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
November 7, 2023 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

Chair Smith reminded members the meetings are public, and the minutes will be posted on the Faculty Council website. Reminded the members of the rules of engagement and etiquette in the Microsoft Teams environment. Asked members to limit questions to speaker to one question, allowing everyone to ask a question before any additional questions can be asked, and to limit questions and comments to two minutes.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – November 7, 2023

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next Faculty Council Meeting – December 5, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm

Chair Smith: Reminded members of the Provost's Ethics Colloquium on November 8th from 4:00-6:00 p.m. in the Lory Student Center.

2. The Conversation Open Forum - November 9, 2023 – Lory Student Center 312 - 1:30pm
   a. Faculty Council members interested in learning more about writing for The Conversation are invited to attend an in-person, one-hour session with two of its representatives. Chief Innovation and Development Officer Bruce Wilson and University Membership Manager Nancy Jensen will be on hand to discuss this outlet, which only runs faculty-written articles that are then republished by larger media outlets. More information: https://vimeo.com/198123060

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

1. Faculty Council Meeting – October 3, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from October 3rd as seen in the agenda packet.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – September 22, 29, October 6, & 13, & 20, 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 – Graduate Representative to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Steve Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the election of Nancy Ghanem as the graduate student representative to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics.

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

Motion approved.

2. Election – Faculty Representative to Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty– Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair
3. Election – Faculty Representative to Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning– Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: Asked to include the faculty representative to the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty and faculty representative to the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning in the same election.

Chair Smith: Agreed.

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the election of the academic faculty nominees to Faculty Council standing committees.

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

Motion approved.

4. Academic Calendar Fall 2028-Summer 2030

Joseph DiVerdi: On behalf of the Faculty Council, move to approve the Academic Calendar for Fall 2028-Summer 2030.

Michael Antolin: Second the motion.

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

Motion approved.

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

Jennifer Martin: Indicated that Ryan Brooks was present to respond to questions. The revisions to Section E.6 make the appropriate changes to reflect recently passed legislation that increases the maximum contract length to five years. On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that Section E.6 be revised as shown in the agenda packet.

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any discussion of the motion.

Ryan Brooks: This legislation was signed by the governor earlier in the year. We expect this change to move forward and then we will update the Provost's Office letters once the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual is accurate.

Antolin: Commented that it is nice to see this change for faculty.

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.

6. 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: Noted that Richard Eykholt, University Grievance Officer, was present to respond to questions. On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that Section K be revised as shown in the agenda packet. Section K addresses resolution of disputes. Several minor revisions reflect updated section titles or numbers as well as grammatical corrections that were needed. The proposed revision to Section K.1 clarifies the language

regarding conflict resolution resources. The proposed revision to Section K.3.2.2 clarifies the language regarding grievable action, and the proposed revisions to Section K.12.3 improves language regarding service of the University Grievance Officer. Asked if Richard Eykholt had any feedback to provide for this slate of revisions.

Richard Eykholt: Noted that none of these revisions make a change to what we are doing; these are all for clarifying language. At the last Faculty Council meeting, a revision to Section K was proposed to eliminate the university mediators. That revision has been taken out and these current revisions are housekeeping.

Peter Jan van Leeuwen: Noted that the role of the department head in Section K.12.3 has been removed. Asked for clarification regarding this change.

Eykholt: Noted that the University Grievance Officer's department head plays no role in the duties or funding of the University Grievance Officer position. The funding comes from the Provost's Office, so there is nothing for the department head to negotiate anymore.

Van Leeuwen: Asked about the workload of the University Grievance Officer.

Eykholt: Clarified that the workload of the University Grievance Officer is specified as 50% time in the Faculty Council Procedures Handbook, rather than the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Since the workload is specified there, there is nothing left to negotiate.

Gregg Griffenhagen: Noted a concern that the links in the Manual to other websites may not be durable and could become out of date.

Martin: Think that is a challenge with the Manual in multiple places where current live links may change.

Eykholt: Commented that links throughout the Manual are updated as changes get made, and these links have not changed in over a decade.

Griffenhagen: Noted that if we link to higher level pages, it will help everybody's work in the future.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Understands that changing things like links, references to people, or phone numbers in the Manual would be considered clerical changes.

Eykholt: Confirmed that if a website link were to change, it would be a clerical change to the Manual and would not need to come before Faculty Council.

Alex Bernasek: Asked for the rationale for replacing the language, "decision on the amount of salary" with "annual salary adjustment", in Section K.3.2.2.a.

Eykholt: Explained that a grievance has to be against an action taken by an administrator. The final decision on the amount of salary is made by the Board of Governors, and you technically can't grieve the Board. This language change makes it so that you can file a grievance regarding your annual salary adjustment.

Bernasek: Concerned that "annual salary adjustment" may not be broad enough to cover issues around salary.

Eykholt: Noted that you can only grieve something within twenty days of it happening.

Bernasek: Asked if salary adjustments other than annual salary adjustments are covered in this statement.

Eykholt: No, and it is not covered now. If a request for a salary adjustment outside of the annual salary adjustment was denied, that is not grievable.

Chair Smith: Asked if it is worth considering removing the word "annual".

Craig Partridge: Provided an example of a department changing its supplemental pay policy for teaching online in the middle of term, and someone being paid less than they had been told at the start of the semester. Asked if that is included here or outside of the scope.

Eykholt: Noted that would be grievable but would be outside the scope of Section K.3.2.2.a.

Partridge: Thanked Eykholt for clarifying.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any further 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.

