

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**  
**October 3, 2023 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

Chair Smith reminded members of etiquette in the Microsoft Teams environment and the rules of engagement for the meeting. Reminded members that Faculty Council meetings are public, and minutes are posted to the Faculty Council website.

**FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – October 3, 2023**

**A. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – November 7, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm

Chair Smith: We will continue to meet over Microsoft Teams for this semester and will revisit format for the spring semester.

Chair Smith: Reminded members that the Fall Address will take place on the Oval tomorrow, October 4<sup>th</sup>, from 11:00am to 1:00pm, which includes the University picnic.

Chair Smith: The Board of Governors meeting will take place later this week, on October 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> in the Lory Student Center. The meeting will also be livestreamed. Encouraged members to attend if they are able.

2. [Budget Open Forum](#) – October 18, 2023 – Lory Student Center 386/Zoom
3. [Symposium for Inclusive Excellence](#) – October 23-27, 2023
4. [Open Scholarship Workshops](#) through CSU Libraries -- [CSU Libraries Events - Colorado State University Libraries Calendars - Colorado State University Fort Collins \(libcal.com\)](#)
5. [Volunteer Service Hours Program](#) -- [8 hours of admin leave per year now available to CSU employees for volunteer work \(colostate.edu\)](#)

Chair Smith: It was announced that the new Provost and Executive Vice President is Dr. Marion Underwood. Welcomed Dr. Underwood on behalf of Faculty Council. Asked if Dr. Underwood wanted to say a few words.

Dr. Marion Underwood: Thanked Chair Smith. Am thrilled to have been selected for this role. Thanked the search committee. Enjoyed meeting with some members of Faculty Council as part of the interview process and am looking forward to start working with everyone to help realize shared governance in its fullest form at Colorado State. Expressed hope to see more members tomorrow at the Fall Address.

Chair Smith: Thanked Dr. Underwood.

## **B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED**

1. Faculty Council Meeting – September 5, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from September 5<sup>th</sup> as seen in the agenda packet.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

## **C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

## **D. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. UCC Minutes – August 25, September 1, 8 & 15, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding the University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Hearing none, consent agenda approved by unanimous consent.

## **E. ACTION ITEMS**

1. Election – Faculty Representative to Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Steve Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the election of Ryan Morrison as the College of Engineering representative to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education.

Chair Smith: Thanked Reising. Asked if there were any objections to this election.

Hearing none, election of Morrison to the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education approved.

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

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the election of the undergraduate and graduate student representatives to Faculty Council standing committees.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any objections to these nominees. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

3. Election – Undergraduate and Graduate Student Representatives to University Policy Review Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the undergraduate and graduate student representatives to the University Policy Review Committee as seen in the agenda packet.

Chair Smith: Thanked Reising. Requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

4. Proposed Revisions to Section F.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Jennifer Martin: Indicated that Richard Eykholt was present to respond to any questions. The proposed revisions to Section F.1 clarify an outdated policy related to leave or absence from campus. On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that Section F.1 be revised as shown in the agenda packet.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin. Asked if Eykholt wished to speak to this further.

Richard Eykholt: This was something that Vice Provost Susan James. This is an out-of-date policy and refers to a Board policy that no one can find. It conflicts with the way we do things, so we are removing it.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding this motion. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

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

5. Proposed Revisions to Section E.10 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move to revise Section E.10 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual as seen in the agenda packet. Asked Eykholt to speak to the rationale.

Eykholt: The biggest change that is being proposed here is that we have consistently had problems with tenure and promotion committees being too small. If there are three (3) people and you get a two (2) to one (1) vote, it was not clear what this would mean. This has also been an issue with grievances. The Office of the Provost has recommended that we increase the size of these committees from three (3) to five (5). The other changes involve clarification on how reports are written and who writes reports. The other item is that it was never specified how tenure and promotion committees select their chair. The intention was for the committees to pick their chair, but we have had instances where an administrator has selected the chair, which is undue influence by the administration over the committee process.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding this motion.

Rob Mitchell: Asked what departments will do if they are too small and do not have enough full professors, for example, and there are promotion to full professor decisions to be made. Wondering what the best way is for departments to handle this. Think there are departments where this would apply.

Eykholt: That is regarding promotion, which is the next motion. Not aware of any department that have fewer than five (5) tenured faculty members.

Mitchell: Will wait for next motion to ask this question.

Chair Smith: Thanked Mitchell, we will address that question in the next motion. Asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

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

6. Proposed Revisions to Section E.13 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that we modify Section E.13 of the Manual as found in the agenda packet. As previously mentioned, this change deals specifically with promotion and many of the same changes as the previous motion. There are updates to language and the size of the committee, the composition of the committee and the selection of the chair.

Eykholt: To address Mitchell's previous question, while these are similar changes as the previous motion, it does get trickier when talking about promotion to full professor, for example. There is a small number of departments on campus that do not have five (5) full professors. The process for handling this is not being changed. If the department does not meet the minimum, then we go outside the department into the college and look for people of appropriate rank. If the department

code does not specify otherwise, you will look for people of same rank, but the department code can specify a reduction of this group, such as limiting it to certain departments within the college or people with certain types of expertise.

Chair Smith: Thanked Eykholt. Asked if there were additional questions.

