicating with their Academic Success Coordinators.

Ali Pezeshki: Asked: Is the only mechanism for repair retaking the course?

Archibeque: We would not be revising any of the policies. The students are limited on the number of credits and courses that they can use this policy on, so we are not changing any of that. The students have to apply for this and there are several steps they need to go through for this to occur. There has been some criticism of those aspects of that policy, but that would be handled separately from this motion.

Pezeshki: Asked: When the students drop one of these courses, do they have to retake it?

Archibeque: Yes, the repair would be done through applying for the process and taking the course again in a separate semester. This has been the standing policy.

Pezeshki: For practical purposes, this would be about repairing or retaking or an equivalent.

Archibeque: Not necessarily. Students can retake a course, but still have their original grade applied to their GPA in this policy. It is limited in the credits allowed that they could apply for through this policy. They can retake other courses after they have used up these credits, which is a separate process.

Canetto: Language matters. Think there are enough comments about the language that it warrants some reflection about a good choice. Wondering if there can be some discussion about choosing a better word, given the negative connotations of "repair" so that it is clear for everyone. Can also consider some alternatives and commit to something that doesn't have negative connotations, even if it is only for internal use.

Olve Peersen: Wondering if students doing Repeat/Delete are bound to the second run-through, even if you get the worse grade during the retake. Asked: Is that correct?

Archibeque: Believe the policy has the original grade being replaced only if the second run-through is a higher grade.

Peersen: Then it would be repair as opposed to replace.

Archibeque: Correct.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for this discussion. We have a motion on the floor. Requested a second for the motion.

Joseph DiVerdi: Second.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved.

9. Motion Regarding Student Course Survey – Committee on Teaching and Learning – Shawn Archibeque, Chair

Archibeque: On behalf of the Committee on Teaching and Learning, move that the student course survey be opened for a standard period of time that will encompass the final two weeks of the semester through the Friday of finals week.

Archibeque: For some background on this, the vendor that is currently running our student course survey gives us two options. We can leave the student course survey as it currently is,

where each individual instructor for each individual class has control and needs to turn it on for each of the courses. The other option is that we have the student course survey open and close at set periods of time for all classes. These are the only two options that the vendor is putting on the table for us to work with.

Archibeque: Part of the reason this was brought forward to the Committee on Teaching and Learning is because currently only about 54% of the surveys are being activated in the courses out there, so it is not surprising that we have a low student response rate. We obviously are not getting the feedback we want there, so this motion is looking at having it open for a standard period of time. It would be the final two weeks of the semester through Friday of finals week, making sure we do not encompass the grade cutoff point, as faculty felt that grade entry may influence or have a negative connotation on the results.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. Requested a second before discussion.

Lisa Daunhauer: Second.

Emily Hardegree-Ullman: Commented in the chat that she does not open the course surveys because the questions are not relevant to her. She uses her own surveys. Commented that these are known to be biased against women and minorities.

Archibeque: Hardegree-Ullman brought up that student course surveys have been known to be biased against women and minorities. This was considered in the generation of the current form of the survey. Those modifications are under discussion, but that is separate from this proposal regarding the activation time.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. We have had many robust discussions regarding bias and student course evaluations. The current iteration of the survey is a five-year long effort to revise course surveys to be less biased, but it is always challenging. Expressed appreciation for Hardegree-Ullman's comments.

Lisa Langstraat: Commented in the chat that the confusion about the requirement for administering the course surveys is one of the reasons faculty don't use them. Department uses the language that we are "strongly encouraged" to analyze student responses to the surveys in our annual reviews. This suggests that faculty really have no choice.

Archibeque: The administering of the survey is still up to the faculty member. They could instruct their students not to fill out the course survey. This is under the purview of the instructor. As mentioned in the Faculty Manual, the provision of sending results further down the administrative chain is up to the individual faculty member as well.

Suarez-Garcia: In some cases and departments, it is required that we provide the results of these evaluations. Wondering how we can provide the results of the evaluations if we do not give students the opportunity to complete these evaluations. There are many issues that need to be evaluated here, not just the type of survey and when we open and close it, but also the requirement in some locations that surveys be administered and then provided to the department.