7. Proposed Revisions to Section J 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 Section J be revised as shown in the agenda packet. Section J addresses a faculty member's rights and responsibilities related to inventions and creative works. The version of Section J that is currently in the Manual was last revised in 2003 and is largely out of compliance with federal state policies. The major proposed changes worthy of note include replacing the term "copyrighted" with "copyrightable", meaning that employees don't have to go through the process of copyrighting their work in order for it to be protected. The proposed revisions also clarify language around the fact that faculty own the materials they create for teaching their courses as well as language requiring written agreements to be made when employees are hired to create something they won't own.

Martin: There are still opportunities for improvement of Section J, but we feel this proposed version is worth considering because of the substantial nature of these changes and the positive impact they will have on faculty and their rights to protect their work. Acknowledged Eykholt, who played an instrumental role in this process as well as the other committee members.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any further 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.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin, the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, Eykholt, and everyone else involved in these changes to the Manual.

F. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – President Amy Parsons

President Amy Parsons: We have finalized our appointments for Provost and Executive Vice President Marion Underwood and Vice President for Research Cassandra Mosely. Both of these leaders are in the process of moving to Fort Collins and will be starting in January. Thanked Interim Provost Jan Nerger and Interim Vice President for Research Christa Johnson for serving in these important roles. Thanked Deans Lise Youngblade and James Pritchett for chairing those searches. We got great feedback from all the candidates who visited campus that they had a positive experience without issue and found it to be very welcoming and positive.

President Parsons: We are appointing Kevin MacLennan as Interim Vice President for Enrollment and Access. Interim Vice President MacLennan has tremendous energy and expertise around enrollment and access and along with the team that we already have in place is really taking us to the next level with strategic enrollment plans and looking at all our processes from enrollment through registration and onboarding of our students.

President Parsons: Welcomed Dean Allen Robinson who just started in the last week with Engineering, it is wonderful to have him on board.

President Parsons: James Pritchett will be stepping into the role of Vice President for Engagement and Extension in January as well. Starting in January we will finally have the whole cabinet leadership team together, which has been a focus of mine since I started in February. We will be launching a new search for the Dean of the College of Agricultural Science, but everything else is filled at this point. Deans Sue VandeWoude and Alonso Aguirre will be chairing the search for the new dean. Thanked Kathay Rennels for serving as Interim Vice President for Engagement and Extension over the last eighteen months. It has been a long time that she has served in that sole, so really glad to have those locked in. Once we have the full cabinet on board, we'll be doing some retreats and some off sites to make sure that everybody is on board with our priorities around student success.

President Parsons: Academic and research excellence, institutional competitiveness, outreach, impact around the state, and strengthening our democracy are priorities that you've been hearing me talk about for the last many months. Thanked Laura Jensen, our Vice Provost for Planning and Effectiveness. As most of you know and probably participated in, she just wrapped up the Higher Learning Commission accreditation review. Think Vice Provost Jensen probably does not get enough credit for how much work goes into the Higher Learning Commission review every four years, and this was no exception. She put in a tremendous amount of work and a lot of people on the screen participated in that. We don't have the final accreditation report, but we've seen drafts of it and it's great. No concerns which we didn't expect, but really to get that clean bill of health and have the Higher Learning Commission Review Committee work so hard on campus, meet with so many groups, and come back with such a positive reflection of our

programs is really a testament to CSU, but also to Vice Provost Jensen for shepherding all this. We will get that final accreditation report, and maybe you can distribute it out to Faculty Council for review, and they'll give us some things to focus on and work on over the next four years.

President Parsons: Noted that one thing being focused on in the last few months as an initiative is getting better about our community college student transfer process, being more proactive at working with the community colleges around the state, and working with their presidents and their admission staff to understand how we can do a better job of being the place that those students want to transfer to, especially after they achieve their associates degree. We know from national data and Colorado data, how many students in Colorado start at a community college who want to achieve a four-year degree and it's around 85%, and the number of students who actually achieve a four-year degree is 17-18% by the time they get all the way through. That is not unique to Colorado, that is a national trend, but that's something that I think we can do a lot better at. I've recently joined a small cohort of university presidents that's funded by the Aspen Institute, the American Talent Initiative, focusing on how we can get better at community college transfer and working with them early on and smoothing out those pathways. Vice President for Student Affairs Blanche Hughes is going to be taking a leadership role along with Vice President MacLennan, so more to come on that. That is one thing I'm going to focus on with the Board of Governors in December, is access for those students and increasing our transfer rates.

President Parsons: Noted our thematic year of democracy, which I'm personally very excited about. With Election Day on this campus a year from now, the federal elections will probably look a lot different than today. Today, it is a little sleepy around campus, I imagine it is not going to be so sleepy one year from now. We are really focusing our efforts today on getting out to vote, on voter registration, and a lot of events over the next year which is sure to be a busy election year. Governors Jared Polis and Spencer Cox from Utah will be on campus next week with their Disagree Better conversation. I will be facilitating their discussion where they are modeling how they civilly disagree on important issues and model productive civil dialogue. Encouraged people to tune in or attend in person. It is put on by the National Governors Association, so it is wonderful that they are coming to campus.

President Parsons: We are also having President Ron Daniels of Johns Hopkins University come in the spring. We will let you know as soon as we get that date locked in. He wrote a book about what universities owe democracy, and he is going to come and have a fireside chat as well. We have really interesting speakers, not just politicians, but academics, and even some entertainers who are in this space coming over the course of the next year.

