

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

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

MINUTES
FACULTY COUNCIL
November 1, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m. by Mr. Robert L. Jones, Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Next Faculty Council Meeting - December 6, 2005 - A103 Clark Building
- 4:15 p.m.

Mr. Jones announced that the next Faculty Council meeting will be held on December 6, 2005 in Room A103 Clark Building.

- B. Administrative/Faculty Dialogue - November 1, 2005 - 3:45 to 4:15 p.m. - To Be Determined

Mr. Jones announced that the Administrative/Faculty Council Dialogue for the December 6, 2005 Faculty Council meeting will be announced at a later date.

- C. Faculty Council Current Issues Topic - December 6, 2005 - To Be Determined

Mr. Jones announced that the Current Issues Topic for the December 6, 2005 Faculty Council meeting will be announced at a later date.

- D. *Proposed Revisions to the Manual, Section C.2.1.2 - Powers and Responsibilities - Committee on Faculty Governance*
- E. *Proposed Revisions to the Manual, Section C.2.1.9.4 - Election to Membership and Term of Service - Committee on Faculty Governance*
- F. *Proposed Revisions to the Manual, Section C.2.1.9.5.b - Standing Committees: Membership and Function - Committee on Faculty Governance - Committee on Faculty Governance*
- G. *Proposed Revisions to the Manual, Section C.2.1.9.5.g. -Standing Committees: Membership and Function - Committee on Scholastic Standards and Awards - Committee on Faculty Governance*
- H. *Proposed Revisions to the Manual, Section C.2.2 - Procedures for Programmatic and Organizational Change - Committee on Faculty Governance*
- I. *Proposed Revisions to the Manual, Section C.2.3.1.e - Colleges and Academic Departments - College of Engineering - Committee on Faculty Governance*
- J. *Proposed Revisions to the Manual, Section C.2.3.1.f - Colleges and Academic Departments - College of Natural Resources - Committee on Faculty Governance*
- K. *Proposed Revisions to the Manual, Section C.2.5 - Evaluation of Performance of Faculty - Committee on Faculty Governance*

Mr. Jones recognized Ms. Sue Pendell, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance. Ms. Pendell announced that items D. through K. are proposed revisions to the Code Section of the Manual and will be action items at the December 6, 2005 Faculty Council meeting.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

A. FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - OCTOBER 4, 2005

THE OCTOBER 4, 2005 FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES WERE APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

A. BOARD OF GOVERNORS REPORT - OCTOBER 7, 2005 - MR. F. C. "TED" WESTON, FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Mr. Jones recognized Mr. F. C. "Ted" Weston, Faculty Representative to the Board of Governors. Mr. Weston noted that his report could be found on pages 32-33 of the November 1, 2005 Faculty Council agenda materials.

MR. WESTON'S REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

B. PROVOST/SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT REPORT - MR. TONY FRANK, PROVOST/SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. Jones recognized Mr. Tony Frank, Provost/Senior Vice President. Mr. Frank reported that there was no new information regarding the searches for the Vice President for Research, Dean of Liberal Arts and Dean of Engineering. Mr. Frank noted searches for the new administrative positions, related to the reorganization of the University, will begin soon. Mr. Frank reported that the University Planning Council Advisory Group will be meeting with the Provost on November 2, 2005. Mr. Frank reminded Faculty Council members that the planning and budget cycle for 2006-07 will begin in the next few weeks. He noted that there are multiple ways for faculty to interact in this planning process and urged faculty to participate.

He added that draft budgets will be forthcoming in Spring 2006 and the University budget will be reviewed by the Board of Governors in May and June.

MR. FRANK'S REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

C. FACULTY COUNCIL CHAIR REPORT - MR. ROBERT JONES, FACULTY COUNCIL CHAIR

Mr. Jones reported that the October 11, 2005 Executive Committee meeting minutes are included in the agenda materials. Mr. Jones announced that he and Mr. Kenneth Klopfenstein, Vice Chair, Faculty Council, met with two students from the Greek Life Council. The students requested the meeting seeking advise on ways to strengthen and maintain the Greek chapters recruiting and relationships with a faculty advisor. He asked that if anyone was interested to please contact the Faculty Council office.

MR. JONES' REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

SPECIAL ACTIONS

A. CHANGES IN CURRICULUM TO BE APPROVED: UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES SEPTEMBER 19, AND OCTOBER 3, 2005

Mr. Jones recognized Ms. Carole Makela, Chair, University Curriculum Committee.