Doreene Hyatt: Directed members' attention to page 63 of the agenda packet, where the eligible faculty members for promotion of tenured or tenure-track faculty are listed as all the other tenured faculty members of higher level than the faculty member under consideration. Indicated that department has promotions for faculty not on the tenure-track and there are questions about non-tenured associate professors not being able to vote on tenured positions. Asked how this is handled elsewhere.

Eykholt: When voting on tenure or tenure-track, only tenured faculty get to vote, which was something insisted upon by the upper administration. When non-tenure track faculty are coming up, the Manual language states that both tenured and non-tenured faculty of the appropriate rank get to vote. Reminded members that department codes can restrict or reduce that and indicate that only tenured faculty get to vote on non-tenure track faculty, but the Manual does not make that restriction. The Manual allows tenured and non-tenured faculty to vote on the promotion of non-tenure track faculty, as long as department codes do not specify otherwise.

Bharadwaj Kannan: We had discussed some of these changes in the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty and discussed some of these changes with colleagues in the College of Business. One of the concerns is related to a statement that if a response needs to be sent by the chair, the response cannot state that only a minority of the committee members felt that the response was appropriate. Some faculty felt this could be misinterpreted. The chair does not necessarily need to say that it was a minority, but maybe the letter should say whether it is a minority viewpoint or a majority viewpoint.

Eykholt: Clarified that this statement does not refer to the report from the committee, which has to represent the minority and majority points of view. This refers to a response to an adverse recommendation, such as if the committee says yes and the department head or dean say no. Some members of the committee may feel a response is appropriate. This language indicates that if at least a third of the committee feels a response is appropriate, then a response will be written and the response can state that only a minority of the committee felt a response was appropriate. Indicated that this language could be changed to indicate that the response "shall" state that a minority of committee members felt a response was appropriate. Would find that amendment acceptable if it were to be made. Again, this is only referring to the response to an adverse recommendation. The original report makes the minority and majority points of view clear.

Kannan: Moved to make a proposed change to the wording to state that the response "shall" state that only a minority of the committee felt a response was appropriate.

Mitchell: Seconded motion.

Chair Smith: Asked if there was further discussion on the amendment. Hearing none, requested a vote on the amendment in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion to amend statement in Section E.13.3 approved.

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any further discussion on the original motion, as amended. Hearing none, requested a vote on the amended main motion in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

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

7. Proposed Revisions to Section E.14.3.2 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty move to modify Section E.14.3.2 of the Manual as seen in the agenda packet. This is a similar change, which is increasing the Phase II Comprehensive Review committee from three (3) to five (5).

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions about this motion. Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

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

8. Proposed Revisions to Section E.15 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty move to amend Section E.15 of the Manual as seen in the agenda packet. Asked Eykholt to speak to this since it is related to role as University Grievance Officer.

Eykholt: This section has to do with disciplining tenured faculty, which fortunately does not happen very often. We have not had a disciplinary hearing for a long time. However, we got close to having one this past summer and through the process noticed some problems with wording, so we clarified several things with these changes. The main change has to do with language that indicates that the faculty member being disciplined shall be present at the hearing. The intention was that the faculty member being disciplined is allowed to be present at the hearing, but this can be interpreted in two (2) ways. It can be interpreted as the faculty member not showing up means the hearing cannot proceed, or it can be interpreted that the faculty member is required to be there and if they do not show up, that would be another ground for discipline, which does not make sense. The wording has changed to make it clear that the faculty member has the right to be present but is not required to be there. There are a few other changes to clarify language. Reminded members that as the University Grievance Officer, he does not make decisions, but simply manages the disciplinary hearings.

Craig Partridge: Have a comment that is probably larger than this amendment. It was mentioned that a grievance is likely to come up during the summer, and this section is full of statements involving timelines of when things need to happen, often involving faculty members who are not required to be on campus or working in the summer. Wondered if we should continue in that process, because if a grievance occurs during the summer, some faculty members cannot be asked to come in and do something, as this might create an outlet for more grievances.

Eykholt: Noted that none of those things are being changed with this motion.

Partridge: There were some working days requirements added to this document, so this is relevant.

Eykholt: What has been described is a common misconception that faculty are not employed over the summer, and that is not correct. Faculty are employed year-round and that is why you still get benefits over the summer. As an employee, you are obligated to perform required duties over the summer. Most people choose to get paid over the nine (9) months, or there is a choice of getting paid over twelve (12) months. Most people choose to get paid over nine (9) months so that they can pay themselves out of grants over the summer and get extra pay, but it is not true that you are not employed during this time. Faculty can be assigned committee or teaching work; it is just rare. What is being described here is not being changed.

Partridge: As chair, would have had faculty revolt if they had been told they were being pulled for additional hours over the summer.

Eykholt: You can do that. Supplemental pay can be given to people.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were additional questions. There was a question in the chat about what it means to be a nine (9) month employee.

Eykholt: Faculty are not really nine (9) month employees, it is simply a nine (9) month appointment, which indicates you have a nine (9) month appointment for teaching students. If faculty really had only nine (9) month employment, they would not receive benefits over the summer. This is something we can discuss at length, but it has nothing to do with any of the changes being suggested to Section E.15. This is a policy over employment of faculty members.

Chair Smith: Expressed agreement that this discussion is not necessarily germane to the changes being suggested.

