

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**  
**May 2, 2023 – 4:00pm – TILT 221/Microsoft Teams**

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

Chair Doe: Welcomed members to the final Faculty Council meeting of the year, and final meeting of term as Chair of Faculty Council.

Chair Doe: Reminded members that the meeting will be recorded to ensure accuracy of the minutes, and that this is a public meeting that is accessible by everyone, including media.

**FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – May 2, 2023**

**A. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – September 5, 2023 – Location TBD – 4:00pm

Chair Doe: The next Faculty Council meeting will be on September 5<sup>th</sup>, with Melinda Smith as the new chair. Joseph DiVerdi will be the new vice chair, and Andrew Norton will return as the Board of Governors Representative.

- b. Harry Rosenberg Award – Announcement of Winner

Chair Doe: We have our annual Harry Rosenberg Award. This award is intended to recognize one (1) person each year who has provided exceptional service to Faculty Council. We have a new winner for this year that was nominated from the rank and letters of support were submitted. This year's award winner is Steve Reising. Congratulated Reising. A plaque is coming, and there is also a small cash award. Thanked Reising for his service to Faculty Council over many years.

Faculty Council members congratulated Reising.

Chair Doe: Would like to also recognize Lola Fehr, our parliamentarian. Fehr has been doing this work for over a dozen years and serves as the parliamentarian for a number of different organizations. Fehr also had an entire career as a nurse, served as chair of the CU Nursing Alumni Association and is being recognized by the University of Colorado in June for lifetime

service. We wanted to recognize Fehr as well for her service to Faculty Council over many years. Thanked Fehr. We have a plaque coming as well. Presented Fehr with a card.

Faculty Council members expressed appreciation for Fehr.

Chair Doe: Directed members' attention to Norton to introduce our Board of Governors Representatives that are present today.

Andrew Norton: At every Faculty Council meeting this semester, we have had a few Board of Governors members come and introduce themselves so we can get to know them a little better and they can sit in on the meeting. Introduced Governor Louis Martin. Asked Governor Martin to introduce himself and talk about interest in serving on the Board of Governors:

Governor Louis Martin: Thanked Norton. Expressed appreciation for the invitation. Have been serving on the Board of Governors for about a year. Was a student at Texas A&M University and received a bachelor's and master's in animal science. Worked as a staff member there for eighteen (18) years before moving to Colorado. Education and agriculture are strong passions. Currently operate a business called Round River Resource Management, which is a land and livestock management company. We manage over 75,000 acres and run over 3,000 head of cattle. We also have an intensive apprenticeship, which allows young people to have access to land and get involved with agriculture and agriculture management. Asked if there were any questions from the members.

Norton: Hearing no questions, thanked Governor Martin. Introduced Governor John Fischer. Asked Governor Fischer to discuss background and what excites him about serving on the Board of Governors.

Governor John Fischer: Thanked Norton. Think education opens up worlds to people. Have been involved with education for most of life. Have been on boards at various levels, including higher education. Find a lot of satisfaction in contributing in some fashion to improving education. Education is the key to the kingdom and there are a lot of people who need keys to the kingdom.

Norton: Thanked Governor Fischer. Introduced Governor Ray Baker and asked same question. Requested Governor Baker introduce themselves and discuss interest in higher education and what they enjoy about being on the Board of Governors.

Governor Ray Baker: Thanked Norton. Expressed agreement with Governor Fischer about belief in the future and where we are with education and where it can take us. Had agreed to give community service to education and served on the Commission of Higher Education for many years. Know the Board of Governors and the institution fairly well through the work on the Commission of Higher Education. Have a tremendous regard for CSU, its mission, and its history in Colorado, as well as the leadership and entire faculty.

Norton: Thanked Governors Martin, Fischer, and Baker for being here.

Chair Doe: Thanked the Governors for being here and introducing themselves. Expressed appreciation for their willingness to attend and watch our proceedings.

**B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

- a. Faculty Council Meeting – April 4, 2023

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections or concerns regarding the Faculty Council minutes from April 4<sup>th</sup>.

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

**C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**D. CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1. UCC Minutes – March 31 & April 7, 2023

Chair Doe: Asked if there was anything to be pulled for further consideration from the University Curriculum Committee minutes as seen in the agenda packet.

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

**E. ACTION ITEMS**

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

Steve Reising: Thanked everyone for the Harry Rosenberg Award.

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move to approve the election of the academic faculty nominees to Faculty Council standing committee positions as seen in the agenda packet.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising. Asked if there was any discussion of the nominees. Hearing none, requested a vote of hands in the room, as well as a vote in the virtual environment in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

- 2. Election – Faculty Representatives to the Academic Misconduct Review Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the election of the academic faculty nominees to the Student Conduct Appeal Committee. Indicated that there are several other positions available in case others are willing to serve. There are normally ten (10) faculty on this committee, and they participate in appeals hearings.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising. Asked if there was any discussion of these nominees. Hearing none, requested a voice vote for those in person and a vote in the chat for the Teams environment using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

Chair Doe: This is a very important committee. It is often difficult for the Committee on Faculty Governance to find people willing to serve, so we want to make a special note of this group's willingness to step up. Thanked Reising for putting forward these names.

3. Proposed Revisions to Sections C.2.1.2, C.2.6 & C.2.7 of the  
Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual –  
Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Doe: Our third item are some Code changes. Reminded members that these were sent two (2) weeks ahead of time. Expressed hope that everyone had time to review.

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move to approve the proposed revisions to Sections C.2.1.2, C.2.6, and C.2.7 of the Manual as seen in the agenda packet.