Ms. Carole Makela, Chair, University Curriculum Committee MOVED THAT THE FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE ACTION ITEMS IN THE SEPTEMBER 19, AND OCTOBER 3, 2005 UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES CHANGES IN CURRICULUM.

Ms. Makela noted the following exemptions in the September 19, 2005 University Curriculum Committee Minutes:

1. Request to Change the Name of the Department of Fishery and Wildlife Biology

Ms. Makela's motion was adopted.

B. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, SECTION E.1 - DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC FACULTY - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Richard Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, MOVED, THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL SECTION E.1 - DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC FACULTY, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

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

E.1 Definition of Academic Faculty (~~last revised March 14, 2000~~)

The academic faculty includes all personnel who carry academic rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, ~~lecturer~~, instructor, lecturer, faculty affiliate) and additional personnel as defined by C.R.S. 23-31-113.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the listing of Academic Faculty should be in order of decreasing rank. Mr. Eykholt noted that time served as an instructor counts toward the probationary period for tenure, but time served as a lecturer does not.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

C. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, SECTION E.10.5.1 - ORIGIN AND PROCESSING OF TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic

Faculty, MOVED, THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL SECTION E.10.5 – PROCEDURES FOR THE GRANTING OF TENURE, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

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

E.10.5 Procedures for the Granting of Tenure (~~last revised June 15, 2005~~)

E.10.5.1 Origin and Processing of Tenure Recommendations

The head of the department shall initiate the process leading to a recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure not later than the sixth year of service of a regular member of the faculty and not later than the final year of the probationary period of the faculty member. Because the recommendation for the granting or denial of tenure is primarily a faculty responsibility, the department head shall ask the members of the tenure committee, to vote by ballot for or granting of tenure to the faculty member being considered. A tenure recommendation shall be by a majority vote of the tenure committee.¹ The recommendation shall include a vote summary and a statement of reasons representing the majority and minority points of view. The recommendation shall be forwarded successively to the department head, the dean of the college, the Provost, and the President for review and either endorsement or opposition. The Board has delegated the final decision to the President.

All reviews are to be exercised expeditiously at each level. After

¹ The use of the term "majority" in this *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* shall be according to the definition provided in *Robert's Rules of Order*, that is, more than half of the votes cast, ignoring blanks.

each review, the reviewing administrator shall make a recommendation in writing and send copies to the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation.

The tenure committee must have at least three members and shall consist of all eligible department faculty, or, if so specified in the department code, a duly elected committee thereof. The department head, college dean, Provost, and President are not eligible to serve on the tenure committee. A faculty member holding an administrative appointment (as defined in Section K.12a) of more than half time is not eligible to serve on the tenure committee, unless the department code specifies otherwise. If a faculty member holding an administrative appointment does serve on the tenure committee, it is expected that he or she will not participate in discussions of the case at higher administrative levels. The eligible department faculty are all other tenured department faculty, except for those faculty members who are allowed by the University Grievance Officer to recuse themselves. If a committee of at least three tenured faculty cannot be constituted, then additional members shall be selected from other departments within the college so as to produce a committee of three members. The department head shall draw these additional members by lot from faculty on tenure committees within the college. A department may specify in its code a procedure for narrowing the selection of additional members to faculty in disciplines similar to that of the candidate. In the absence of such a procedure, the selection will be from all faculty on the tenure committees from all department within the college.

After a recommendation is received from the tenure committee, a contrary recommendation shall be issued at a higher administrative level below the President only for

compelling reasons which shall be stated in writing to the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation. If such a contrary recommendation is issued, the faculty member, the tenure committee, and all administrators who have previously reviewed the recommendation shall be given seven (7) working days from the date of notification of the contrary recommendation to respond in writing to the administrator's reasons for opposition, and the contrary recommendation may be opposed at an even higher administrative level. The responses from the faculty member, the tenure committee, and the administrators shall be forwarded to each successive administrator along with the recommendation and rationale for the contrary recommendation.

When a department head is under consideration for tenure, the successive forwarding of the tenure committee's recommendation shall begin with the dean of the college, rather than the department head.