Archibeque: Think we have to follow what the handbook and departmental codes are. A lot of departments strongly encouraged the use of these surveys in their annual reviews. But as it is indicated in the Faculty Manual, it is recommended that multiple facets of evaluation of teaching effectiveness be used, not just a single survey. It is recommended that it could be a component, but that is not the purpose of the student course survey to evaluate teaching effectiveness, which is highlighted in the current form of the student course survey.

Chair Doe: Thanked everyone for the conversation. Seeing no further questions, we have a motion on the floor. Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved.

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

Yielded time for discussion. Posted report to the chat for members' viewing. An additional addendum was also posted to the chat.

H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Posted report in writing in the chat to yield time for discussion.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

No report at this time.

I. DISCUSSION

1. Extension Proposal – Vice President for Extension Blake Naughton

Vice President Blake Naughton: Will go over this discussion quickly with the hope we can bring this up as an item for voting in April.

Vice President Naughton: This is a proposal that has been winding through Faculty Council and other areas for about six years, which is related to the faculty status for our Extension professionals around the state. This is something the Directors Advisory Committee put forward in 2016. Research was done, votes taken, and then we continued the work with Faculty Council and Provost Office leadership. We have had some delays due to the pandemic. Thanked the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty and the Committee on Faculty Governance and Chair Doe for being helpful with this.

Vice President Naughton: There is a second part to this proposal, which Faculty Council will see at some point, and that is related to something called the Field School. This is a way of renaming

the Division of Continuing Education to encompass all our off-campus educational programs and services we offer. That is currently tabled, and we will discuss that another time.

Vice President Naughton: Today's discussion and proposal is about converting Extension agents and specialists to faculty titles. When we are talking about converting Extension professionals to faculty titles, we are talking about the academic work of Extension faculty. They do teach curriculum, apply scholarship, and the learning of individuals from youth to adult in a variety of ways based on their disciplines. There are certain professionals in our organization that are commonly recognized in Extension systems nationally as being faculty. We are the only state in the western United States where these professionals are not in faculty appointments.

Vice President Naughton: One of the rationalizations for this is the career ladder. We have faculty that move elsewhere where they can be promoted to associate and full levels and academic rank. It is also a way of thinking about increased expectations. We expect the impact of your work to show in different ways, and the peer review process will demonstrate that you are working at a higher level than an entry level faculty member. That peer review process is critical and a big switch from an administrative professional line to being faculty where the internal and external peer review will carry and understand the craft of their disciplines.

Vice President Naughton: The other rationalization is that this is the norm. As mentioned earlier, we are the only state in the west, and one of the only ones in the whole country that do not have faculty positions. We have difficulty recruiting and retaining, both of which are important for the long-term effects of Colorado State University. We want trusted professionals around the state, great students coming to this institution, and building the reputational effects.

Vice President Naughton: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty and Legare helped us navigate the best way to create this new appointment type and where visiting and affiliate faculty go. These are faculty that are not regularly represented on Faculty Council, and that is a conversation we can have over time about whether that needs to change.

Vice President Naughton: For now, this is the category that makes the most sense for Extension. These are at-will, meaning non-tenured appointments, and that is related to Colorado law as our funding comes from county offices and other areas. These positions would not be able to be tenured but would be ranked as non-tenure track faculty positions. These individuals are limited to non-credit courses, unless they are invited by academic departments and teaching or mentoring graduate students for credit opportunities. To be specific, there is only a certain stripe of professionals that would be eligible for these positions, and those are the individuals doing faculty-level work. Those are our county agents and regional specialists. We do have some specialists on campus that would be included in this who aren't in academic departments but doing specialist work as well.