Reising: Expressed appreciation to the Shared Governance Task Force. This is based on an earlier revision that went forward in spring 2021 and was rejected by the Office of General Counsel. It was rejected because it included a rationale for shared governance in the Preface, which they argued would apply to administrative professionals as well as faculty. With these new revisions, including for the next motion, we backed off of the Preface, and instead included shared governance front and center in the section around powers and responsibilities, seen in Section C.2.1.2. We also added language indicating that as part of the duties of officers, including deans of the colleges, would “adhere to principles of shared governance” as seen in the proposed revisions. The same thing is applied to department heads and department chairs. It states that shared governance should be implemented in all the responsibilities and adding contributions to and facilitating shared governance.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Curious as to whether there is no aspiration or willingness to have administrative professionals included in shared governance. It should be the aspiration of this institution to also hear our colleagues who are in those positions.

Reising: Shared governance does include administrative professionals. What we decided to do is take this step by step, and we can talk about the Preface next year. We wanted to get these revisions through and into the Manual so that shared governance is more front and center and more explicitly stated than it has been in the past. It does not preclude an additional amendment

in the future, and we will continue to consider this in the Committee on Faculty Governance as advised by the Faculty Council officers and any other task forces that are convened.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising. Hear Pedros-Gascon's concern loud and clear. We want to indicate our support for administrative professionals and them having a clear voice in shared governance. The question is how to do that and what approach we might take to accomplish that.

Vice Provost Susan James: Directed Reising's attention to a revision on page 46 of the agenda packet. The portion that is crossed out is about the term "department heads." Wondering about the rationale for this edit.

Reising: Indicated that this revision is part of the next motion but will explain. We decided to make this strikeout because it is referred to in Section B.

Vice Provost James: Thanked Reising. Have been asked before what the differences between "department chair" and "department head" are, and in the Manual, there is no difference.

Reising: The task force determined that this was a duplication and was not necessary.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising. Asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, requested a vote of hands in the room and a vote in the chat in the Teams room using Microsoft Forms.

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

4. Proposed Revisions to Sections C.2.4.1.1 and C.2.4.2.1 of the  
Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual –  
Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move to approve the proposed revisions to Sections C.2.4.1.1 and C.2.4.2.1 of the Manual regarding college codes and department codes.

Reising: This is again adding shared governance front and center. It adds recognition of shared governance as one of the bullet points required to be included in college codes and departmental codes. Noted that the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs reviews all departmental code revisions. We have fifty-four (54) departments on campus plus the Libraries, so this would apply to everyone.

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

Scott Wiebensohn: Knowing the other motion was rejected, wondering whether these revisions were also presented and rejected in 2021, or if this is supplemental to those previous revisions.

Reising: We presented those changes as one (1) bulk motion. The reason the changes were rejected, as explained by the Office of General Counsel, was that the Preface would change. Would be happy to share those previous revisions. They are public record and can be found in

the materials from those meetings in spring 2021 as well. Expressed appreciation again for the Shared Governance Task Force. Members included Norton, Jennifer Martin, Mary Van Buren, and Carole Makela. Expressed appreciation to Chair Doe for reconvening the task force to help make this happen.

Chair Doe: Thanked Reising. Asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, requested a vote by hands in the physical room and a vote in the chat for the Teams environment using Microsoft Forms.

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

5. Proposed Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Admissions Requirements and Procedures, “Accelerated Master’s Degree Programs” – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – William Sanford, Chair

William Sanford: On behalf of the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education, move that Faculty Council adopt the following revisions to the section regarding Admissions Requirements and Procedures for the Accelerated Master’s Degree Programs in the Graduate and Professional Bulletin to be effective upon Faculty Council adoption.

Chair Doe: Indicated that Dean Colleen Webb is also on the call in the event there are questions. Asked if there were any questions from the membership.

Sanford: Clarified that these revisions are just to clarify procedure that is already going on. This states that for the accelerated master’s programs and continuous enrollment, once a student finishes their undergraduate degree, they need to go directly into the graduate program and have to register for that first semester because they need to maintain at least a 3.0 GPA.

Chair Doe: Thanked Sanford. Asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, requested a vote by hands in the physical room and a vote in the chat in the Teams environment using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

6. Motion Regarding Adjustments to Planned Leave – Committee on Teaching and Learning – Shawn Archibeque, Co-Chair

Shawn Archibeque: The Committee on Teaching and Learning moves to modify the planned leave language. The changes proposed include extending the planned leave from two (2) to three (3) semesters, allow for second bachelor students to also be eligible for planned leave, and extending the deadline for planned leave from noon the Thursday before classes to 11:59pm on the Sunday before classes. The rationale for all of these changes is to increase accessibility to this policy.

Chair Doe: Thanked Archibeque. Asked if there were any questions from the membership. Hearing none, requested a vote by hands in the physical room and a vote in the chat in the Teams environment using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

## **F. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – President Amy Parsons**

Unable to attend—no report at this time.

- a. Budget Presentation – Brendan Hanlon, Vice President for University Operations

Vice President Brendan Hanlon: This will be more of a budget update so that we are being respectful of our Board of Governors' process. Will be presenting materials on Thursday at the Board of Governors meeting, so this will be a sneak peek of what is being presented.

Vice President Hanlon: On Thursday, this presentation will cover the 5<sup>th</sup> version of the incremental budget. This is the one-page that gets sent out to the Board of Governors and then to the rest of campus with the incremental changes to the proposed budget for 2024. In the first version of the budget, we were looking at a deficit that ranged from \$20 million to \$40 million, depending on the revenue assumptions and growth assumptions. Right now, when we are looking at the budget, that is one of the notable things that have changed. We have gradually whittled that deficit down over time through a series of different decisions and information we have received from the state, so this is an evolving process.