The department head, the college dean, or the Provost may elect to postpone consideration of a faculty member for tenure, without prejudice, if a the recommendation from the tenure committee for the granting or denial of tenure is made in a year earlier than the final year of the probationary period. The decision to postpone and the reasons for postponement shall be communicated immediately in writing to the faculty member and the tenure committee. Nonetheless, the faculty member must be granted tenure or her or his contract terminated by the end of the seventh year of regular or regular part-time service (except when there is an extension beyond this as described in Sections E.10.4.c and E.10.4.d). Once a faculty member is on a regular tenure track appointment, the use of special or temporary appointments to extend the probationary

period for tenure is not permitted.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the revisions to the sixth paragraph are proposed to clarify what "recommendation" is being referred to. The previous paragraphs were included for clarification and had no revisions.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

D. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, SECTION E.10.7. - DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOR TENURED FACULTY - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, MOVED, THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL SECTION E.10.7 - DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOR TENURED FACULTY, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

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

E.10.7.5.5 Reversal or Modification of Hearing Committee Recommendations

The Faculty Member's immediate supervisor, the dean, or the Provost may, for significantly convincing reasons, recommend action more or less severe than that recommended by the Hearing Committee. The convincing reasons for such a reversal of a recommendation at any administrative level must be stated in writing and be transmitted to the Faculty Member, the members of the Hearing Committee, and to the next person in the administrative chain (dean, Provost, or President). Upon reversal or modification of the recommendation, the Hearing Committee and/or

Faculty Member may appeal the decision to the next level in the administrative chain (dean, Provost, or President). This appeal shall be submitted in writing, not to exceed five working days after the reversal or modification of the recommendation. The appeal shall be considered at each succeeding level in the administrative chain. If the Hearing Committee or Faculty Member does not file an appeal within five working days after the reversal, the recommendation shall be forwarded to the next level in the administrative chain. The Provost shall make a report of the case to the President with a recommendation of the action to be taken. The decision of the President is final.

E.10.7.7 Time Limit for Action by the Provost

Pursuant to the recommendations of the Hearing Committee the Provost must act on revocation of tenure or disciplinary action recommendations within 10 working days of receiving the ~~Hearing Committee's report. No recommendation shall become final without~~ approval of the President.

~~E.10.7.8 Appeal of Decision~~

~~In the event that the Faculty Member is dissatisfied with the President's decision, the Faculty member can appeal the decision to the Board (see Section K.5.8.3).~~

Mr. Eykholt explained that the proposed revisions conform to the Board's decision that it will no longer hear appeals of disciplinary actions against tenured faculty.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

E. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, SECTION E.11 - PERFORMANCE

EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT SALARY INCREASES -
COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, MOVED, THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL SECTION E.11 - PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND MERIT SALARY INCREASES, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

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

**E.11 Performance Expectations for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Salary
Increases (~~last revised June 10, 1998~~)**

All faculty being considered for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate a level of excellence appropriate to the rank under consideration and consistent with the standards of their discipline, their unit's institutional mission, and the faculty member's individual effort distribution in teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service and/or outreach.

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

articulated criteria and standards for evaluation in these areas.

Mr. Eykholt explained that this proposed revision acknowledges that different faculty members may have different effort distributions among the various categories for evaluation.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

F. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, SECTION K.11.7.1 - GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE - PROVOST REVIEW - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, MOVED, THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL SECTION K.11.7.1 - PROVOST REVIEW, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

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

K.11.7.1 Provost Review (~~last revised May 5, 2005~~)

The Provost shall consider the recommendations of the Hearing Committee concerning a Grievance only on the basis of the written record accumulated to that point, together with an appeal, if any, by the Grievant. An appeal by the Grievant must be submitted to the Provost within five working days after receipt of the written decision of the Hearing Committee and must provide reasons for the appeal. Failure of the Grievant to file an appeal within this time frame shall constitute acceptance of the Hearing Committee decision. No party may introduce new substantive issues. The Provost shall overturn a decision of the Hearing Committee only if there is a finding that the decision of the Hearing Committee was unfair, unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious, or discriminatory.

Within ten working days of an appeal from the Grievant or a Hearing Committee decision that was not appealed, the Provost shall respond by providing to all parties to the Grievance and the UGO a written statement of the decision rendered with a summary of relevant evidence and the reasoning that sustains the decision. ~~Failure of the Provost to respond to an appeal within the designated time period shall permit the Grievant to take the appeal to the President.~~

Mr. Eykholt explained that this proposed revisions clarifies that the Provost should always respond to such an appeal.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

G. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, APPENDIX 1: SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, MOVED, THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL APPENDIX 1 - SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