Vice Provost Susan James: What Eykholt is saying is legally true and we are all glad we get benefits over the summer. However, what Partridge is stating is reasonable. Most chairs do not ask nine (9) month faculty to do significant amounts of service or teaching without more compensation in the summer. What Section E.15 is saying here is that you need to pay attention to your job, because if there is disciplinary action going on during the summer, you have to respond during the summer.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Think it could also be considered as that we are being employed for twelve (12) months and have benefits for twelve (12) months as part of an agreement for working nine (9) months. If we are working for twelve (12) months, would like to get paid for twelve (12) months. It would make sense and consider these as benefits as accrued during the regular academic work.

Chair Smith: These are all great questions, but are not germane to the motion at hand, so we need to proceed. If this is something we would like to discuss at a future Faculty Council meeting, we can do that. Asked if there were any questions specifically pertaining to the motion at hand.

John Slater: Asked if it was possible to table this motion, given the uncertainty regarding these changes.

Chair Smith: A motion could be made to table this motion, and we need to have votes in favor of the motion.

Slater: Moved to postpone this item until the November Faculty Council meeting.

Pedros-Gascon: Seconded motion.

Eykholt: Requested to comment. If you are moving to table these changes because of the discussion about nine (9) month and twelve (12) month appointments, that really has nothing to do with the changes that are being made here. This question has come up year after year and is something we can discuss separately. If these changes are not made, it leaves ambiguity about what the language means that is being changed. The nine (9) and twelve (12) month appointments and being employed during the summer will not be affected, so tabling this motion will not have an effect on this.

Partridge: Expressed disagreement. The issue is that there are deadlines that require actions by people who are tenured faculty members, and the deadlines are tight. The question is if an issue comes up during the summer, am concerned that by approving these changes and adding these additional deadlines in, we will not be able to staff the action in the timeframe specified.

Eykholt: Asked Partridge to indicate where additional deadlines are being added instead of just language being changed.

Partridge: There is a requirement for a five (5) working day response following notification in Section E.15.4.4.b.

Martin: To clarify, the five (5) working days were already present in that section.

Partridge: Indicated that there is an additional deadline of five (5) working days. The point is that we are voting on language that states timeframes.

Eykholt: If you table, those deadlines will still be there.



Partridge: There is also a note of ten (10) working days of receiving a recommendation from the President.

Eykholt: Those are deadlines for the President and the Provost.

Partridge: The point is that there are deadlines being added.

Chair Smith: Stated that we are only voting on the changes being made. In consultation with our Parliamentarian, the motion to table is outside the scope of the original motion regarding the language being proposed and is out of order. We will go back to the original motion, which is to approve these revisions to Section E.15. Given the amount of discussion around the nine (9) month and twelve (12) month issue and the ambiguity there, we will address this at our November meeting. We will attempt to get clarity around that and whether it might impact future revisions.

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

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

9. Proposed Revisions to Section K of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: The Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty move to modify Section K as seen in the agenda packet. This is specifically related to the grievance process. Asked Eykholt to speak to this motion.

Eykholt: The main item being proposed here is the elimination of the mediation process in Section K. Emphasized that we are not removing the mediation process, just one (1) avenue for mediation. This language predates the creation of the Ombuds, and when there was no avenue for mediation, the University Grievance Officer would attempt to resolve things informally. This was called “conciliation.” If the University Grievance Officer was not able to reach an informal resolution, the University hired a mediator at \$100 an hour to try to mediate the conflict. These mediators were typically previous University Grievance Officers, so they were not necessarily more qualified than the current University Grievance Officer. Having been in this role for eight (8) years, have never had a case that was unable to be mediated, and looked at what happened with previous University Grievance Officers going back twenty-three (23) years. In this time, there has never been a case where the University Grievance Officer was unable to reach an informal resolution. The hired mediator was just a process that did not work. The Manual requires we hire this mediator. This has two (2) effects, which includes delaying the grievant and it has cost the University thousands of dollars to pay these mediators without success. It makes a lot more sense for the University Grievance Officer and the Ombuds to reach a resolution which can now be called mediation, and we can remove the mediation process that is stated in Section K, which will allow the grievant to move on to a hearing and get a resolution. There are also a few other clarifications in the suggested revised language.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern that we cannot be guaranteed that the next University Grievance Officer may not be like Eykholt. Expressed concern about reducing protections of faculty that later may be needed by someone who cannot reach a resolution. Asked why we do not receive an annual report from the Ombuds like we do from Eykholt. Indicated the same has been requested from the Office of Equal Opportunity, which is not happening.

Martin: Clarified that mediation is still available to faculty through the Ombuds.

Sharon Anderson: Expressed concern about visibility. If this is not stated in the Manual, regarding the mediation processes, wondering if people will understand this is something they can still pursue.

Eykholt: There is still a statement in the Manual in the second paragraph of Section K that there are additional offices on campus that are available to assist with the resolution of conflicts. It provides a website and refers to the office of the Ombuds. The Manual is very clear that there are many sources for resolving conflicts.

Sybil Sharvelle: Requested more information on the role of the Ombuds and their activities so we can understand.

Eykholt: The Ombuds, unlike the University Grievance Officer, is confidential. They can advise you and mediate meetings and attempt to resolve conflicts. They have a lot more flexibility and formal training as mediators.

Martin: As previously mentioned, the current mediators are typically former University Grievance Officers who are not always trained on mediations.

Eykholt: Confirmed. None of the mediators we have hired over the past twenty-three (23) years have been trained mediators.