Vice President Hanlon: We received good news on state appropriations, which will be 11.4%. We have blended this information into our latest round of assumptions. In our revenue profile, we also have proposed tuition increases, which have not really changed from our last presentation at 4% for undergraduates and 3% for graduate students. All of the other factors in our revenue profile have not really changed since the last two (2) iterations.

Vice President Hanlon: Those are the major components that have changed before you consider financial aid. We were at about a \$47.2 million revenue profile for our incremental budget. When you consider financial aid, that is \$4 million deducted, which leaves us at \$43 million in new expenses. Will go through the incremental expenses categories a little bit. The multi-year investments of about \$3.3 million is similar to what it has been in the past and includes the graduate assistant fees funding that we have set aside for that initiative. Noted that in the revenue category, there is also a special education program revenue that is part of the state appropriations. A category that experienced a 1% increase in the multi-year commitment is an allocation of funds going to the medical school.

Vice President Hanlon: The academic incentive funding of \$1.6 million has not changed too much, but it does have differential tuition in it and graduate tuition-sharing. For mandatory costs, this includes primary costs for utilities, information technology, and is at approximately \$5.2 million. Quality enhancements are in your startups and staffing changes that have occurred and

that are built into the base budget in subsequent years. Those quality enhancements are at about \$6.1 million. That is relatively unchanged.

Vice President Hanlon: There is also a bit of reallocation included in there, which has been consistent since our original, at about \$4 million. When describing the impact to the Executive Leadership Team, instead of thinking about this in percentages, we are thinking about it through the monetary lens. The range of impacts across our institution would be between \$35,000 in terms of reallocation to up to \$480,000. That is the magnitude of what different areas are looking at. We are working through those numbers and trying to go through a calibration process, so do not currently have final numbers in there. Sometimes the \$4 million number can seem daunting, but when it is allocated out, even though reallocations are always a stressful conversation, it does appear more digestible when it is broken down.

Vice President Hanlon: Will go back to faculty and staff compensation. At the last iteration of the Board of Governors meeting, it was reported that we had enough funds to have a 4% merit increase. We are now aspiring to 5% due to state appropriation funds. We are working through that process right now, but that 5% increase also allowed us to set aside some funds that would go toward equity. Equity really means two (2) things in the budget. The first is to bring faculty compensation up to 80% of the median. The other is looking at compensation for those people making \$50,000 or less and doing decompression for people who are already at or near above that level. These are the equity components of the compensation piece. Acknowledged that President Amy Parsons, Angie Nielsen from the Budget Office, and himself have discussed these concepts with the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. We received input from that group and that is consistent with what we have presented and the feedback we have received. Expressed appreciation to the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning for talking with us and joining those deliberations. We do not have enough funds to do everything for everyone, so we have to make informed choices and we appreciate the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning for being a sounding board in that process.

Vice President Hanlon: People may have heard about the budget model concept that is coming up. We have Andrew Comrie, who is a professor in the University of Arizona system, who has been on campus and has met with the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. Comrie is meeting with various parties across campus, opening up a conversation about what a new budget model can be. He has been forthright about the pros and cons to each budget model. There is not a perfect budget model that satisfies everything that we want to invest in, but there are tradeoffs and parameters that come with each different iteration. Comrie has been attempting to educate us about that and start a listening tour around that conversation. It is important to President Parsons to make sure that we hear from people on campus and have an inclusive process about what this could look like. This is still in its infancy and there are more conversations to come.

Vice President Hanlon: Something that was discussed with the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning was lending more transparency to our current process. Something we discussed was having a more formal public transparent kickoff to next year's budget process, regardless of the model we use. President Parsons mentioned that there used to be hearings on campus where deans and vice presidents would make presentations about budget priorities, and reconvening this in some form.



Vice President Hanlon: Something else we have heard from Comrie while he has been here on campus is this desire for transparency and more clarity around understanding not just the incremental budget but the base itself and making sure we are clear about where the total amount of investment across this campus goes every year. We have heard about and are looking at ways to do that, including this kickoff process.

Vice President Hanlon: President Parsons wanted to mention that as part of the Board of Governors meeting, there will be a lunch with the leadership of the Administrative Professional Council, Classified Personnel Council, Faculty Council, and student governance on Thursday afternoon.

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

Pedros-Gascon: Not sure how familiar you are with this situation, but there are eighty (80) faculty in the College of Liberal Arts that are subject to a 3-2 load rather than a 2-2 load, which is the universal maximum across the rest of the institution. Since we are talking about some extra money being moved around, wondering what the odds are that that money could be used to bring equity to those situations. Reminded Vice President Hanlon that this issue is affecting some of the most diverse faculty in the institution, as well as mostly female and some of the worst paid.

Vice President Hanlon: Thanked Pedros-Gascon for the question. Not familiar with this situation, so may need additional detail. This is why we tried to leverage the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning for these types of dilemmas because we have these challenges across campus. This is just the beginning of the equity conversation because we understand that the finite dollars do not resolve all the problems. We have heard the President talk about aspiring to a multi-year addressing of these issues and challenges. Would welcome more information on that. This is also why we will continue to engage with the Faculty Council Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning to hear about these particular issues and weigh them against challenges that are being experienced across the institution.

Chair Doe: Indicated that interim Provost Janice Neger is present and has heard this question and concern before. Know that has been on the radar.

Mary Van Buren: Thanked Vice President Hanlon for the presentation. Have a few questions. The first is where the money was found to reduce the deficit, other than the increase in state appropriations. The second question is what the timeline is for this new budget model and whether it will be decided on over the summer while faculty are not present. Third question is whether or not different mechanisms have been considered for distributing the money that is going to faculty compensations, such as a flat increase rather than a percentage.