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

APPENDIX 1: SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

III. Resolution of a Complaint

B. Formal Resolution

6. Administrative Action Following the Hearing Committee

Recommendations

The senior administrative officer may accept the recommendations of the Hearing Committee or may recommend disciplinary actions more or less severe than those recommended by the Hearing Committee for persuasive reasons that shall be stated in writing to the Respondent and the Hearing Committee. If the Respondent accepts the recommendation of the senior administrative officer, the remedial action or disciplinary sanction shall be implemented without further review by the President. If the Respondent rejects such officer's recommendation, the President shall review the case and recommendation and shall make the final decision on the disposition of the case. Since the procedures herein are designed to provide appropriate relief and due process, appeals through other grievance procedures such as Section K of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* cannot be made by either party. ~~However, appeals of the President's decision can be made to the Board.~~

Mr. Eykholt explained that this proposed revisions complies with the Board's decision that it will no longer hear appeals of sexual harassment cases.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

- H. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL, APPENDIX 4: PROCEDURES FOR RESOLUTION OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS (OTHER THAN SEXUAL HARASSMENT) - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic

Faculty, MOVED, THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MANUAL APPENDIX 4 - PROCEDURE FOR RESOLUTION OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS (OTHER THAN SEXUAL HARASSMENT), TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

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

**APPENDIX 4: PROCEDURE FOR RESOLUTION OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS
(OTHER THAN SEXUAL HARASSMENT) ~~(adopted June 22, 2004)~~**

I. Policy

no change

II. Applicability of Policy

no change

III. Definitions

A. Complainant

A complainant is a current or former Colorado State University: 1) student, 2) student employee, 3) academic faculty member, 4) administrative professional, or 5) employee who files a complaint. Volunteers and others who encounter issues covered by this policy are encouraged to contact the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity for guidance regarding appropriate channels to pursue.

B. Respondent

no change

C. Discriminatory Act or Policy

no change

D. Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (OEOD)

This office is a unit of the University that reports to the ~~Provost~~ President. It is administered by the Director and Associate Director, it attempts to conciliate informal complaints of discrimination, and it investigates and hears formal complaints of discrimination.

E. Associate Director

The Associate Director of OEOD receives all complaints, both informal and formal, extends all deadlines as deemed appropriate, coordinates the procedures listed under this policy, and informs all parties of the procedures and deadlines under this policy.

F. Director/Hearing Officer

The Director of OEOD shall serve as the Hearing Officer for formal complaints that are referred for a hearing. Any party to the Hearing may submit to the ~~Provost~~ Vice President of his or her administrative unit a written statement claiming that the Director has a conflict of interest. If the ~~Provost~~ Vice President agrees, then he or she shall appoint a different Hearing Officer after consultation with the Office of the General Counsel. If the ~~Provost~~ Vice President is a party to the Hearing, then this duty shall be assumed by the President.

G. Complaint

no change

IV. The Form of the Complaint

To file either an informal or formal complaint, a prospective complainant must submit to the Associate Director a written signed dated document containing the following information:

A. Identification of the Complainant and Respondent(s) and the nature

of their relationships to the University;

- B. the type of discrimination alleged (see Section III.C);
- C. a description of the circumstances of the alleged discrimination, including the dates(s) and location(s), witnesses, and supporting documents, if available; and
- D. a designation of whether the complaint is informal or formal.

V. **Time Restriction and Conditions for Filing Either an Informal or Formal Complaint**

- A. Both informal and formal complaints shall be submitted to the Associate Director within one hundred eighty (180) calendar days from the time the Complainant becomes aware of the alleged discrimination. The ~~CEO~~ Associate Director has the discretion to consider a complaint outside this time frame, but compelling reasons must be given for extending the deadline.
- B. no change
- C. no change

VI. **Resolution of Informal Complaints**

Informal resolution of discrimination complaints is encouraged whenever possible. In order for an informal complaint to proceed, the parties must have agreed to participate. When an informal complaint is received by the Associate Director, the following steps shall be completed within twenty (20) working days of receipt;

- A. no change
- B. no change
- C. no change

- D. *no change*
- E. *no change*
- F. *no change*
- G. *no change*

A brief summary of the informal process shall be kept on file in the archives of the OEOD for the duration of the employment of the Complainant and Respondent(s), and it shall be considered to be part of the official Personnel Files of the Complainant and Respondent(s). If the Complaint is dismissed, the summary shall include the reasons for dismissal. If an informal resolution is achieved, the summary shall include the conditions of the resolution, including any written understandings. If a resolution is not achieved, the summary will include a statement to this effect.