President Parsons: Thanked those who are working on the budget redesign process. Do not profess to be an expert on budget redesign, and very much appreciate everyone who is and everyone on Faculty Council who has been working on this. Specifically, Rob Mitchell and Jennifer Martin, who are taking leadership roles on the Executive Sponsorship Committee. They are about to finalize both the Steering Committee and the Technical Committee on budget redesign. Thanked everyone who volunteered to be on these committees. When it comes to looking at the budget model, we are a little bit fortunate in an odd way that we have not redesigned our budget for so long. It has been a couple of decades since we've undertaken a review on this. In the meantime, a lot of universities who look like us, including CU, have gone through major budget redesigns, so we have all of that to look at. Some have gone way in one

direction or way in another direction. So far, they have all been generous with their time and expertise to help us minimize the risk of making a mistake and also increase our chances of reaching a budget that achieves the transparency and the growth that we want.

President Parsons: Asked if there were any questions and noted that Vice President for University Operations Brendan Hanlon was also present to answer questions.

Bernasek: Noted that there are some issues with the quality of classroom services, such as Wi-Fi failing and the quality of equipment in the classrooms and wanted to know where we should direct those concerns and questions. Know that a lot of people are concerned, students and faculty in particular, with the quality of classroom facilities. Asked for President Parsons perspective and if there were suggestions in terms of going forward.

President Parsons: Thanked Bernasek for raising this and had not heard the concern about Wi-Fi or classroom equipment. Encouraged Bernasek to email this directly and include Vice President Hanlon and note if there are particular locations that are of concern. Will take this on to try and get a handle on it. Noted that we also kicked off the budget process for fiscal year 2025. It allows for both top priority operating requests as well as capital investments and could see this falling into either of those categories. We are trying to leverage a process like that to give us some surveillance on campus of where these pain points are. That doesn't mean we could fund everything but at least it will be on our radar for prioritization. Also happy to reach out the Vice President of Information Technology Brandon Bernier and partner with him.

Bernasek: Thanked President Parsons and Vice President Hanlon. Will pass that on and noted the discussion at the end of this meeting about the Clark remodel, because this is a bit of a part of that.

Griffenhagen: Noted the new IT governance strategy that is being finalized. We will soon have methods for individuals within their departments to communicate that IT is not working, so that we can get input from the individual faculty members when things don't work. This is something we've been working on for a year now and will be coming to faculty shortly.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, thanked President Parsons for her report.

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

Interim Provost Jan Nerger: Indicated three updates to present to the group. The first has to do with student success initiatives which we have been working very hard on. We are in the final year of the $9 million investment that the Board of Governors provided the university. That was three years of $3 million each, and this is the final year. The Provost's Office hosted a symposium on October 17th, and presented what money has been provided to the different projects and some preliminary results. We also made reports to the Board of Governors. We are continuing to look at the data analysis and see what the things are that we're seeing make a difference on student retention, graduation rates, and closing the opportunity gaps. Let's invest in

those, try to scale them, and find a way to financially sustain them. With President Parsons and Executive Vice President Rick Miranda's help we have been able to pull some of the money over to student success each year. We are a far cry from $3 million, so we can't fund everything, and we are going to have to prioritize. Encouraged everyone to look at all the data that is on the Student Success website. It is an ongoing project, but think we've made some good headway into what can affect student retention, especially from the freshman to sophomore year, as well as graduation rates.

Provost Nerger: Second, the Provost's Ethics Colloquium is on November 8th from 4:00-6:00 p.m. in the Lory Student Center Theatre. It is on generative AI and higher education, and we've invited Abram Anders from Iowa State University. They've looked at academic innovation and student success, and his specialty right now is generative AI and human centered design. Following the keynote, we are going to have a panel which will consist of four people from our university, Tim Amidon from English, Meena Balgopal from Biology, Laura Sample-McMeeking from the STEM Center, and Wade Troxell from Mechanical Engineering. Think it will be a good discussion that will take a slightly different angle than you've seen before.

Provost Nerger: Third, I have been meeting regularly with Marion Underwood who will be arriving in the middle of December. Will do whatever I can to smooth the transition for her to take the reins here. For those of you going to the APLU meeting in Seattle this weekend, she will be there and is anxious to meet any CSU folks. President Parsons and I will be at the APLU meeting as well.

Chair Smith: Thanked Interim Provost Nerger for her report.

H. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Provided an update on the Faculty Council communications plan. The plan is to update the website this Fall, and have it refreshed and hopefully easier to navigate. We are also going to be launching a Faculty Council newsletter that will be sent out to the broader university community to provide updates on actions and what the Faculty Council is doing or planning to do in the future. Hopefully you can keep an eye out for those in the Spring. We are also planning coffees with the Executive Committee in the Spring. That will be open to anybody in the university community to come and talk to Executive Committee. There is going to be one each month in February, March, and April. We are looking forward to seeing you in person at those meetings.

Chair Smith: Wanted to touch base on the budget redesign process. Am serving on the Executive Sponsor Committee and we had our first meeting last week. This week we are meeting to discuss membership of the Steering Committee and Technical Committee, so you will be hearing about that soon. There were a lot of people interested in participating in the committees. Am looking forward to serving on the Executive Sponsor Committee and being involved in the budget redesign process.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Andrew Norton: The last time the board met was the first week in October, which was some time ago. Much of the news we heard back in October we already know. We had, for example, the incremental budget and if there are any questions around that we can put those to Vice President Hanlon.

Norton: Since the last time I saw you, it looks like the governor's request is out and that is at 6.5%.

Vice President Brendan Hanlon: Our estimate is that it is at 3% rather than the 5% that was in version one. There is a change in that there were other programs that were funded in the higher education line. We really get a breakout of what we thought our traditional allocation of support to higher education is that then refolds into our base budget, so that might be why there is a difference.

Norton: Recalled that last year the JDC came back with a higher number than the initial governor's request for hiring.

Vice President Hanlon: That is correct, think we are moderating our expectations.

Norton: Thanks Vice President Hanlon for that update. The last time we talked, it looked like CSU Global revenues were down. They have gone back up and appear to be heading back in the correct direction.