Vice President Hanlon: Primarily the state funds were responsible for helping reduce that deficit as part of the latest round of the incremental budget. The budget model timing is likely not something we can complete in a few months. Those are bigger, more complicated questions and thoughts that need to go into a budget model and some of that starts with educating ourselves on what our current structure is as we move to evolve into a new one. It will be hard to compare and contrast the pros and cons of a new system if we do not have a shared understanding of the pros

and cons of the current one. This will likely not happen over the course of a summer or within a matter of months. That being said, we also do not want to set up a process where this takes five (5) years, and that model never arrives. We will need to find that sweet spot of engagement and process that allows us to get to a model in the future.

Vice President Hanlon: For the last question, had heard about the concept of a flat dollar increase. This is not something that is reflected in this budget at this point in time. What we have done is set aside that 5% as part of a merit increase budgeted across campus and the application of that will come from there. This is really the high-level allocation funds. The application of the increases that happens is a different conversation.

Van Buren: Asked: Who is responsible for that particular conversation? It does not seem that there has been a creative approach toward the way in which allocation of those funds takes place.

Vice President Hanlon: Understanding is that we have a merit-based system here when it comes to applying that 5% increase. Am currently going through performance evaluations for direct reports and will be allocating based off a performance-based system.

Van Buren: Asked: So, there have not been any conversations about different kinds of ways of approaching this?

Vice President Hanlon: Not that have been influencing salary exercises on campus.

Melinda Smith: The increase obviously took a dent out of the deficit, but then reallocation was discussed, which must also help offset this deficit. Asked: Is that correct?

Vice President Hanlon: It did, but we did not increase the reallocation. The reallocation was the same as was presented by the President in earlier versions and has persisted even through the additional state appropriations. That reallocation is still a portion of this because, if you recall, we were solving the bigger gap from previous versions of the budget. When we talk about reallocation, it's within campus. We will send out communications eventually about the range of dollars that needs to be achieved, but we need to finish that methodology to determine how exactly those will be applied.

Smith: Clarified that it is still to be decided what dollar amounts each college and division would have to achieve.

Vice President Hanlon: Confirmed. The decision not to reduce that reallocation was to target the deficit.

Smith: It sounds like the administration is striving to get us at a zero deficit.

Vice President Hanlon: We are aspiring to get to zero, but we are sticking with the idea of cutting it in half for now. Reminded everyone that this budget still needs to be presented to the Board, and they are provided time for feedback in May and June. It is possible that they come

back and tell us to revise and what they would like to see, so this is not a final budget. We briefed that Audit and Finance Committee yesterday.

Smith: It sounds like right now we are trying to solve the deficit with the incremental budget, but potentially, it lies further than that in the base budget, this issue of continual deficit. Asked if one of the motivations behind the evaluation of budget models and thinking about a new budget model was this deficit.

Vice President Hanlon: Would say that the budget deficit is not leading the conversation, and the budget model may not solve that. We could use the incremental budget to solve this deficit. We do not have to change everything. What we have heard is a desire for greater transparency in the budget model itself and how we recognize and reward reinvestment into our budget model, and those things are not being captured in the incremental budget. Think it is more about how we conduct our budget each year and less about the deficit.

Rob Mitchell: Wondering if analysis of the CUPA data is happening not just at the department level but the individual level.

Vice President Hanlon: Believe it is being conducted at the individual level. It is hard to aggregate this out, because especially in the larger organization, the harder it is to diagnose it. Know the data presented is by department and rank. Think it is a multi-step process to not just identify those people but also estimate what the total budget impact is.

Anders Fremstad: We were told for months that there was going to be serious money toward both merit raises and equity. Expressed gratefulness that some did come through for equity. Requested clarification on how much it is and how that compares to the amount of money that has been allocated to our normal system for merit-based faculty members. Speaking to equity, also wondering whether any of these judgments will raise the pay of our non-tenure track faculty members.

Vice President Hanlon: Will start with the second part of statement. This is why we are working to identify where these people are on an individual basis when it comes to the 80% of median and those calculations. We need to go through and diagnose those areas and then estimate the budget impact. That is being done on a case-by-case basis.

Vice President Hanlon: For the first question, the total amount that is going toward compensation in this incremental budget is \$27 million. We are a bit north of \$1 million when it comes to equity. We focused on locking in the 5% increase and then still have residual funds for that equity conversation.

Fremstad: Wondering if we will be having bigger conversations going forward. Feel we were told for months that we would be doing something serious for those being paid at the low end for teaching courses that are bringing hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Vice President Hanlon: This is why we are discussing a multi-year allocation towards equity. This will not all be solved in the first year. Would say that \$27 million toward compensation is a huge investment.

Fremstad: Am asking for colleagues. That amount is a good investment personally, but talking about colleagues who are making closer to \$48,000.

Vice President Hanlon: Understand there are tradeoffs in that calibration between equity and merit. What we tried to do is put our best foot forward and will be making progress incrementally in equity investments.

Chair Doe: Asked if there has been any thought given to having a cutoff for people earning above a certain pay level would not get a raise and we could use that difference to address some of these equity issues.

Vice President Hanlon: This was discussed a little bit, but we really focused on the other challenges across campus. It is difficult to draw those sorts of lines, so we did not go down that route.

Jenny Morse: When talking about equity, wondering who decided that it would be 80% merit and 20% equity, because that does not sound equitable.

Vice President Hanlon: In previous iterations, we were still trying to go through the mechanics of calculating out the individuals who would be impacted by that and made a final determination on it. The conversations we had on campus indicated that there were inflationary pressures, as well as merit increases and prioritization, so that is where we tried to focus.