Vice Provost James: Would add that we are expanding Ombuds services now, because the need for their services has increased. These are highly trained individuals and are the national standard for Ombuds. They are confidential and report to the President, because they report to the highest authority at the University.

Alexandra Bernasek: Expressed concern. Eykholt is transparent, but the Ombuds are not transparent. We are not aware of what the success rate is with these alternatives. Expressed reluctance to take out anything in terms of opportunities for faculty to resolve conflicts. Would like to see more transparency from the other places where these conflicts are being addressed.

Martin: What we are hearing is a request for more transparency or reporting from the Ombuds to Faculty Council. However, Vice Provost James indicated that the Ombuds report to the President and their reporting structure is different from what we receive from Eykholt. Not sure what is being requested is allowable.

Eykholt: Confirmed. The Ombuds report to the President and do not report to Faculty Council the way the University Grievance Officer reports to Faculty Council.

Vice Provost James: This does not mean we cannot invite them to a Faculty Council meeting to discuss what they do.

Eykholt: Stated that the grievants themselves do not want this mediation process and do not like it. It adds another series of meetings and interviews, which delays their process getting resolved.

Pedros-Gascon: Stated that in May 2020 we had a report from the Ombuds and there were complaints about that report for not being very informative. Also stated that in April 2020 the Ombuds indicated the willingness to provide “this type of information at the end of each fiscal year” in an email to FC Chair. That has not happened. Also stated that when OEO was created, the expectation was to have that unit provide an annual report to FC, and that is not happening either. So we are talking about offices that seem to be little interested in engaging with Faculty Council and just report directly to the President. That does not build trust in the system.

Joseph DiVerdi: Moved to close the discussion.

Reising: Seconded DiVerdi’s motion.

Chair Smith: We have a motion to close the discussion. Requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms. Indicated we would need a two-thirds vote.

Motion failed.

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, requested a vote on the main motion regarding the revisions to Section K in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion failed.

Chair Smith: These proposed revisions to Section K will be sent back to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty. Thanked everyone for the discussion. Thanked Martin and Eykholt for all their work.

## **F. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Susan James**

Vice Provost James: Provided a snapshot of our research expenditures. Recognize that expenditures are only one (1) measure of research, as we heard from our Vice President for Research candidates that are on campus interviewing last week, this week, and next week. It is still notable to look at the change in a ten-year period, a 62% increase.

Vice Provost James: The Provost’s Ethics Colloquium will take place on November 8<sup>th</sup> from 4:00pm to 6:00pm. This will be on artificial intelligence. We will have a keynote speaker and a panel discussion. Encouraged members to engage.

Vice Provost James: President Amy Parsons and the administration have been committed to improving compensation for all employees on campus, and they recently announced some improvements for administrative professional employees. This is part of a multi-year effort to address compensation, market competitiveness, as well as looking at internal equity and compression. Exempt administrative professional employees who are under \$50,000 are being brought up to \$50,000 and those above between \$50,000 and \$55,000 will get a small bump to avoid compression. There is also some minor smoothing that is being done. Non-exempt employees are also being raised as well. Thanked Vice President Brendan Hanlon and Vice President Eric Ray, who have been going around campus discussing this with all the deans and unit leaders.

Vice Provost James: The Faculty Success team presented to the Provost Leadership Council last week, which is the deans, the vice presidents and the vice provosts. Directed members' attention to items that the team is working on. We know that faculty drive the research and education, which is central to everything we do at CSU and there is plenty of evidence that shows that diverse faculty leads to student success, particularly for students with minoritized identities and are underrepresented. Improving faculty success and diversity helps everything we do here.

Vice Provost James: Presented a snapshot of retention. We can see that minoritized women have a much lower seven-year retention rate than other groups. There is also discussion about how expensive it is to lose faculty, especially given because we are in the middle of budget discussions. Obviously there are more important things than the cost of losing a faculty member. It does cultural damage, and it hurts student success. We do just want to point out that retaining faculty has a true return on investment. Research shows that a sense of belonging and mentoring make a huge difference in retaining faculty, so the Faculty Success team is working on improving mentoring across the University. We are rolling out some programs now and borrowing best practices from places that are successful at mentoring so we can address bias and improve culture and structures.

Vice Provost James: Provided an update on the Interfolio process. Indicated that this information is on the Faculty Success website and on the Provost's website. There are two (2) pieces to Interfolio, which is the new IT system that we are adopting for our promotion and tenure process. Indicated that the College of Agricultural Sciences and the College of Health and Human Sciences have been piloting for us. There will be more information coming on this.

Vice Provost James: In November, interim Provost Janice Nerger will come to Faculty Council to provide updates on enrollment, debt, and student success. Thanked Provost Nerger for all she has done in the interim role as Provost.

[Provost presentation slides.](#)

- a. CSU Spur Update – Jim Bradeen, Associate Vice President for Spur Strategy

Jim Bradeen: Want to provide an update on Spur and where we are at, as well as take time to hear how we can better support our faculty colleagues.

Bradeen: CSU Spur integrates education, public outreach, and research scholarship, as well as providing lifelong experiential learning. We are also expanding educational access and launching careers that grapple with the big challenges of our time. It sounds similar to the land-grant mission of our Fort Collins campus. Spur is part of the National Western Center, where we came in as part of the CSU System as an educational anchor. CSU Spur is comprised of three (3) buildings. These buildings are Terra, which is focused on food and agriculture; Vida, which is focused on both animal and human health; and Hydro, which is focused on water and sustainability.