Norton: When the Board was here, they were finishing up with the search for the CSU-Pueblo president. As you all probably know, President Tim Mottet elected to move on. We are awaiting the decision of the Board on who the next CSU-Pueblo president will be. That is very important to this campus and the entire system to have that strong leader.
Norton: We also got the go ahead from the CSU System Office to cover the costs of the evaluation of the CSU president. You will probably see that survey at the beginning of February so that we can complete all our work and get that to the Board in time.

Norton: The next Board meeting is November 30th through December 1st in Denver.

Chair Smith: Noted a question posted in the chat for Provost Nerger, regarding the November 8th Colloquium. Asked if the event will be recorded.

Provost Nerger: It will be recorded but will not be remote.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding these reports. Hearing none, welcomed Athletic Director Joe Parker.

I. DISCUSSION

1. Athletics Update – Director of Athletics Joe Parker

Joe Parker: Appreciative of Faculty Council for making time for this opportunity to visit. Thanked Steve Cottingham, our deputy athletic director, for helping us pull this content together. Matt Klien, who is the chair of the Administrative Professional Council, is our CFO for the department and has done a great job in putting information together for this presentation. Also thanked Becky Orr, who oversees our student athlete support services unit, she did a really nice job of compiling some of the academic data.

Parker: Want to start first with student success, because that is something we all care very much about. This is reflecting back on the previous academic year. We sponsor sixteen varsity programs here at CSU and fifteen of those sixteen teams posted team term GPAs of 3.0 or better. That is phenomenal academic performance by our student athletes. The spring of this year, we had six teams that had better than a 3.5 team term GPA. The only sport that lagged was football. It is a big roster size. There are 117 students, typically, on the football team. They did earn the highest team GPA in recorded history for the program this past spring semester. That was a shade under 3.0, so Coach Norvell's goal is to bring that up to 3.0 or better for the team. They are always trying to make positive progress on that.

Parker: Shared individualized data for student athletes. Reflecting on individualized data for last year, we are outpacing the department average, which reflects semesters averaging from Spring 2007 to Spring 2020. This is a great performance from our student athletes, and something all of us can be proud of.

Parker: The Mountain West has academic all-conference awards for student athletes, and we had just over two hundred of our students that achieved that status. The four-year class graduation rate is equal to the CSU general student population this last year at 69%. The four-year average typically outpaces that of the general student body.

Parker: Our women's track program had great performances in the previous academic year. They won two conference championships, both indoor and outdoor, which is a powerful statement on the strength of that program. Our cross-country programs, both men and women, qualified for the NCAA championships. That was the first time in several years that was achieved for both programs. Men's gold went to Scottsdale to compete in the NCAA championship tournament. A metric that we always track very carefully is the number of conference titles that our programs are winning. Last year, we marked fourteen consecutive years in which at least one of our teams won. Typically, in any given year multiple of our teams win conference championships. When you measure that against our peer group of the Mountain West, we are tied for second in the number of conference titles achieved since 2015.

Parker: University support helps fund Title IX and our Olympic sports, which really provides a broad-based experience for CSU student athletes. When you look across what experience is created for the CSU and Fort Colins communities, athletics is a key contributor. In many ways, our student athletes represent only slightly more than 1% of the total university student population, but we have almost 2% of the minoritized population of the university. We also parallel very directly what the mission of our institution is, and that is providing access to education. Almost a quarter of our students identify as first-generation students. Something that

we take a lot of pride in is the practical experience that we provide not only to student athletes but the general student body. In fiscal year 2023, we employed over two hundred student workers and paid those student workers almost half a million dollars for the work that they did. Probably the greatest benefit is the genuine career experience that they receive. We employ them in our areas of marketing, business operations, and creative services. If you are at a game and you are watching what is occurring on the big screen at Canvas Stadium, all of that is content that is delivered by student employees. We have about three full-time employees, but everyone else is a student employee. Camera operators and people operating those boards are fully formed and ready for employment and that is because of their experience gained through intercollegiate athletics on our campus.

Parker: There was an economic impact study commissioned back in 2014 that talked about the operations of Canvas Stadium, delivering more than seven hundred jobs, and the benefit direct and indirect to Larimer County was $7 million over the first ten years of operation. We do support the community significantly. Athletics does something else for the university, and that is creating top of mind awareness and diploma value. When you look at the media exposure that takes place with athletic events, think back to September when we played CU Boulder in football. That was the fifth largest audience in the history of ESPN. The number one audience in that time slot and was the number one streaming event in the history of their company. The peak was over eleven million viewers and on average there were over nine million viewers. That is significant in the awareness it has delivered by helping people shape some thoughts around CSU. The CSU admissions page saw almost a 40% increase in traffic through the week of the game, and we had twice as many applicants the day after compared to the same day in 2022.

Parker: St. Peter's University is a small school that is in New Jersey. They made a significant run in the tournament in 2022 and the earned media value that was assessed to that run was $130 million. They saw an increase in donor support for the university of almost 50% year over year, and their non-resident students doubled. Five years ago, Wyoming had Josh Allen, a highly talented quarterback prospect who now plays for the Buffalo Bills, on their roster and the value that they saw in media exposure was almost $160 million. Clemson, Florida Gulf Coast, and TSU have seen direct impacts to out of state student applications and enrollment.

Parker: CU has had a 40% increase in non-resident applications since Coach Sanders was hired. Admissions sees higher acceptance and commitment rates from potential students who attend football games. That is the direct data from the state audit report.