Morse: Just wondering why it is 80% going to merit instead of 80% going to equity and 20% to merit instead.

Vice President Hanlon: We were trying to prioritize increases across the entire campus. That is the competitiveness of people's compensation, but also helps raise everyone's compensation to make sure we are being competitive across the entire University. Then we can use some other targeted funds to help particular people in particular circumstances.

Morse: Wondering if focusing on equity first would solve a lot of the problems.

Vice President Hanlon: Focusing on merit does solve some of the problems. It does move people closer to median compensation, not just faculty, but across campus in different classifications. It does help, but it does move slow.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions or discussion, thanked Vice President Hanlon for being here.

**G. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Interim Provost  
Janice Nerger**

Interim Provost Janice Nerger: Will be going over what we have done this year and what we still need to work on as a group.

Provost Nerger: We have had five (5) searches out of the Provost's Office this year. Four (4) of them are complete. The completed searches include the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs is Thomas Siller, the Vice Provost for Graduate Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School is Colleen Webb, Sue Doe as the Executive Director for TILT, and the Director of Honors, Shawn Bingham. Thanked individuals who had filled these positions in the interim as the searches were going on. The search that is not complete is the Dean of the College of Engineering. All four (4) candidates have been interviewed and feedback was due to the committee last Friday. Expecting report early next week, so we are moving quickly on that search.

Provost Nerger: With the student success initiatives, we are really focusing on the retention of our students from one fall to the next. Explained some of the gaps as shown in the slides. When you look at our six-year graduation rate, it is low, at 68%. Think we can do better than that. Even though we look at these gaps, we are also looking at the graduation rates themselves.

Provost Nerger: With the Fall 2022 class, they came through COVID and was the largest class we have ever had. Of this class, 40% were non-resident, and we had a set of rural students, minoritized students, and other students recommended for support. We also had to rent the Best Western. Of the students that stayed at the Best Western, we lost 10% of them. This speaks to our student success initiatives because belongingness is critical, and they did not get that sense of belonging and were not staying in our residential learning communities. Our overall spring retention was 94%, so we have already lost 6% of our students. We could look at our admissions, because we might be admitting students who do not have as high a chance for success without additional support, and we may not be providing enough support, so we need to look at that equation a little bit.

Provost Nerger: With the Academic Master Plan, we have been working on some of the first-year initiatives. We have put quite a bit of resources into the student success initiative, the MURALS program, United in STEM, and a new freshman seminar. We are also starting undergraduate certificate programs. We are working on a post doc program with Adams State, who came to us indicating that they are having a hard time recruiting faculty because of where they are and the pay they can provide. With students emerging from a PhD program who do not know where they want to go yet and want a teaching opportunity, there might be an arrangement. The MOUs for this are almost agreed upon. We also have an accelerated addictions counseling program and are working on the Associate in General Studies. We have also been discussing a behavioral and mental health summit and the Climate Institute and getting people interested in climate as part of our academic themes. All of this is still a work in progress, so nothing is firmed up.

Provost Nerger: With AUCC 1C, we formed two (2) task forces. The first was the implementation task force, which was tasked with looking at AUCC 3E and estimating how many of those courses could transfer over to AUCC 1C and look at how many seats we were going to need, as well as cost. They came up with a range of funds that they felt we would need, both in one-time costs and ongoing costs for course development and professional development.

This has been presented to Executive Vice President Rick Miranda. We also formed a guidance committee to have them define a curricular process and how we facilitate the new courses. We wanted them to look at the transition of courses from 3E to 1C. They thought it would be good to put in place another committee that would approve these courses. They looked at a course effectiveness rubric, as well as syllabi examples, some content pedagogy, and their role in the CIM process. We have discussed this with Executive Vice President Miranda but have not gone over this with President Parsons yet. The next steps we have are to secure funding, as well working with the Faculty Council Executive Committee and the University Curriculum Committee to determine what the most efficient process is for moving courses through the curriculum process. Some of the issues that arose from the guidance committee was that there was difference in opinion about what AUCC 1C courses need to have as content, as well as support for professional development. This is where we want to work with Executive Committee and the University Curriculum Committee so that we can firm up how we can do this.

Provost Nerger: Vice Provost Laura Jensen will be providing an update on reaccreditation later today. Vice Provost Jensen and University Director of Assessment Stephanie Foster have been diligently writing the report, the comprehensive evaluation, and the self-study report that is due this summer. The accreditation team will be on site on September 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>.

Provost Nerger: Vice President Hanlon discussed the budget models that are being considered. Comrie was here on campus talking to us about this as well. President Parsons will be discussing this with the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning, as well as other campus experts. There is a lot more discussion to occur and this is ongoing.

Provost Nerger: The Board of Governors meeting will be this Thursday, May 4<sup>th</sup> and Friday, May 5<sup>th</sup> at the Translational Medicine Institute on south campus. Encouraged members to attend if they are able.

Provost Nerger: Ongoing conversations include employee compensation and retention, admissions and DEI in both hiring and in general. We are also looking at transfer students, as well as doing more work getting pipelines in place from community colleges. We are also still discussing the rural initiative, which the Board of Governors has been discussing quite a bit. Other discussions are occurring around interdisciplinary degrees and how to house them. Encouraged members to reach out if they had ideas or thoughts.

Provost Nerger: Thanked everyone for all the work they do. There is a lot of work in front of the scenes and behind the scenes. Asked this to be relayed to colleagues. Being faculty makes a difference to the lives of our students and our colleagues.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Nerger. Indicated that a member in the chat asked whether interdisciplinary programs could be in a college.