Vice President Naughton: We would commit to having an elected Extension assembly, a form of faculty governance for this group, since they would not be regularly represented on the Faculty Council. This would be a bridge ensuring they are formally represented in shared governance.
Vice President Naughton: There are about 120 Extension agents and specialists around the state that would be affected by this and be converted from administrative professional appointments to

faculty appointments. These are people doing work around educating and demonstrating strong academic ability and credentials. Stated that this would not be something that would cost anything to the general campus. We get our budget from the experiment station in the Colorado State Forest Service or from counties and federal funds.

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

Norton: Asked if Vice President Naughton could go over the process that they went through to come up with this model for CSU Extension faculty.

Vice President Naughton: There was a committee that was initially exploring this. Directed members' attention to a link on Extension website where different materials, including benchmarks, can be found. We looked at models at other peer states. We also had a task force launched that had Extension professionals from around the state and some Extension faculty on campus who have experience going through promotion. This is the group that is working on what would be the code for these faculty just like codes for departments and colleges and other academic units. We will also go through the normal process of Provost approval after a vote of these professionals and determining the details of faculty criteria, promotion, appointment, and other details.

Rob Mitchell: Wondering how this will impact the research focus as an R1 institution and how this may play out in terms of how we position ourselves as a research university.

Vice President Naughton: Previous institution was University of Missouri, where field staff were faculty as well. What is important to know are student and faculty ratios and that this is a segmented group of faculty that are in an institutional research office. We will separate the metrics to make sure it is clear that this class of faculty works in a different way and for a different purpose that our teaching and student-facing faculty on campus. Any metric of looking at R1 research productivity would not include these faculty in those metrics, because that is not their purpose.

Canetto: Asked for clarification on the demographic profile of these individuals.

Vice President Naughton: Of the 120 that would be eligible for faculty status, the majority are female. Believe it is about 60%. Many of them have disciplinary split appointments, There are a broad range of disciplines and they are required to have a Masters degree. We have a good number of PhDs as well, though that is not required. We also hire in more rural areas where it is difficult to recruit particularly diverse candidates. We will hire people at the Bachelors level and allow them time to complete a Masters degree within a certain period of time upon appointment. The demographic profile is skewing quite young. In the past five years, over half of our agents and specialists have turned over due to retirements. Our workforce does not demographically racially represent Colorado, and it is something we are working on. We hired Eric Ishiwata as our DEI specialist for Extension. This is helping us to think of new ways to attract and retain a more diverse workforce that better reflects the people of Colorado. This fall, we will have a review from the Civil Rights Office of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which provides our

federal funding, and they will be consultants with us on finding better ways to attract diverse learners and diverse faculty and staff for our workforce.

van Leeuwen: Asked if this was just a way to explore expertise without real responsibility.

Vice President Naughton: These are obviously administrative professional appointments now, which are at-will according to the current nomenclature here in the state of Colorado. Most of these individuals are split funded three ways, federal, state, and county funding. Because of this, we are not able to offer tenure because there is more institutional risk for that over time. We might explore whether we could have higher rank or contract arrangements. During work with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, have learned that the Manual specifies contract, continuing, and adjunct as appointment types, and we can explore the actual employment relationship being either a continuing or contract arrangement, even though it's not the appointment type we are replicating in this sense.

Mary Van Buren: Despite the differences in funding mechanisms, am assuming these are all CSU employees. Wondering also, if this is organized as a school, why there wouldn't be representatives at Faculty Council.

Vice President Naughton: The employees that would be eligible for faculty appointments would only be those that are CSU employees, which is the majority of our county agents and all our regional and state specialists. We do have some county agents who are county employees, and administrative staff who are county employees. Our county partnerships work through Cooperative Extension, which means we cooperate with counties and work through an MOU arrangement. For the handful of agents who aren't CSU employees, counties might offer to transfer them to CSU.

Randall Boone: Asked in the chat: Would these folks join CCAF status? If so, wondering if that group is comfortable with their ranks swelling. Asked: Are there any repercussions for Council representation given our recent votes to change CCAF representation on Faculty Council?