VII. Resolution of Formal Complaints

- A. **Notification**
no change
- B. **Respondent's Reply**
no change
- C. **Complaint and Reply**
no change
- D. **Notification of Hearing**
no change
- E. **Submission of Names of Witnesses and Exhibits by the Parties**
no change
- F. **Hearing Proceedings**

1. **Rights of Participants**
no change
2. **Rules of Evidence**
no change
3. **Identification of Witnesses and Exhibits**
no change
4. **Notification of Witnesses**
no change
5. **Role of Hearing Officer**
no change
6. **Hearing**
no change
7. **Issuance of Hearing Officer's Written Report**
no change
8. **Written Records**

All written records, including the Complaint and each Reply; the verbatim record of the Hearing; supporting documents; the written report of the Hearing Officer; administrative reviews of the Hearing Officer's recommendations; appeals, replies, and results of appeals; and final actions, shall be kept on file in the archives of the OEOD for the duration of the employment of the Complainant and Respondent(s), and these shall be considered to be part of the official Personnel Files of the Complainant and Respondent(s).

VIII. Appeals and Administrative Review

A. Appeals

1. **Appeals of Hearing Officer's Recommendations**
no change
2. **Vice President's Review of Hearing Officer's Report**

Within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Appeal, the Hearing Officer shall forward the Appeal, the reply, and the record of the Hearing to the Vice President charged with overseeing each Respondent's area of employment (or the President, if the Respondent is a Vice President). The Vice Presidential (Presidential) review shall be completed within twenty (20) working days. The decision from this review is final. Each party and the Hearing Officer shall be provided with the written result of the Vice Presidential (Presidential) review, specifying in writing the reasons for support or modification of the Hearing Officer's recommendations with regard to the Respondent(s) overseen by him or her.

3. Administrative Action Following Review of Hearing Officer's Report

no change

B. Administrative Review

no change

IX. Expectations for Members of the University Community

A. Cooperation and Participation by Members of the University Community

no change

B. Truthful Testimony

The Complainant, Respondent(s), and all witnesses shall be truthful in their testimony. This includes statements made in the Complaint and each Reply. Failure to comply with this expectation may result in the implementation of ~~established~~ University sanctions.

C. Protection of Participants

No person shall restrain, interfere with, coerce, attempt to intimidate,

or take any reprisal against a participant under these procedures. Failure to comply with this expectation may result in the implementation of ~~established~~ University sanctions.

D. False or Malicious Charges

Intentionally making false or malicious charges may result in the implementation of ~~established~~ University sanctions against the Complainant.

Mr. Eykholt explained that the section has been amended to reflect the following changes:

1. The Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) has been renamed the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity (OEOD).
2. This office now reports directly to the President, rather than to the Provost. As a byproduct of this change, it is no longer appropriate to send to the Provost all claims that the Director of OEOD has a conflict of interest. Instead, such claims will now be sent to the Vice President of the division involved.
3. The Board has decided that it will no longer hear appeals.

Finally, in the final three paragraphs, the word "established" has been deleted, since Faculty Council decided last year to make this same change to Section K on the grievance process.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

- I. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE 2004 - 2006 GENERAL CATALOG (PAGE 47) - COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

Mr. Michael Palmquist, Chair, Committee on Teaching and Learning, MOVED, THAT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE "REPEAT/DELETE POLICY," WHICH

APPEARS ON PAGE 47 OF THE 2004-2006 GENERAL CATALOG, BE ADOPTED BY FACULTY COUNCIL (EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY) AS FOLLOWS:

Additions - Underlined Deletions - ~~Overseored~~

Repeat/Delete Policy

Repeat/Delete is a one-time per course grading option that may be used by undergraduate students who repeat a course. The following rules apply when the Repeat/Delete option is applied:

1. The grade received in the repeated course will be used in calculating the student's GPA, regardless of whether the repeated grade is higher, the same as, or lower than the initial grade received. The initial grade will remain on the transcript, but will not be used in calculating the GPA when the Repeat/Delete option is applied. ~~Use of the repeat/delete policy may change a student's cumulative grade point average, but will not result in a notation of probation on the student's transcript.~~
2. It is the student's responsibility to request the Repeat/Delete option from the Registrar, before the expiration of the course withdrawal period in the semester in which the course is first repeated.
3. The Repeat/Delete option may be used for a maximum of ten (10) credit hours and no more than three courses. The Repeat/Delete option may not be applied to courses for which the final grade was given as a penalty for academic dishonesty.
4. If the course is repeated at any time subsequent to the use of the Repeat/Delete option, all grades in that course, except the initial grade, are used in computing the student's GPA.
5. Although a course may be repeated as often as a student chooses, the Repeat/Delete option can be used only the first time a course is repeated.