Provost Nerger: Both colleges would want to house the degree, and that is difficult. Some say they should be kept in the Provost's Office, but that cannot work in our current system. We can change our current system, but a student needs to have a graduation to go to, and be able to get

scholarships, and go to Ram Welcome somewhere. They have to have a home, and so we have to choose a college.

Chair Doe: Stated that another chat indicated that some universities have a college of interdisciplinary studies. Reported that this comment was posted by Allison Goar who states that she attended such a university.

Provost Nerger: Have not been able to find one at a large public institution, but we are looking into that.

Pedros-Gascon: Would like to discuss teaching loads as mentioned earlier. Know that the executive report indicated that this affected seventy-five (75) people in total and the total cost was calculated to be somewhere around \$380,000. Asked for Provost Nerger's understanding of this and what the main reason is for not addressing this issue immediately.

Provost Nerger: Have talked to the three (3) department chairs who have submitted proposals. Think the number was around \$380,000 and that solution is based on freeing up tenure-track faculty to reduce those loads. See this more as a local level than a Provost level, and a lot could probably be handled within the college itself. Not sure why it is different in this particular case but am meeting with Dean Benjamin Withers to understand what these departments have done and why they are different from the rest of the college.

Pedros-Gascon: Would encourage Executive Vice President Miranda to be involved in these conversations since he was the Provost for almost a decade and is familiar with the situation.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Hearing no further discussion, thanked Provost Nerger for being here.

[Provost Report slides.](#)

## **H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED**

### **1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe**

Chair Doe: In terms of the budget piece, think that there are some interesting conversations going on. Know that everyone will want to participate in those conversations in the fall with the open forums. Am eager to see what those ideas will be.

Chair Doe: Directed members' attention to report as seen in the agenda packet. Was elected to this role on March 3, 2020. Want to thank this group for the opportunity and support you have provided through this period. We have done a lot during this time. Thanked everyone for the work they have done during an unparalleled difficult time. We had the pandemic, social unrest, athletic scandal, and a complete restructure of our upper administration. You have continued to show up and insist upon shared governance as part of what goes on here.

Chair Doe: Have only a few disappointments. Wish we could have gotten farther with the AUCC 1C piece, as well as getting the Section J changes through. Wish we could have also had more progress in terms of contracts for our non-tenure track faculty and figuring out what is preventing this. Wish we also could have provided some explanation for what happened in June, especially as many indicated they felt unsettled as we moved into the final stages of the process in the search for the new president. Our new President seems to be listening and working with us, so am eagerly looking forward to opportunities to come with President Parsons.

Chair Doe: Expressed pride in everyone and expressed appreciation for the standing committees, as they are really doing the work of Faculty Council. Expressed pride of the efforts of this group to support student athletes when they asked for our support, and our involvement in the presidential search and selection.

Chair Doe: This is all to say that shared governance matters. Predecessor Tim Gallagher stated that shared governance is the essential nature of faculty to speak to the overall university function. It is critical that the faculty voice be heard. It speaks to the future. At the time, Gallagher had heard from faculty that service on Faculty Council did not matter. It is more important than ever. We need to have a prominent seat at the table. We are one faculty, those on and off the tenure track, and meaningful conversation must occur. Expressed personal agreement with Gallagher's statements. Thanked everyone for their support during these three (3) years.

Chair Doe: Wished to close by expressing special thanks to Executive Administrative Assistant, Amy Barkley.

## 2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: Reminded members that the Board of Governors is this Thursday, May 4<sup>th</sup> and Friday, May 5<sup>th</sup>. A Provost update will be presented on Friday.

Norton: Had the opportunity last week to attend the national meeting of the [Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics](#), which was in Washington D.C. but offered virtual attendance. This is a group of faculty leaders. About half of the Mountain West Conference is represented there. The topics covered were unemployment status, threats to amateurism, and whether student athletes are employees. What is going on in college athletics is dramatic and will radically shape the NCAA over the next few years. Think this group should be aware of what is going on and participate in that conversation. There are a lot of recommendations from those faculty experts on how we, as faculty governance structure, can play a bigger role in athletics here.

Chair Doe: Also attended the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics meeting. Additional topics were student-athlete mental health needs and how faculty can best support student athletes. Think we need to be paying attention, joining the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics and getting our Faculty Council Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics involved so that they can report to us about how they are seeing these issues play out and how they would like to see us weighing in. There are enormous implications to the changes in college athletics, especially at the D1 level. Encouraged members to research the [NCAA transition report](#) so they understand what exactly is going on.



## I. DISCUSSION

### 1. Housing Initiatives Report – Audra Montoya-Baker, Employee Housing Programs Coordinator

Audra Montoya-Baker: We recently launched a number of new programs and wanted members to be aware of these programs.

Montoya-Baker: We have the mortgage insurance waiver program. Mortgage insurance is an insurance many lenders require for home buyers that do not have the full 20% to put down. We created a strategic partnership with Canvas Credit Union to develop a program for employees who meet certain criteria to have their mortgage insurance waived.

Montoya-Baker: We launched a Housing Partners Program, which is similar to the Commitment to Campus program. We have real estate professionals who are interested in offering discounts to our employees. We are continuing to build this program out, but we currently have two (2) local home builders, three (3) real estate agents, and a home inspector who are participating. We have a few more that are interested in partnering and are reviewing the guidelines.

Montoya-Baker: We have partnered with Brothers Redevelopment to provide homebuyer educational opportunities for our employees. This year, we had a two-part session that included tips and tools to boost credit scores and navigating affordability options to buy a home. Those recordings can still be found on the website for those interested.