Bradeen: At the start of fiscal year 2024, CSU Spur had fifty-five (55) different projects coming from each of the colleges and come from the Office of Engagement and Extension. These projects represent a broad portfolio of activity that align with the land-grant mission. Most of these projects encompass education and this education spans the life of Pre-K to gray, and we see CSU Spur as a lifelong educational partner. We have things like Pre-K programming, field trips for K-12 children, and other visitor experiences across the fifty-five (55) projects. Others fit in the solution-focused category, which is education that focuses on solving a problem and improve someone's day-to-day life. We also have a career access bucket, and this focuses on the grade six (6) to twelve (12) space for career discovery and college preparation, as well as other non-traditional educational opportunities. Stated that there are also undergraduate and graduate experiences happening at CSU Spur, including a series of professional development opportunities for CSU undergraduate and graduate students. As we have grown these projects, one of the priority areas is to think differently about how we approach education and keeping CSU as a lifelong educational partner. The final educational bucket is lifelong learning, which includes a whole series geared to an older audience. The Osher Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI) that has operated out of Fort Collins has expanded their offerings to include classes that will be offered at Spur.

Bradeen: One area that has not been fully realized yet, but offers a tremendous opportunity, is educational tourism. This would have CSU partner with tourists to take them across the state to provide a series of educational impacts and extend the impact of Spur beyond the Denver metro area.

Bradeen: This model of education grew out of conversations with faculty about what they were already doing. We have some unique research spaces, and we have spaces that are integrated into the educational mission. We have been taking advantage of the location and that we are embedded in a neighborhood that is underserved. We are seeing our colleagues, across all these projects, engage with industry and leveraging industry relationships.

Bradeen: As for challenges and opportunities, the Board of Governors has been generous in financially supporting many of these projects. These projects are supported through seed funding, so the idea is that over a period of the next five (5) years, projects will develop their own funding models, and we are already seeing fewer resources from the CSU System being put into these projects as a result. We are also actively shifting to a model of supporting projects in

growing funding streams. There are five (5) basic areas at play here. The first is growing student credit hours, another is user fees, as well as research grants, philanthropic giving, and industry relations.

Bradeen: We have also had more of our colleagues engaged at Spur, and it has been clear that we need to do a better job of providing robust training for projects and project teams. We are working across the University with experts to identify and deliver some of those opportunities. There is also a need for better alignment with what is happening at Spur and what is traditionally done in Fort Collins. Finally, public transportation and on-site housing are significant challenges at this moment. Would like to hear ideas about how we can do a better job of supporting our colleagues and communicating that CSU Spur can potentially be an asset to their work and help them conceive and launch projects.

Chair Smith: Thanked Bradeen for the presentation. Given the time constraints, requested that members contact Vice Provost James and Bradeen directly with any questions or comments.

## **G. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED**

1. Faculty Council Standing Committee 2022-2023 Annual Reports
  - a. Faculty Council Report to the Board of Governors

Pedros-Gascon: Requested a correction to this report.

Chair Smith: We can only ask questions about these reports, not request corrections.

Pedros-Gascon: Understood, but feel in the future, we should indicate that we are responsible for evaluating the President since that was not something that was indicated. This is a clear investment that we have in the process.

- b. Committee on Faculty Governance
- c. Committee on Information Technology
- d. Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
- e. Committee on Libraries
- f. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty
- g. Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty
- h. Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education
- i. Committee on Scholastic Standards
- j. Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning
- k. Committee on Teaching and Learning

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed disappointment in one of the statements in the Committee on Teaching and Learning report of language as part of a possible discussion for diversity. Think it is inappropriate and creates a misunderstanding when it comes to the function of language in a multicultural and multilingual state like Colorado. It is hard to read these comments and seeing colleagues advance those kinds of misunderstandings.

- l. Committee on University Programs
- m. University Curriculum Committee

Reports received.

2. TILT Annual Report 2022-2023

Report received.

3. Budget Model Goals and Values Report – Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning – Gamze Cavdar, Chair

Chair Smith: Directed members' attention to the Budget Model Goals and Values report from the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning.

Mary Van Buren: Value #3 in this report states that the principle of shared governance dictates that faculty are the primary stakeholder and decision-maker regarding the curriculum and elimination of programs, and these cannot be made solely based on budget concerns. Wondering what the motivation was behind this statement and if the committee expects the elimination of some programs.

Gamze Cavdar: We do not expect the elimination of any programs. There is experience there that we can learn from other universities and do what we can to avoid those kinds of terrible situations. The best analogy for the reasoning behind this statement is putting on your seatbelt even if you do not anticipate getting in a car accident.

Van Buren: Executive Vice President Rick Miranda announced another committee recently for the budget planning and this new budget model. Would like to know how the values listed here will be incorporated into that committee going forward.

Chair Smith: This might be a better question for Executive Vice President Miranda, who will be presenting later in the agenda.

Pedros-Gascon: Would like to understand the background and process behind this report.

Cavdar: The Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning provides recommendations regarding financial and strategic issues. In the spring, we were visited by President Parsons, who invited us to contribute to the process of developing a budget model. For that purpose, a subcommittee was created for over the summer, and we worked on the report seen here. We read Andrew Comrie's book, which recommended that the budget model start with values. This allows people to get together over common denominators.

Chair Smith: Thanked Cavdar. Asked if there were additional questions.