Parker: Every three years, the state looks at the compilation of NCAA financial data associated with athletics programs in the state of Colorado. The latest data that they used was for the fiscal year 2022. The state report showed that Colorado State University spends more on football than CU Boulder, and that is not accurate. If you look at just the base compensation for the head coach, they pay Deion Sanders three times what we pay. What skews that is that our stadium debt service and facilities expenses were allocated to football. In the case of CU Boulder, the only allocation that they saw in their reporting structure was just under $55,000, but they have a corner end zone facility called the Champion Center that is primarily dedicated to football. It had nearly the equivalent budget of Canvas Stadium, and the debt service on that project is $7.1 million. It is recorded in their state audit report as non-specific debt service. If you pull the debt

service out of that audit it shows that athletics annual rate of growth for our expenses was half a percent lower than the university's rate of growth over the same ten-year review. The state audit also reported that we had $28 million in university support. That included our $6 million in student fees, which has had no increase in ten years. Our student fees are helping our students gain admission to all our venues.

Parker: With all our ticketed sports, we have had incredible participation from students for football, men's basketball, women's basketball, and volleyball. There was also almost $2 million of indirect facility support. That is a line item that is pulled out of the athletic budget that is used to support facilities that are used by multiple users including Moby Arena, the IPF, and Glenn Moore Field House. When you look at what is the net number for institutional support, it is $20 million. We are also paying all the scholarship financial aid cost for our student athletes, so when you pull that out it gets to a lower net number.

Parker: When you look at our equivalency sports, which are student athletes that come on a partial scholarship, they have to make up the difference out of their own pocket or through other financial aid. That delivers almost $900,000 to the university in revenue. If you look at the walk-ons that participate on our rosters, they are paying their entire way themselves. That is almost $1.5 million that is going back to the institution. Then there are funds to other internal university entities of about $1 million. When you net all of those numbers out, it brings the university support number down to $9.3 million which is less than 2% of the overall institutional budget.

Parker: The fundamental question is what is the value delivered by intercollegiate athletics to a Tier 1 research institution. As a reminder, we run two separate financial organizations. One is referenced to as 0120 which is the athletics budget, and the other is 0125 which is all the revenues and expenses associated with the stadium. Direct institutional support is plugged into 0120 as is the NCAA conferences, tuition, student fees, ticket revenue, sponsorship contributions, and a direct transfer from 0125 which is coming over from the stadium.
Parker: Of projected expenses, the biggest is staff compensation. Our second biggest is student financial aid, then the operations for the team. That includes team travel and recruiting, principally. Occasionally we have one-time expenses when there is a coaching transition. When you look at these two organizations side by side with revenue, you can see direct institutional support to 0120 and with 0125 you see the sponsorship contributions and tickets. The majority of it is self-generated revenues associated with football. Under expenses for 0120, compensation is the biggest and operations of our programs. Financial aid is a big one for us and game management is another part of that sliver. Looking at 0125, the biggest parts of the stadium expenses are the debt service on the project and stadium operations. There is $3.6 million that gets transferred back to 0120. We do have a few staff members that work directly in the stadium operations. The NCAA report takes 0120 and 0125 and puts all the revenue and expenses together.

Parker: Finally, our student athletes are achieving academically and athletically at very high levels. They have earned their place on this campus. We in athletics believe that we contribute to the overall diversity of campus, it is proven out by data in significant ways. Our student athletes and staff are valuable members of this campus community. The net institutional support is less than 50% of the total because we are moving a lot of money back into other areas of the

university in the form of revenue to other departments on campus. Athletics provides an invaluable platform for bringing community to campus. We view the stadium and Moby Arena and our other athletic venues as engagement assets for the overall institution. We are bringing community to campus, and it is pulling people together to understand in some way what it is to be a CSU Ram. Whether it is a prospective student or alumnus to the university, we also view our opportunities of engagement to create authentic memories for our students that keeps them engaged over a lifetime at CSU. These are all the things we believe create value for intercollegiate athletics.

Parker: The university has made it clear that with Division One athletics it is important to play at the highest level. We take all the voices through all the shared governance into that equation, but it is an important part of the fabric of campus and decision makers are supportive of that. When you look at our peers, we take a lot of pride in being a land grand institution, and land grant institutions around the country have made the same exact judgement that CSU has. 96% of the land grant institutions around the country participate in Division One football. Don't think we want to be an outlier in that space. Athletics is thoughtful of the stewardship of university resources. We have met our budget every fiscal year for the last eight years and probably longer. We do everything within Athletics with an iron fiscal responsibility. Matt Klein, who I mentioned, is a frugal person as is our staff. We are proud of the work that we do here for the university, and we look forward to continuing to provide opportunities for the campus community.

Chair Smith: Thanked Parker. Asked if there were any questions.

Partridge: The Mountain West contract is up in two years. We've just watched the PAC 10 disintegrate completely. Asked if Parker has done any contingency planning with President Parsons, about what we might do if things start to go south in a year or so.
Parker: We're constantly thinking about shifts in the landscape of college sports. We have seen more change in college sports in the last three years than we've seen in the preceding three decades, including transfer portal, NIL (name, image, and likeness), and conference realignment. President Parsons and I have very authentic relationships throughout intercollegiate athletics. She with CEOs of other institutions and myself after 35 years in college sports, there is a lot of conversation and deep, trusting relationships. We are tracking everything that relates to where we want to be positioned in the future. Think there is great solidarity in the Mountain West. With the dissolution of the PAC 12, there is a void for football conferences in the Western United States. Think we have a great opportunity to put a unique offering together with the existing membership of the Mountain West and possibly Oregon State and Washington State joining us at some point. It is a dynamic landscape and we've got to be very attuned and nimble to what opportunities we can create for ourselves.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked Parker for attending Faculty Council. You've informed us that the numbers are wrong, and I just want to indicate that is the usual response we always get from CSU when we ask for numbers. Asked if Parker will be informing the auditor of the State of Colorado, in writing, that he or she has erroneous numbers and request that a new report be produced with the right numbers. That is my first question.