6. The Repeat/Delete option will not retroactively affect academic standing for previous terms. For example, use of the repeat/delete option may change a student's cumulative grade point average, but will not change of a notation of probation previously recorded on the student's transcript record.

Note: Although the University does not use the original Repeat/Delete grade for GPA calculation, other educational institutions and potential employers may use this grade in their GPA calculation. Medical schools, many law schools, and other graduate programs, for example, may recalculate cumulative GPA using ALL grades on a transcript.

Mr. Palmquist explained that proposed revisions to the Repeat/Delete Policy will help to clarify the potential consequences for students using the Repeat/Delete Policy. This proposal is in response to questions and concerns expressed by students. The description of potential consequences have been added to the Repeat/Delete request form. Addition of this these potential consequences in the *General Catalog* will ensure that students, who are considering whether to use the Repeat/Delete option for a course in which they are currently enrolled, will be better informed about the ramifications associated with exercising the Repeat/Delete option. The committee consulted with representatives from the Office of the Provost/Senior Vice President and Enrollment Services regarding the proposed revisions.

MR. PALMQUIST'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

CURRENT ISSUES TOPIC

- A. "STUDENT ISSUES AT COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY" - MS. COURTNEY HEALEY, ASCSU PRESIDENT AND MS. MISTY LENARD, ASCSU DIRECTOR OF ACADEMICS

Mr. Jones introduced Ms. Courtney Healey, ASCSU President, Ms. Misty Lenard, ASCSU Director of Academics, and Ms. Meagan Hart, ASCSU Assistant Director of

Academics.

Ms. Healey thanked the Faculty Council members for the opportunity to participate in a Current Issues Topic at a Faculty Council meeting. She added that the ASCSU students especially appreciate the opportunity afforded to them to participate as members of selected standing committees of Faculty Council. Ms. Healey noted that while ASCSU addresses many issues of concern to the student body, the following are three issues which it currently is focusing upon and would like input from Faculty Council.

Advising

The advising that a CSU student receives has the potential to make or break that student's success at CSU. Knowing what a valuable resource advising can be to students, ASCSU has begun to collect student reaction and input on their advising experiences. The student body feels that requiring quality advising for every student on at least an annual basis would help students use their time at our university more effectively and hopefully graduate in four years. Only 34% of the students enrolled at CSU in 1999 graduated in 2003 (in four years). We know that advisors are a resource with the potential to increase the frequency of students graduating on time.

South Campus Study Area

The South Campus Study Area has been an important project to ASCSU and students at large for several years. This year, pending the approval of the University Facility Fee Advisory Board, it will become a reality. The Study Area will be in the form of an addition to the Microbiology Building and the whole project will cost about \$500,000. It will seat approximately 100 students in the indoor area. It will be open 24 hours and available for the use of all students at all times. Just for clarification, the study area will actually be on the south part of the main campus, not the South CSU Campus (the Vet School).

Honor Code

The honor code is another project which ASCSU has endeavored to further in previous years. Creating an environment of accountability for themselves and their peers is important to students and fosters a sense of pride and confidence in the

university which makes learning as well as teaching more trouble-free. The Committee on Teaching and Learning has created a sub-committee for the honor code, on which ASCSU Director of Academics Misty Lenard will sit. The committee is currently working from the copy of the honor code which previous ASCSU Director of Academics Courtney Cage assisted in creating.

Ms. Lenard shared data graphically with Faculty Council members on advising and student graduation rates in four or five years. She noted that approximately 50 percent of the students graduating take five years. She noted that better and more advising might help students to graduate in four years. Ms. Lenard noted that every department has different rules regarding advising. The ASCSU is considering required advising for students to make advising more equitable across the departments. She asked if requiring advising on an annual basis for every student would be beneficial to the students and the University as a whole? Ms. Zinta Byrne asked if ASCSU has determined that advising is the problem for the five year graduation rate. Ms. Healey responded that ASCSU was not sure what was causing the five year graduation rate - there could be a variety of reasons - and asked if better student advising could help this issue. Mr. Michael Palmquist suggested that ASCSU request data from the Office of Budgets and Institutional Analysis comparing graduation rates among departments who offer advising on a regular basis and the departments that do not offer advising on a regular basis. Ms. Nancy Levinger noted that from the data shown the four year graduation rate is actually improving and asked if advising was attributed to the increase. Mr. Evan Vlachos noted that many students are undecided about their major because there are so many options to explore, and more students are working while attending college and these issue could delay a student in receiving advising in a timely manner. Ms. Lenard noted that some students probably do not use advising, but consider it an option. However, if advising was required, it could make a difference. Ms. Sue Pendell noted that in the Speech Communication Department most faculty members have 60 or more students to advise. She added that she would have a difficult time advising 60 students in three weeks. She added that the students who want advising will participate. Ms. Levinger suggested that senior majors could do some advising when the student to faculty ratio is high. Ms. Lenard noted peer advisors are used in the Human Development and Family Studies