Ashok Prasad: Asked if the point of this document was to be adopted by the University or placed in front of the administration.

Cavdar: Our role is to provide feedback. Because the process has just started, we are not sure how it will unfold. Executive Vice President Miranda might be in a better position to respond to this question.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions, report received.

4. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Ceded report time due to time constraints.

5. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Ceded report time due to time constraints.

## H. DISCUSSION

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any objection to extending the meeting to accommodate the discussion items. Expressed hope that we can finish by 6:30pm.

Hearing no objections, proceeded with discussion items.

1. ASCSU Syllabus Bank – ASCSU Director of Academic Affairs Theo Reese

Theo Reese: Serving as the Director of Academic Affairs for the Associated Students of CSU. Have been working with President Nick DeSalvo and Vice President Alex Silverhart to implement a University-wide syllabus bank.

Reese: The three (3) purposes for doing this include enabling students to have more detail around the course they want to register for, having students who are better prepared for their courses, and having students who are more informed about the course, while allowing faculty as much academic freedom as possible.

Reese: With more detail, students will have a better idea of what the course will entail and be more prepared. This enables the professor to hit the ground running and not have to take multiple classes to go over the foundations. This will allow professors to cover more material or more challenging or interesting material. Another benefit would be having the complete knowledge of the course load and students can better plan what they are doing each semester and allow them to better balance their course load. This autonomy does come with the responsibility to plan, and we hope this will cut down on the need for extensions.

Reese: There are also distinctions between lower-level courses and upper-level courses. The fundamentals tend not to change, such as mathematical formulas. With lower-level course, we tend to see more consistency, but this does not necessarily mean they need to be set in stone. There can still be variations from semester to semester and year to year. With the upper-level



courses, we see more leeway because there is more complexity. With these courses, the syllabi might just indicate what broad topics would be covered and any additional topics that might come up that vary from semester to semester.

Reese: Encouraged faculty to reach out with any thoughts or questions. Directed members' attention to the QR code as seen in the agenda packet for the survey and contact information.

Reese: Indicated that there were questions previously that we have addressed. Universities such as Duke and Stanford have syllabus banks, so this is not necessarily a new idea. We understand this would be new at CSU, so we are treating this as pilot program. We can adjust and continuing to work with ASCSU to make improvements.

Reese: Each professor for a class such as Math 114, for example, would upload their syllabi for the past two (2) or three (3) semesters so students registering for the course can see what it entails and any variation. We do understand that multiple professors teach the same course, so there would be different syllabi and teaching styles. This would be per professor per course.

Reese: One of the major discussions has been around concerns with intellectual property. We want to make sure that all faculty members and professors feel safe and secure, knowing that their materials will not be disseminated widely without their knowing or consent. We are looking to have it behind a CSU wall so only those affiliated with CSU can access the materials and have disclaimers prohibiting distribution beyond CSU. There will also be statements indicating that these will not be verbatim copies of what will unfold in the classes but can provide an overview and a general idea of the class without the specifics.

Chair Smith: Asked if the best way to provide feedback is through the QR code.

Reese: Yes. This allows us to keep a record of any concerns and comments so that we can reach out to individuals for more clarification or discussion. We want to work with everyone on how we want this implemented.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any immediate questions. Hearing none, thanked Reese. Looking forward to seeing how this develops.

## 2. New Budget Model Updates – Executive Vice President Rick Miranda

Executive Vice President Rick Miranda: Have given several presentations to a number of groups as we are launching this conversation around whether we should employ a new budget model. Introduced Rob Mitchell and Jennifer Martin, who are serving as Presidential Fellows to help with this process. Asked Mitchell to start the presentation.

Rob Mitchell: In this process, CSU has had a lot of success, and we are in a great position. Part of the rationale for revisiting and exploring a new budget model is to ensure we are enabling a successful future. We realize the landscape of education is changing and we want to avoid missteps that other universities have made. Part of this includes looking at our incremental budget model. The incremental model limits flexibility and adaptability, and some universities

have moved to a Responsibility-Centered Model (RCM). Part of what this budget model is intended to do is to enable us to continue our great research, teaching, and engagement across Colorado and fulfill our land-grant mission.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Will start with some of our guiding values. The budget model should support our mission and send resources to mission areas that have need of resources. The second value is around transparency, clarity, simplicity, consistency, and accountability, all of which are listed in the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning values document. These are shared governance principles, but all of these values are here to ensure there is trust in the decisions and fiscal decisions that are made. The goal of having trust in the decisions that are being made is paramount. We also want any budget model to empower innovation and give responsibility to the local level as is sensible. We know that innovation in curricular matters happens in the departments and in the colleges, and we want to be driving resources toward those innovations and those activities locally. We also put in some guardrails to make sure that the University perspective and our entire University ecosystem is considered. We also want to encourage collaboration, as well as fiscal responsibility, efficiency, productivity, performance, and quality, not just quantity. Finally, any budget model should not be so formulaic that it takes all decisions out of the hands of the leadership of the institution. There should be some capacity for strategic investments to be made.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Will address questions regarding the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning document. What we have presented here are values, and any values statement needs to be adopted by the President. This statement will be drawn from a variety of resources, including the document from the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Asked Martin to speak to timeline of what will happen over the next few months.