Chair Smith: Asked Pedros-Gascon to ask just one question for now.

Pedros-Gascon: Agreed. Hope to be given the chance for a second question, and if not will indicate it in the chat.

Parker: They are using a combined data set. We do financial reporting at the institutional level. We make a report to the NCAA. When you say that we provide false information, don't think that is an accurate statement. We participate in the university rigor of the financial plan of the institution. All these numbers are audited, and think you have been misinformed.

Pedros-Gascon: Reiterated the question if Parker will ask in writing for a correction.

Parker: Don't see a need to ask in writing for a correction. I described the reason why they stated that we have higher expenses associated with CSU football than CU does.

Pedros-Gascon: The problem is that with you providing your numbers, we are comparing apples to oranges. The reality is that those numbers are the same for all the academic programs.

Norton: Asked what the impacts of NIL (name, image, and likeness) on our students are now and where that is going in the future. If you could talk about the equity issues between sports and gender, that would be great.

Parker: The summer of 2021, the NCAA made it permissible for a student athlete to monetize their name, image, and likeness, which had previously been prohibited. Students can create a revenue stream by being a social media influencer, signing autographs, being spokespeople for businesses, or serving charitable organizations. Probably not anticipated, but there has been the development of something that is referred to as collectives. Those are organizations that set up a legal framework to collect funds that are then dispersed to student athletes for some kind of quid pro quo. For example, going to the Boys and Girls Club or attending an event for Respite Care. Our community has a collective that is referred to as the Green and Gold Guard. It was set up by individuals outside of the university, and they are creating opportunities for our student athletes. Think that is wonderful, because there are some students even on a full ride who come to the university without many family resources. Know that by the fourth week of a month the stipend check might be running a little bit thin, and think it is helpful if they can supplement an athletic scholarship with name, image, and likeness. The long-term impacts on college sports are yet to be determined. Our focus at CSU has been to create the best traditional experience we possibly can. This includes hiring great coaches, recruiting great students, and having those students have great experiences and be supported appropriately with all the arrayed services to make sure they can be high performing students and hone their craft. Think that name, image, and likeness can help supplement that, and that our community is responding pretty well. In our peer group, we're not competing for student athletes who are considering Alabama, Auburn, Florida, Michigan, or Ohio State, with the exception of the transfer portal where sometimes a developed student athlete who has proven their performance is going into the portal to either change their environment or increase access to better name, image, and likeness opportunities.

Mary Van Buren: If you look at the legislative audit of athletics in Colorado, they indicate that there is a deficit at CSU of $28 million, $13 million at CU, and $10 million at UNC. Our students pay $231 in mandatory fees for athletics whereas CU students pay $57. Asked why we have so much of a deficit in comparison to CSU and UNC. presuming that all these universities were assessed in the same way.

Parker: Have not looked at CU's books. Think the fundamental question for you and others that may not see the value that we see in college sports at CSU, is whether we are delivering an experience that is valued by the institution. Think that Van Buren and Pedros-Gascon don't see it that way. What we're trying to do is be responsible with the funds that are provided to us, either by our self-generated revenues, or direct institutional support, or the student fees. We work with the student fee board each year as every other auxiliary that is supported by student fees does. We've been able to confirm their interest in supporting athletics, and it has been more than ten years since we have asked for any kind of increase in the student fees. As a percentage of the overall operations of the department, student fees have been on a precipitous decline.

Van Buren: Noted that did not answer the question, and don't think that you're entirely characterizing my or anybody else's position accurately. Would say that in this time where we are facing a new budgetary model that focuses on fiscal responsibility that Athletics, just like English, Languages, Anthropology, or any other program, is going to have to face the same sort of consequences.

Bernasek: Think that Parker's statement about Van Buren's and Pedros-Gascon's comments is very off and shows some serious level of bias. You have people who care deeply about students, and they may differ from you in terms of priorities for funding. Think that to say we don't get it is not appropriate. Referenced an article that discusses Tony Frank and accounting regarding athletics. Think that in the new budget model, we have so many needs for students and curriculum. Expressed disappointment in Parker for the things that he said, because athletics does a lot of positive things for students. Would like Parker to speak to some of the accusations that were made in writing against Tony Frank about his accounting and tell us where they were wrong.

Parker: Apologized, but every year that I give these presentations, and the voices that don't seem to be aligned with the institutional decision to support athletics are typically Pedros-Gascon and Van Buren. I would say that they value athletics on one level but not at the level of people that have helped us make decisions associated with how we are going to operate athletics on this campus. Our peer land grant institutions around the country have made the same judgement, 96% of them participate in Division One football. Whether you want to believe it or not, we run an efficient FBS Division One program here at CSU and we are cognizant of the dollars that are spent on Athletics. We are very appreciative of the dollars that we have available to support the experience for our student athletes but much like any other area of campus, if we are going to make significant cuts to Athletics, the only place that we go is people. We are at the NCAA minimum of sixteen sports, and we don't want to cut scholarship opportunities or eliminate jobs within Athletics. Certainly, if we were asked to do that, we would figure out a way to make it happen, but we operate a very efficient and lean Division One athletic department here at CSU. Wish that we could find a way to find more support from some of the members of Faculty

Council. We work with FCCIA in a very cooperative way. They have a very inside look at what intercollegiate athletics is like on our campus, and we are very transparent.

Bernasek: Agreed with Parker.

Chair Smith: Apologized, but going to have to stop the conversation to move to the next agenda item. Encouraged people to email Parker with questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Don't enjoy the characterization that I received. I am not against athletics or athletes, am against abuses happening in this institution and that is something different.