Department. Ms. Byrne noted that the Psychology Department has one person dedicated for advising. She added that some students delay taking required courses and this could delay graduation. Mr. Stephen Stack noted that initial advising for students and parents during "Preview" may be the best place to address the issue of the under use of advising. Mr. Eykholt pointed out that he has talked with students who have been advised, during "Preview," to not take more than one math/science course and that could delay graduation by one year. Ms. Julie Inamine noted that the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences does require advising and, in addition, faculty from the college attend "Preview" and advise students coming into the college.

The second issue discussed was the proposed South Campus Study Area. Ms. Healey explained that the proposed South Campus Study Area will be a 24-hour study area attached to the Microbiology Building. The area would be large enough to accommodate 50 - 100 students. She asked if the study area would benefit graduate teaching assistants. It was asked why the area was attached to the Microbiology Building and not the Library. Ms. Healey noted that students need a variety of study areas and this location was conducive to students with science majors. She added that it was determined that an addition to the Microbiology Building would be the most cost effective. She added that the area would be secured and security cameras, etc. will be installed. A question was raised concerning furnishings, restrooms and ongoing upkeep for the study area. It was noted that restrooms in the Microbiology Building are limited. Ms. Healey explained that these issues will be addressed. Ms. Pendell pointed out that most GTA's have offices so a study area probably would not be of benefit to them. Ms. Anderson asked if the rooms will be equipped with computers and have wireless capabilities. Ms. Healey replied that computer kiosks are being requested and that it will have wireless capabilities.

Ms. Lenard noted that the Committee on Teaching and Learning has appointed a subcommittee to study the feasibility of a student honor code. She asked if faculty would support promoting a student honor code on syllabuses and if faculty, in general, would support a student honor code. Mr. George Seidel noted that the Professional Veterinary Medical Program has a student honor code and it is enforced

by peers. He noted that honor codes vary and have many different structures. Ms. Mona Schatz noted that the School of Social Work asks students to adhere to the Social Work Professional Code. A question was raised if there was any data on how extensive "cheating" is? Ms. Lenard responded that it is difficult to obtain reliable data. She added that the internet has allowed "cheating" to become easier.

She added that some students do not realize that they are "cheating." It was noted that the honor code should define "cheating." It was also noted that most parents defend their child when they are accused and it was suggested that parents also receive copies of honor codes.

Ms. Healey thanked the Faculty Council members again for the opportunity to come and discuss student issues with them. She added that the students value the faculty input and ASCSU is very appreciative that the faculty want student input and value the opportunity to participate in Faculty Council and to be elected to serve on various Faculty Council Committees. She added that the faculty make Colorado State University a great place to attend college.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 5:17 P.M.

Robert L. Jones, Chair

Kenneth Klopfenstein, Vice Chair

Diane L. Maybon, Recording Secretary

ATTENDANCE

BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING

UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

Agricultural Sciences

Stephen Davies (Substitute for **Agricultural and Resource Economics**
Jerry Eckert)

TBA

Animal Sciences

Louis Bjostad **Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management**

Harrison Hughes **Horticulture & Landscape Architecture**

Greg Butters **Soil and Crop Sciences**

Eric Schuck for Dana Hoag **College-at-Large**

Steve Newman **College-at-Large**

Phil Westra College-at-Large

Applied Human Sciences

S. Clemons for Molly Eckman **Design and Merchandising**

Robert W. Gotshall **Health and Exercise Science**

David A. Sampson **Food Science and Human Nutrition**

Alicia Cook (Substitute for **Human Development and Family Studies**
David Macphee)