Martin: We want to be thoughtful regarding this approach, as well as being timely for some key deadlines that we have for the budget of the University. For the past few months, we have engaged as a campus, as well as with the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning and other committees and experts, to learn a bit about the landscape of budget models and what exists in the higher education landscape. We also discussed experiences that others have faced in the transition from an incremental budget to a hybrid RCM model or something similar.

Martin: We are transitioning into the planning and diagnostic phases, which will carry us through fall and into the spring semester where we have the design phase, and we can see the pieces of a potential new model come to light and see how they might operate within our University structure. We are getting feedback from campus in that process and some iterations that we may see lead us to finalization of this in spring or summer and into next year of what we would propose as a new budget model. The following year, we would move into a phase where we would test that model as a shadow model while operating with our existing incremental budget. There will be a lot of opportunities for engagement from the campus community throughout this process.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Will discuss the governance process that we are putting into place. We are proposing three (3) committees to oversee this development of a new budget

model. The first committee will be the Executive Sponsor Committee. These will be executive leaders of the institution and they will set the direction and make the final decisions. The President has approved the composition of this committee to include the President, the Chief Financial Officer of the institution, the Provost and Executive Vice President, and the chair of Faculty Council.

Executive Vice President Miranda: The other two (2) committees will be the technical committee, which includes the budget and fiscal officers, as well as accountants and other non-technical individuals who appreciate the academic challenges with the budget. Anything that comes from the technical committee will be vetted by the steering committee, which will be comprised of the deans, faculty representation, and department chairs. Vice President Hanlon will be asked to convene the steering committee, and Angela Nielsen will be asked to convene the technical committee. This is a similar construct to what has been employed at other universities, particularly at CU Boulder.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Described the incremental budget model structure. We ask ourselves what the change in revenue we will most likely experience the next year will be. Then it becomes how we distribute the incremental revenue. We do a few things off the top, such as pay mandatory costs such as utility bills or bond payments. We might put some money in a strategic fund for the President's discretion. Then we decide how much of the incremental revenue should be sent to academic units and administrative units based on discussions with deans and vice presidents regarding their needs.

Executive Vice President Miranda: With the different model, the overall structure is not much different, but it might change how people think about distributing more of the revenue rather than just the incremental revenue. Questions to be asked include whether the tuition should be included or state appropriations, so we will have those discussions. We will still need to have central funding for the administrative units, but the academic units will have the opportunity to try stimulating formulas that would send resources to academic units based on a variety of metrics. The primary stimulating formula metric is enrollment for the academic units. We will need to ask whether we want to encourage retention, or graduation rates, or time to degree metrics. The colleges will also be supplemented with additional funding that acknowledges that some colleges are more expensive to run than other colleges and it is not sensible to expect a single formula to apply to satisfy the needs of all the colleges.

Executive Vice President Miranda: The charge this year is to roll up our sleeves and ask ourselves these questions and what the nature of these exercises should be. This new model will not create more revenue automatically. We hope that changing the model and employing sensible, stimulating formulas will stimulate growth, which will provide the additional revenue.

Executive Vice President Miranda: For next steps, we are hoping to have the Executive Sponsor Committee together in the next few weeks and we will fill out the other two (2) committees next week. We will be making some sort of formal announcement of the project this year and put in place a series of listening sessions that will go through October and into November. We also want to try to get feedback on what people think about the metrics to be used, the values we have

in play here, and how much tuition revenue should be put in service of the formula. There will be multiple opportunities for engagement and discussion.

Chair Smith: Thanked Executive Vice President Miranda. Asked if there were any questions.

Van Buren: Wondering what the role of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning will be in this and how faculty will be selected for the steering committee.

Executive Vice President Miranda: We will have membership from the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning on the steering committee or technical committee, or both. We have not yet figured out membership for those committees yet. We want to have discussions about how we should select other members of those committees and have the opportunity for nominations. We need to have some diversity and representation on these committees.

Slater: Asked if there is anything we should be doing now. Some people on campus are anticipating these changes, but based on the timeline, it looks like we should not be taking any specific action yet. Wondering what we should be doing now and how we can make sure that we have a place at the table in these early stages of definition the operational values.

Executive Vice President Miranda: That is the purpose of having a robust conversation with the campus community over the next month or so. We want to have these kinds of conversations, so we have what we need as we emerge from that process and start designing the model and formulas. The committees will also be informed by those conversations. There is not much to do at the moment but would encourage people participate in the conversations we are setting up.

Mitchell: This is the reason we wanted to have all the deans and budget officers represented. We felt strongly that every voice from every college should be represented.

Chair Smith: Asked if additional questions or comments could be submitted directly.

Martin: Emails are great. Next week, we will announce the slate of opportunities to provide feedback, both through in-person sessions and online feedback. Our emails are open as well. There will be upwards of twenty (20) opportunities over the next six (6) weeks for people to ask questions and have conversation around these topics.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin, Mitchell, and Executive Vice President Miranda. Expressed appreciation for the presentation and information. Encouraged members to participate in the opportunities to provide feedback.