Bernasek: Agreed and think there should at least be a response.

Chair Smith: Apologized, and reiterated needing to move on in the agenda and encouraged follow up with Parker for additional questions.

2. Clark Revitalization – Tara Opsal, Jared Orsi, Mary Van Buren

Tara Opsal: Thanked Faculty Council for inviting me, Tracy Brady, and Jared Orsi to talk with you about the Clark Revitalization project and provide an update. Acknowledged that there are a lot of people in this space from CLA, faculty as well as some Dean representatives, and they can certainly add important clarity and depth. Invited those from CLA to add sentiments in the chat and in the questions and answers portion as well.

Opsal: We want to bring everybody in Faculty Council into the loop about challenges that emerged over the summer that faculty are really concerned about. That challenge is what we are going to do with faculty and staff during the three and a half years of construction during the Clark Revitalization project. Dean Ben Withers and his team as well as university leadership worked tirelessly to advocate for a complete Clark renovation. This is an old building with a lot of structural problems and high maintenance costs. Unfortunately, over the summer we learned that due to exponentially increasing costs in terms of building supplies, the original budget no longer met the project scope and so the scope of the project was fundamentally altered.

Opsal: This had a variety of consequences. First, rather than a complete rebuild of Clark, the project is now going to focus on Clark B which is going to be completely demolished and transformed int a beautiful new building with great new classroom space, gathering spaces for students, and faculty offices.

Opsal: A second consequence of this change in the project scope is that, although renovations are needed in the C wing, they are not going to happen in the short term. Faculty that I have talked to are glad to know that university leadership has kept Clark C on the docket for the next phase of this build project, which is great because a lot of things happen in that wing.

Opsal: The third consequence of this change in project scope is the displacement of one hundred and sixty faculty and staff from the B wing for three and a half years without a comprehensive displacement plan in place. What this means is that we don't yet know where many of the faculty and staff who are housed in the B wing will go, even as the project is about to begin over winter

break. Dean Withers and his team in the Dean's office have provided important leadership through quickly evolving circumstances since this summer.

Opsal: The tools that are needed to help solve this displacement problem are really only available to the university as opposed to the College of Liberal Arts. We are grateful to university leaders for recent steps that they have taken to collaborate with CLA to help begin progress on solving this displacement problem. Many faculty were looking forward to being a part of this movement towards effective solutions. Also want Faculty Council to be aware of some of the challenges related to the solutions that have been proposed. These include being in scattered offices and shared spaces around campus or working virtually from home. We are quite concerned about these kinds of solutions that don't provide an adequately sized or singular physical location on or near campus to house faculty and staff of the displaced departments for the three and a half years of construction.

Opsal: We all orient ourselves toward student success in such fundamental ways. It is a shared value that we all have, and so this is one of the things that faculty are really concerned about in terms of the current solutions. We are concerned about how students are going to meet faculty in a central and accessible location. We in the College of Liberal Arts tend to educate majors who are disproportionately first generation, Pell Grant, and racially minoritized students. These are already students who have access issues at the university more broadly. We are concerned about the disproportionate impact that this kind of displacement would have on those students that we are more likely to serve. We are also concerned about the impact that this has on our students' sense of belonging to the university, and well-being.

Opsal: A second concern is faculty success. If we are displaced and in shared and scattered places around campus or working virtually form home, that means we don't have private or secure facilities on campus where we can meet with our graduate and undergraduate students and keep our confidential research materials. This is another equity issue because we know that working from home requires resources, so race, class, and gender will structure the outcomes associated with displacement and how faculty are impacted.

Opsal: Finally, we are worried about the effect that this will have on the department, college, and university success. If we are scattered around campus, the work that we will be doing is trying to keep our community together as opposed to advancing important student initiatives, programming, and curriculum. We are trying to view and encourage others to view these problems and consequences through an equity lens. We want to make sure that the solutions that are put into place do not burden some members more than others, and that is why we want this to be understood as a university issue as opposed to a college or department level issue.

Opsal: What we are hoping for is that the university will be able to find us a unified physical space on campus. We want to make sure that our departments are kept together or as close as possible and that we have private and secure workspaces for our students and our research materials and that we have a convenient location where students can find us easily. The first ask is of central administration. It is the university that has the tool set to solve this problem of displacement. We are asking for central administration to both find a space as well as fund us on campus space for the one hundred and sixty affected faculty and staff. For the Faculty Council

folks, one thing that you might consider doing as we talk about these problems is signing a petition that some of my colleagues have started to bring some awareness to the issue. We also want to note passing a resolution in support, as a potential pathway forward.

Vice President Hanlon: Thanked Opsal for bringing this to Faculty Council. Has seen the petition, and this is something on the radar for myself, the president, and other leadership. The scope change did set us back a bit, going from a Clarck A and C focus to a Clark A and B focus. This did scrap a previous plan that we had for relocating people on campus because it is a different cascade of assets that became available in the old plan versus the new. Know that probably next to compensation, space is a huge issue for employees. Received a briefing this morning from a number of folks and think we are close to having a plan for this.

Vice President Hanlon: There are three distinct groups that have different timing for moving, and we are filling in a few small gaps across those groups. Noted the presentations list of options that are acceptable and unacceptable. Would say that the current plan has a little bit of both, but that is why we need to reach back out to the college and engage with folks who would be impacted. We are close to having the plan, but we need to have a conversation about what trade-offs there are financially, with space, co-location, student success, and accessibility.

Partridge: Noted that, having been Chair of Computer Science, which is a growing program with substantial space needs, one of the issues is that the university space planning process is opaque. Was told that nobody is in charge of long-term space planning. Think this is another sign that we need to get back to both immediate space and longer-term space planning. Would love to see Faculty Council engaged and helping in the process.