Montoya-Baker: We also expanded the Employee Hardship Loan fund with additional funding from then-interim President Miranda during his tenure. We were able to collaborate with campus partners to modify that fund to including emergency housing assistance, which was previously excluded, and increased the loan amount from \$1,000 to \$1,500.

Montoya-Baker: Am currently working with the Advancement Office on fundraising to continue to be able to grow what we offer and will be participating in CSU's Day of Giving on May 4<sup>th</sup>.

Montoya-Baker: It is important that the programs that we are building out and what we do next are driven by employee need. Any and all feedback that members have is valuable. Encouraged members to send feedback via email of what they would like to see next.

Chair Doe: Thanked Montoya-Baker. Know the committee has been working very hard on these options and will continue to do so. Thanked Montoya-Baker for being here.

### 2. Reaccreditation Process Update – Laura Jensen, Vice Provost for Planning and Effectiveness

Vice Provost Laura Jensen: Reminded members that we are on a 10-year reaccreditation cycle. We are currently ending year nine (9), so we are working on our comprehensive evaluation for reaffirmation. The planning and steering committee presented some of this last fall. Oversight lies with the President, the Executive Vice President, and the Provost. Was involved with the

planning team, which also included a faculty fellow and a special advisor to the Provost. The steering committee was made up of the Cabinet, so that we did not have additional groups running around for this process.

Vice Provost Jensen: We are submitting an assurance argument and self-study in July. We will be hitting on five (5) criteria. We are going through the process of each of these criteria and making sure that all of the sub criteria components are also met. We have done this through a lot of campus involvement. We had six (6) teams that were formed, each with about ten (10) to twelve (12) faculty and staff on them. Explained some of the criteria and who led each area. We have reengaged the Vice President for Engagement and Extension and have been contacting responsible faculty and staff for each criterion and sub criteria as was necessary. Have also spoke to each employee council. We have also been fortunate with the number of students that have been willing to be involved.

Vice Provost Jensen: We are almost done drafting the criteria, with two (2) of them having gone off to the editors. After we finish drafting, there is an entire component of federal compliance, which are around our sections regarding contact hours and whether our student credit hours meet federal guidelines. This will all be completed in June, and we will be turning in our assurance agreement and the federal compliance submission in July. Sometime between now and August we may be asked for feedback from our peer review team. Not sure how large that team will be this year. Our only input is that we want to make sure the peer review team is representation of a Research 1 large public institution and would understand the context we have been writing. We have our site visit in September. They will likely visit with specific groups around campus, and undoubtedly Faculty Council will be one of them.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost Jensen. We know this is a lot of work and appreciate the update.

Vice Provost Jensen: Stated that the presentations and minutes of Faculty Council and the standing committees, as well as the task forces, has been great in terms of evidence that we need to provide the Higher Learning Commission around not only shared governance but statements around what we value as an institution.

Chair Doe: Thanked Vice Provost Jensen.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further business, called the meeting adjourned.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

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

ATTENDANCE  
**BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING**  
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING  
**2022-2023**

**Chair: Sue Doe**

**Vice-Chair: Melinda Smith**

**Executive Assistant: Amy Barkley**

**BOG Representative: Andrew Norton**

**Professional Registered Parliamentarian: Lola Fehr**

<b>ELECTED MEMBERS</b>	<b>REPRESENTING</b>	<b>TERM</b>
<b>Agricultural Sciences</b>		
<b>Stephan Kroll</b>	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2025
<b>Jennifer Martin</b>	Animal Sciences	2024
<u>Jane Stewart</u>	Agricultural Biology	2024
<b>Kelly Curl</b>	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2025
<u>Jim Ippolito</u> (excused)	Soil and Crop Sciences	2023
<u>Marco Costanigro</u>	College-at-Large	2023
<b>Bradley Goetz</b>	College-at-Large	2023
<b>Andrew Norton</b>	College-at-Large	2023
<b>Health and Human Sciences</b>		
<b>Ruoh-Nan (Terry) Yan</b>	Design and Merchandising	2024
<u>Jennifer Richards</u>	Health and Exercise Science	2025
<b>David Sampson</b>	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2025
<b>Lisa Daunhauer</b>	Human Development and Family Studies	2023
<u>Erin Arneson</u>	Construction Management	2024
<b>Aaron Eakman</b>	Occupational Therapy	2023
<b>Sharon Anderson</b>	School of Education	2024
<b>Elizabeth Kiehne</b>	School of Social Work	2025
<b>Brian Butki</b>	College-at-Large	2024
<b>Business</b>		
<u>Lisa Kutcher</u>	Accounting	2023
(substituting for Bill Rankin, on sabbatical Spring 2023)		
<b>John Hoxmeier</b>	Computer Information Systems	2024
<b>Bharadwaj Kannan</b>	Finance and Real Estate	2025
<b>Rob Mitchell</b>	Management	2024
<u>Jonathan Zhang</u>	Marketing	2023
<b>Engineering</b>		
<b>Peter Jan van Leeuwen</b>	Atmospheric Science	2024
<u>Ashok Prasad</u>	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2025
<u>Hussam Mahmoud</u>	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2024
<b>Steven Reising</b>	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2025
<b>Soheil Fatehiboroujeni</b>	Mechanical Engineering	2023

(substituting for Kirk McGilvray)

<b>Thomas Bradley</b>	Systems Engineering	2023
<b>Sybil Sharvelle</b>	College-at-Large	2023

### Liberal Arts

<b>Mary Van Buren</b>	Anthropology & Geography	2023
<u>Mary-Ann Kokoska</u>	Art & Art History	2025
<b>Mark Saunders</b>	Communication Studies	2025
<b>Anders Fremstad</b>	Economics	2024
<u>Tony Becker</u>	English	2023
<b>Ernesto Sagas</b>	Ethnic Studies	2025