Vice President Naughton: For the other question about governance, we have been talking to the Committee on Faculty Governance about different ways to do this. Some agents that work in other areas may not be interested in serving on committees. We need to talk to these individuals about representation on Faculty Council and what would be helpful for them, such as serving on certain committees that apply to their work. This is a conversation that needs to continue and contemplating what shared governance would look like. We want to make sure this doesn't conflict with important issues being discussed. We also do not want to derail those conversations for our campus CCA faculty who are experiencing important changes in their representation.

Chair Doe: Would be interesting to get the input of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty to hear what their concerns would be. Asked if there were any other comments or questions.

Jenny Morse: Indicated in the chat that the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty would welcome a conversation.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further comments, thanked Vice President Naughton for bringing this discussion. Know we will see things in the future but was important to hear the concept. Encouraged members to think about this and read through the slides provided.

Chair Doe: Thanked members for being here. Hearing no further comments or discussion, called meeting adjourned.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:19 p.m.

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

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

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

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Dawn Thilmany	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2022
(substituting for Stephan Kroll, on sabbatical Spring 2022)		
Jennifer Martin	Animal Sciences	2024
Jane Stewart	Agricultural Biology	2024
Kelly Curl	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2022
Jim Ippolito	Soil and Crop Sciences	2023
Steve Fonte	College-at-Large	2023
(substituting for Marco Costanigro, on sabbatical 2021-2022)		
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2022
Andrew Norton	College-at-Large	2023
Health and Human Sciences		
Ruoh-Nan (Terry) Yan	Design and Merchandising	2024
Raoul Reiser	Health and Exercise Science	2022
David Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2022
Lisa Daunhauer	Human Development and Family Studies	2023
Erin Arneson	Construction Management	2023
Aaron Eakman	Occupational Therapy	2023
Sharon Anderson	School of Education	2024

Shannon Hughes	School of Social Work	2022
Brian Butki	College-at-Large	2024
Business		
Bill Rankin	Accounting	2023
John Hoxmeier	Computer Information Systems	2024
John Elder	Finance and Real Estate	2022
Rob Mitchell	Management	2024
Jonathan Zhang	Marketing	2023
Engineering		
Peter Jan van Leeuwen	Atmospheric Science	2024
Margarita Herrera-Alonso	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2022
Hussam Mahmoud	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2024
Ali Pezeshki	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2022
Kirk McGilvray	Mechanical Engineering	2023
Thomas Bradley	Systems Engineering	2023
Sybil Sharvelle	College-at-Large	2023
Steven Reising	College-at-Large	2022
J. Rockey Luo	College-at-Large	2022
Liberal Arts		
Mary Van Buren	Anthropology & Geography	2023
Jason Bernagozzi	Art	2022
Morgan Johnson	Communication Studies	2022
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 (excused) (on sabbatical Spring 2022)	College-at-Large	2023
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	2024
Rob Paton	Chemistry	2023
Ross McConnell	Computer Science	2022
Emily Hardegree-Ullman	Physics	2024
Silvia Canetto	Psychology	2022
Ann Hess	Statistics	2022
(substituting for Mary Meyer, on sabbatical 2021-2022)		
Yongcheng Zhou	Mathematics	2023
Alan Van Orden	College-at-Large	2023
Anton Betten	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
Kevin Haussler	Clinical Sciences	2022
Elizabeth Ryan	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2023
Tony Schountz	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
Candace Mathiason	College-at-Large	2022
Marie Legare	College-at-Large	2023
Doreene Hyatt	College-at-Large	2022
Christianne Magee	College-at-Large	2022
Jennifer Peel	College-at-Large	2023
John Rosecrance	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
Shane Kanatous, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2022
Jerry Magloughlin, 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
Alan Kennan, 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
Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia, Chair	Committee on University Programs	2022
Brad Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2022
Susan (Suellen) Melzer	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
Christine Pawliuk	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Leann Kaiser	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Jamie Neilson	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Leslie Stone-Roy	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2022
Mary Van Buren	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
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
Yolanda Bevill	Interim 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
Kathleen Fairfax	Vice Provost for International Affairs
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
Colin Clay	Interim Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

John Hayes	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Sarah Olson	Chair, Administrative Professional Council