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

Meeting was adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

Melinda Smith, Chair  
Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair  
Andrew Norton, BOG Representative  
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant



<b>Steven Reising</b>	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2025
<b>Soheil Fatehiboroujeni</b>	Mechanical Engineering	2026
<u>Thomas Bradley</u>	Systems Engineering	2026
<b>Sybil Sharvelle</b>	College-at-Large	2026
<b>Pinar Omur-Ozbek</b>	College-at-Large	2026

### **Liberal Arts**

<b>Mary Van Buren</b>	Anthropology & Geography	2026
<b>Marius Lehene</b>	Art & Art History	2025
(substituting for Mary-Ann Kokoska, Fall 2023)		
<b>Mark Saunders</b>	Communication Studies	2025
<b>Ramaa Vasudevan</b>	Economics	2024
(substituting for Anders Fremstad, on sabbatical 2023-2024)		
<u>Genesea Carter</u>	English	2026
<u>Maricela DeMirjyn</u>	Ethnic Studies	2025
<b>John Slater</b>	Languages, Literatures, and Cultures	2025
<b>Tracy Brady</b>	History	2026
<b>Marilee Long</b>	Journalism and Media Communication	2025
TBD	Music, Theatre, and Dance	2025
(substituting for Madeline Harvey, Fall 2023)		
TBD	Philosophy	2025
<u>Marni Berg</u>	Political Science	2024
<b>Laura Reynolds</b>	Sociology	2025

<b>Alexandra Bernasek</b>	College-at-Large	2026
<b>Antonio Pedros-Gascon</b>	College-at-Large	2025
<b>Emily Morgan</b>	College-at-Large	2026
<u>Lisa Langstraat</u>	College-at-Large	2024
<b>Allison Goar</b>	College-at-Large	2024
<b>Abigail Shupe</b>	College-at-Large	2024
<b>Sanam Emami</b>	College-at-Large	2026
<b>Fabiola Ehlers-Zavala</b>	College-at-Large	2026
<b>Mohammed Hirchi</b>	College-at-Large	2026

### **Natural Resources**

<b>Randall Boone</b>	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2026
<u>Camille Stevens-Rumann</u>	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2024
(substituting for Chad Hoffman, Fall 2023)		
<u>Joel Berger</u>	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2024
(substituting for Yoichiro Kanno, on sabbatical 2023-2024)		
<b>William Sanford</b>	Geosciences	2026
<b>Christina Cavaliere</b>	Human Dimensions of Natural Resources	2026

### **Natural Sciences**

<b>Olve Peersen</b>	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	2025
<b>Mike Antolin</b>	Biology	2024

<b>Brittney Morgan</b>	Chemistry	2026
<b>Craig Partridge</b>	Computer Science	2026
<u>Emily Hardegree-Ullman</u>	Physics	2024
<b>Silvia Canetto</b>	Psychology	2025
<u>Ander Wilson</u>	Statistics	2025
<b>Steve Benoit</b>	Mathematics	2026
<b>Alan Van Orden</b>	College-at-Large	2026
<b>James Liu</b>	College-at-Large	2026
<b>Kim Henry</b>	College-at-Large	2026

### **Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences**

<b>DN Rao Veermachaneni</b>	Biomedical Sciences	2025
<b>Shari Lanning</b>	Clinical Sciences	2025
TBD	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2026
<u>Tony Schountz</u>	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2024
<b>Roxann Karkhoff-Schweizer</b> (substituting for Katriana Popichak, Fall 2023)	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Fiona Hollinshead</u>	College-at-Large	2025
<b>Doreene Hyatt</b>	College-at-Large	2024
<u>Tara Nordgren</u>	College-at-Large	2025
<b>Del Leary</b>	College-at-Large	2026
<b>Dan Regan</b>	College-at-Large	2026
<b>Zaid Abdo</b>	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Brian Geiss</u>	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Jennifer Rawlinson</u> (excused)	College-at-Large	2026

### **University Libraries**

<b>Christine Pawliuk</b>	Libraries	2025
--------------------------	-----------	------

### ***Ex Officio* Voting Members**

<b>Melinda Smith</b>	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2024
<b>Joseph DiVerdi</b>	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2024
<b>Andrew Norton</b>	BOG Faculty Representative	2024
<b>Steve Reising, Chair</b>	Committee on Faculty Governance	2024
<b>Gregg Griffenhagen, Chair</b>	Committee on Information Technology	2024
<b>Shane Kanatous, Chair</b>	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2024
<u>Jerry Magloughlin</u> , Chair (excused)	Committee on Libraries	2024
<b>Ryan Brooks, Chair</b>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
<b>Jennifer Martin, Chair</b>	Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty	2024
<b>William Sanford, Chair</b>	Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education	2024
<u>Alan Kennan</u> , Chair (excused)	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2024
<b>Gamze Cavdar, Chair</b>	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2024
<b>Lumina Albert, Chair</b>	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2024
<b>Peter Jan van Leeuwen, Co-Chair</b>	Committee on University Programs	2024

<u>Tian Wang</u> , Co-Chair	Committee on University Programs	2024
<b>Brad Goetz</b> , Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2024
<u>Karen Thorsett-Hill</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2026
<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 Wiebensohn</b>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025

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

Amy Parsons	President
Rico Munn	Chief of Staff
Jan Nerger	Interim Provost
Derek Dictson	Vice President for Advancement
<b>Kathay Rennels</b>	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
Eric Ray	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
Laura Jensen	Vice Provost for Planning and Effectiveness
Christa Johnson	Interim Vice President for Research
<b>Blanche M. Hughes</b>	Vice President for Student Affairs
Tom Siller	Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
<b>Kyle Henley</b>	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
Ken Reardon	Interim Dean, College of Engineering
Lise Youngblade	Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Colleen Webb	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
Matt Klein	Chair, Administrative Professional Council