(substituting for Maricela DeMirjyn, on sabbatical Spring 2023)

<b>John Slater</b>	Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	2025
<b>Jared Orsi</b>	History	2023
<b>Marilee Long</b>	Journalism and Media Communications	2025
<b>Madeline Harvey</b>	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2025
<u>Andre Archie</u>	Philosophy	2025
<b>Marni Berg</b>	Political Science	2024
<b>KuoRay Mao</b>	Sociology	2025

(substituting for Laura Raynolds, sabbatical 2022-2023)

<u>Ajean Ryan</u>	College-at-Large	2023
<b>Antonio Pedros-Gascon</b>	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Emily Morgan</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Lisa Langstraat</u>	College-at-Large	2024
<b>Allison Goar</b>	College-at-Large	2024
<b>Abigail Shupe</b>	College-at-Large	2024
<u>Sanam Emami</u>	College-at-Large	2024

(substituting for John Carlo Pierce, Spring 2023)

### Natural Resources

<b>Randall Boone</b>	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2023
<u>Camille Stevens-Rumann</u>	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2024
(substituting for Chad Hoffman, Spring 2023)		
<b>Yoichiro Kanno</b>	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2024
<b>William Sanford</b>	Geosciences	2023
<b>Alan Bright</b>	Human Dimensions of Natural Resources	2023

### Natural Sciences

<b>Olve Peersen</b>	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	2025
<b>Mike Antolin</b>	Biology	2024
<u>Rob Paton</u>	Chemistry	2023
TBD	Computer Science	2022
<b>Emily Hardegree-Ullman</b>	Physics	2024
<b>Silvia Canetto</b>	Psychology	2025
<b>Ander Wilson</b>	Statistics	2025

<u>Yongcheng Zhou</u>	Mathematics	2023
<b>Alan Van Orden</b>	College-at-Large	2023
<b>Joseph DiVerdi</b>	College-at-Large	2025
<b>James Liu</b>	College-at-Large	2023
<b>Veterinary Medicine &amp; Biomedical Sciences</b>		
<b>Rao Veermachaneni</b>	Biomedical Sciences	2025
<b>Shari Lanning</b>	Clinical Sciences	2025
<b>Elizabeth Ryan</b>	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2023
<b>Tony Schountz</b>	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
<b>Katriana Popichak</b>	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Fiona Hollinshead</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2025
<b>Doreene Hyatt</b>	College-at-Large	2024
<b>Tara Nordgren</b>	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Jennifer Peel</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2023
<u>John Rosecrance</u>	College-at-Large	2023
<u>Zaid Abdo</u>	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Brian Geiss</u>	College-at-Large	2025
<b>University Libraries</b>		
<b>Christine Pawliuk</b>	Libraries	2025
<b><i>Ex Officio Voting Members</i></b>		
<b>Sue Doe</b>	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2023
<b>Melinda Smith</b>	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2023
<b>Andrew Norton</b>	BOG Faculty Representative	2023
<b>Steve Reising, Chair</b>	Committee on Faculty Governance	2023
<b>Gregg Griffenhagen, Chair</b>	Committee on Information Technology	2023
<u>Shane Kanatous</u> , Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2023
<u>Jerry Magloughlin</u> , Chair	Committee on Libraries	2023
<b>Jenny Morse, Co-Chair</b>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
<u>Olivia Arnold</u> , Co-Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
<b>Jennifer Martin, Chair</b>	Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty	2023
<b>William Sanford, Chair</b>	Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education	2023
<u>Alan Kennan</u> , Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2023
<u>James Graham</u> , Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2023
<b>Shawn Archibeque, Co-Chair</b>	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2023
<b>Cayla Bellamy, Co-Chair</b>	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2023
<u>Jose Luis Suarez-Garcia</u> , Chair (excused)	Committee on University Programs	2023
<b>Brad Goetz, Chair</b>	University Curriculum Committee	2023
<b>Ryan Brooks</b>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
<b>Pinar Omur-Ozbek</b>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2023
<b>Thomas Conway</b>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024

<b>Sean Bryan</b>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
<b>Ann Hess</b>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
<u>Jennifer Reinke</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
<b>Scott Weibensohn</b>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025

***Ex Officio Non-Voting Members***

Amy Parsons	President
<b>Rick Miranda</b>	Executive Vice President
<b>Albert Bimper</b>	Interim Chief of Staff
<b>Jan Nerger</b>	Interim Provost
Karen Dunbar	Co-Interim Vice President for Advancement
Rudy Garcia	Co-Interim Vice President for Advancement
Kathay Rennels	Interim Vice President for Engagement & Extension
TBD	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
TBD	Vice President for Equity, Equal Opportunity & Title IX
<b>Susan James</b>	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Brett Anderson	Interim Vice President for Human Resources
<b>Kauline Cipriani</b>	Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
Brandon Bernier	Vice President for Information Technology
<b>Kathleen Fairfax</b>	Vice Provost for International Affairs
<b>Laura Jensen</b>	Vice Provost for Planning and Effectiveness
Alan Rudolph	Vice President for Research
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
<b>Thomas Siller</b>	Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
Greg Luft	Interim Vice President for University Marketing & Communications
<b>Brendan Hanlon</b>	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
<b>Colleen Webb</b>	Dean, Graduate School
Ben Withers	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Karen Estlund	Dean, Libraries
Simon Tavener	Interim Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Susan VandeWoude	Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
A. Alonso Aguirre	Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
<b>Justin Schwendeman-Curtis</b>	Administrative Professional Council
(substituting to Matt Klein, Chair of APC)	