Vice President Hanlon: Noted that we do have a Space Committee that is convening monthly.

Partridge: Asked to clarify that Space Committee does not do long term planning.

Vice President Hanlon: Correct, and that is a pain point of dealing with incidental space. It is one of the things that we have been talking about is how to get in front of that and have more of a comprehensive view. A few of us are meeting tomorrow afternoon to talk about space utilization and availability because we need to unstick some of these processes and the data that we have available on where space is utilized across campus. We are looking on the horizon, not just at immediate problems, because there are going to be multiple other facilities where we want to do a renovation.

Bernasek: Want people to understand that the Clark Building houses CLA faculty for the most part, but every single student who comes through this institution at some point comes through the Clark Building. Know that it is not a money-maker in research, but this is such an important building. Noted that Dean Withers has been a champion of this building, but it is not his responsibility. At the end of the day, it is the responsibility of the institution to be true to our students, faculty, and staff. Asked Vice President Hanlon to take it to heart, because this will make a difference to many people and is essential to our mission.

John Slater: It bears saying every time we talk about this that there is a cohort of junior faculty that was hired in 2019 and 2020 that are going to be affected by these issues differently depending on when they started, what their space needs are, and what department they are in. Think this is a Faculty Council issue, that we have to be looking out for some of the junior faculty who are going to struggle with these disruptions.

Opsal: Commented that is also something that we are hearing from our department and other departments is that new faculty are particularly concerned about their ability to get tenure. We just hired a new faculty member to start next August, and it was interesting to have conversations with this person when we don't know where we are going to be. We are doing our best to ensure that we have a collective space to support them.

Chair Smith: Thanked Tara Opsal and Tracy Brady for this presentation. Added the link to the petition in the chat, and we agree this is an important issue.

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

Meeting was adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

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

ATTENDANCE

BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING

UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

2023-2024

Chair: Melinda Smith **Vice-Chair: Joseph DiVerdi**

Executive Assistant: Jessica Watkinson **BOG Representative: Andrew Norton**
(substituting for Amy Barkley)

Professional Registered Parliamentarian: Lola Fehr

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephen Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2025
Jennifer Martin	Animal Sciences	2024
Jane Stewart	Agricultural Biology	2024
Kelly Curl	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture	2025
Esten Mason	Soil and Crop Sciences	2026
Bradley Goetz	College-at-Large	2026
Andrew Norton	College-at-Large	2026
Health and Human Sciences		
Ruoh-Nan (Terry) Yan	Design and Merchandising	2024
Jennifer Richards	Health and Exercise Science	2025
Susan Baker	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2026
Blake Naughton	Human Development and Family Studies	2026
Erin Arneson	Construction Management	2024
Jen Weaver	Occupational Therapy	2026
(substituting for Aaron Eakman, Fall 2023)		
Sharon Anderson	School of Education	2024
Elizabeth Kiehne	School of Social Work	2025
Mohammed Mehany	College-at-Large	2024
(substituting for Brian Butki, Fall 2023)		
Business		
Nate Nguyen	Accounting	2026
John Hoxmeier	Computer Information Systems	2024
Bharadwaj Kannan	Finance and Real Estate	2025
Rob Mitchell	Management	2024
Jonathan Zhang	Marketing	2026
Engineering		
Peter Jan van Leeuwen	Atmospheric Science	2024
Ashok Prasad	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2025

Hussam Mahmoud	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2024
Steven Reising	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2025
Soheil Fatehiboroujeni	Mechanical Engineering	2026
Thomas Bradley	Systems Engineering	2026
Sybil Sharvelle	College-at-Large	2026
Pinar Omur-Ozbek	College-at-Large	2026

Liberal Arts

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

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

Natural Resources

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

Natural Sciences

Olve Peersen	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	2025

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

Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

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

University Libraries

Christine Pawliuk	Libraries	2025

***Ex Officio* Voting Members**

Melinda Smith	Chair, Faculty Council/Executive Committee	2024
Joseph DiVerdi	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2024
Andrew Norton	BOG Faculty Representative	2024
Steve Reising, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2024
Gregg Griffinhagen, Chair	Committee on Information Technology	2024
Shane Kanatous, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2024
Jerry Magloughlin, Chair (excused)	Committee on Libraries	2024
Ryan Brooks, Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
Jennifer Martin, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty	2024
William Sanford, Chair	Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education	2024
Alan Kennan, Chair (excused)	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2024
Gamze Cavdar, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2024

Lumina Albert, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2024
Peter Jan van Leeuwen, Co-Chair	Committee on University Programs	2024
Tian Wang, Co-Chair	Committee on University Programs	2024
Brad Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2024
Karen Thorsett-Hill	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2026
Thomas Conway	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2024
Sean Bryan	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Ann Hess	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Jennifer Reinke	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
Scott Wiebensohn	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
Kathay Rennels	Interim Vice President for Engagement & Extension
TBD	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
TBD	Vice President for Equity, Equal Opportunity & Title IX
Susan James	Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
Eric Ray	Vice President for Human Resources
Kauline Cipriani	Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
Brandon Bernier	Vice President for Information Technology
Kathleen Fairfax	Vice Provost for International Affairs
Laura Jensen	Vice Provost for Planning and Effectiveness
Christa Johnson	Interim Vice President for Research
Blanche M. Hughes	Vice President for Student Affairs
Tom Siller	Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs
Kyle Henley	Vice President for University Marketing & Communications
Brendan Hanlon	Vice President for University Operations
James Pritchett	Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Beth Walker	Dean, College of Business
Allen Robinson	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