Michael Nobe **Construction Management**

David Greene **Occupational Therapy**

William Timpson **School of Education**

Mona Schatz **School of Social Work**

Business

William Mister **Accounting**

Dan Turk **Computer Information Systems**

Timothy Gallagher **Finance and Real Estate**

Ray Hogler **Management**

Joe Cannon **Marketing**

Engineering

Chris Kummerow

Atmospheric Science

TBD

Chemical Engineering

Ramchand Oad

Civil Engineering

H. J. Siegel

Electrical and Computer Engineering

Azer Yalin

Mechanical Engineering

TBA

College-at-Large

Darrell Fontane

College-at-Large

Liberal Arts

Lynn Kwiatkowski

Anthropology

Patricia Coronel

Art

Steven J. Shulman

Economics

Pam Coke, Excused

English

Michael Abeyta

Foreign Languages and Literatures

Jared Orsi

History

Jamie Switzer

Journalism and Technical Communication

William Davis

Music, Theater, and Dance

Michael Losonsky

Philosophy

Liberal Arts - Continued

Brad MacDonald

Political Science

Evan Vlachos

Sociology

Kari Anderson

Speech Communication

(Substitute Eric Aoki

Sabbatical Fall 2005)

Elissa Braunstein (Replace A.

College-at-Large

Bernasek 2005-06)

Kyle Saunders

College-at-Large

(Replace Jane Kneller)

Donna Rouner

College-at-Large

Natural Resources

Gary White

Fishery and Wildlife Biology

Douglas Rideout

Forest, Rangeland, and Watershed Stewardship

John Ridley (Replace Sally Geosciences
Sutton Sabbatical 2005)

Maureen Donnelly

Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism

Pat Pellicane

College-at-Large

Natural Sciences

P. Laybourn

Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

for Jennifer Nyborg

Bruce Wunder

Biology

George Barisas

Chemistry

Dale H. Grit

Computer Science

Robert Liebler

Mathematics

(Replace K. Klopfenstein 05-06)

Raymond (Steve) Robinson

Physics

Peter Chen

Psychology

Phillip Lee Chapman

Statistics

Stephen Stack

College-at-Large

Nancy Levinger

College-at-Large

Richard Eykholt

College-at-Large

Zinta Byrne

College-at-Large

Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

George Seidel

Biomedical Sciences

Chris Orton

Clinical Sciences

John Reif

Environmental and Radiological Health Sciences

Julie Inamine

Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology

Gerald Callahan

College-at-Large

Tony Knight

College-at-Large

John Zimbrick

College-at-Large

Sue Vandewoude

College-at-Large

Joel Bedford

College-at-Large

University Libraries

Michelle Wilde	Libraries
Lou E. Anderson	At-Large
Alea Henle	At-Large

Ex Officio Voting Members

Sue Pendell	Chair - Committee on Faculty Governance
<u>Harvey Cutler</u>	<u>Chair - Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics</u>
<u>Katharine Leigh</u>	<u>Chair - Committee on Libraries</u>
Richard Eykholt	Chair* - Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty
<u>Kathy Partin</u>	<u>Chair - Committee on Scholarship Research and Graduate Education</u>
Boris Kondratieff	Chair - Committee on Scholastic Standards
F. C. "Ted" Weston	Chair* - Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning
Michael Palmquist	Chair - Committee on Teaching and Learning
<u>Jeff Collett</u>	<u>Chair - Committee on University Programs</u>
Carole Makela	Chair - University Curriculum Committee

*Indicates Elected Member of Faculty Council

Officers of Faculty Council

Robert L. Jones	Chair, Faculty Council
Kenneth Klopfenstein	Vice Chair, Faculty Council
F. C. "Ted" Weston	BOG Representative
C. W. Miller	Immediate Past Chair, Faculty Council

Ex-Officio Non-Elected Non-Voting Members

Larry Edward Penley, Excused	President
Anthony Frank	Provost/Senior Vice President
<u>Hank Gardner</u>	<u>Interim Vice President for Research</u>
<u>Linda Kuk</u>	<u>Vice President for Student Affairs</u>
<u>Marc Johnson</u>	<u>Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences</u>

April Mason

Dean, College of Applied Human Sciences

Ann Gill

Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Ajay Menon

Dean, College of Business

Sandra Woods

Interim Dean, College of Engineering

Joyce Berry

Dean, College of Natural Resources

Rick Miranda

Dean, College of Natural Sciences

Lance Perryman

Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical
Sciences

Catherine Murray-Rust

Dean, University Libraries

Peter Dorhout

Vice Provost for Graduate Education
and Assistant Vice President for Research

Tom Gorell

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Alan Lamborn

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies