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
April 2, 2024 – 4:00pm – Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

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

Chair Smith reminded members that the Faculty Council meetings are public and recorded strictly for the purposes of the minutes. Reminded members about the rules of engagement.

Chair Smith: Faculty Council Executive Committee met last week and agreed that moving forward, we will attempt to transition to a hybrid format. Part of that transition will be inviting any speakers that are on the agenda and are presenting motions to be present in-person if they are able. We also encourage Faculty Council members to attend either virtually or in-person. We will be sending an RSVP survey out this week to get a sense of how many people would be able to attend the May Faculty Council meeting in-person. We will try to find a venue to accommodate that. We will also send out a survey next year to get a sense of how many people would want to attend these meetings in person, so we can plan accordingly.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – April 2, 2024

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – May 7, 2024 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm
b. President Ron Daniels luncheon:
   https://colostate.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_1NxpPijLjkUMn0TY

Chair Smith: The President Ron Daniels luncheon is on April 18th in the Lory Student Center ballroom from 12:00pm to 1:30pm. There is an RSVP link in the agenda packet. Encouraged members to attend the luncheon.

Chair Smith: We are also having our final Faculty Council meet and greet on April 18th. This will be in the Biology Building West Plaza from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. We are inviting department chairs and heads, as well as deans and directors to attend the meet and greet. Vice President for University Operations Brendan Hanlon will also be able to attend from 4:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. to answer any questions people may have about the budget and budget redesign.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED
Chair Smith: Asked if there were any changes to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from March 5th.

Hearing none, Faculty Council minutes approved by unanimous consent.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – March 1 & 8, 2024

University Curriculum Committee minutes from March 1st and 8th approved by unanimous consent.

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. New Undergraduate Degree Program: Major in Arts Management – University Curriculum Committee – Brad Goetz, Chair

Brad Goetz: On behalf of the University Curriculum Committee, move that Faculty Council consider a new undergraduate degree program. The degree program is a major in Arts Management, to be effective Fall 2024 under the Arts Management Special Academic Unit, as seen in the agenda packet.

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

Rob Mitchell: Expressed support for the program. From the perspective of the curriculum, there is some overlap with existing courses. All the courses are LEAP courses. Asked if there was any discussion about how to engage other classes on campus that are related to this topic, particularly in a budget environment that we are in. Asked if there was discussion about how to leverage other courses in other programs that might be beneficial to this program.

Goetz: This did not come up in discussion in the University Curriculum Committee. It likely came up in college meetings prior to this coming to the University Curriculum Committee but cannot answer about how other courses might work within the proposed curriculum.

Mitchell: Asked: What would be the process for trying to enable some overlap in courses or some streamlining? In terms of ensuring there is not duplication or finding that there are some complementary courses once it is approved, wondering how that would work.

Goetz: If this is approved by Faculty Council, you could meet with program proposers and have discussions about what might be appropriate coursework to use in place of current coursework
that they have in the program or in addition to what they have in the program, depending on what course was being discussed. They would then put that forward as a program change.

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

Motion approved.

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

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

Chair Smith: Thanked Reising. Asked if there was any discussion of this motion.

Chair Smith: Hearing none, requested a vote in the chat using Microsoft Forms.

Motion approved.

3. Proposed Revisions to Section C.2.3.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the adoption of the proposed revision of Section C.2.3.1 as seen in the agenda packet.

Reising: The motion to amend the code proposes a name change from the department of Ethnic Studies to Race, Gender, and Ethnic Studies. This has been carefully considered by the department and the stakeholders in the College of Liberal Arts for some time. The adoption of this motion will help with student recruitment and retention, as well as align the name of the department with similar programs around the country. It will also promote campus initiatives on race, inclusion and diversity as reflected in the University and college strategic plans.

Chair Smith: Thanked Reising. 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.

4. Proposed Revisions to Section F.3.7 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair
Jennifer Martin: On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move the approval of the proposed amendment to Section F.3.7 as seen in the agenda packet.

Martin: Would like to acknowledge the work that has gone into this effort. There was a task force created at the beginning of last year, led by Michael Antolin, LeRoy Poff, and Sharon Anderson, as well as Richard Eykholt and the Office of General Counsel to revise current policies in the Manual reflecting administrative leave. A lot of stakeholders have participated in these conversations for the past year. The version seen in the agenda packet reflects what we feel are more opportunities for faculty to have better representative rights within the process and have the ability to participate actively in the process for its duration versus just at the beginning and the end. Thanked everyone who has been working diligently on this.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin. Asked if there was any further discussion on this motion.

Michael Antolin: Was asked by the previous chair of Faculty Council, Sue Doe, to look at the procedures and policies surrounding essentially what is involuntary administrative leave. That is when events occur that would warrant faculty members being placed on leave away from their regular duties at the University, and this has now been extended to include both paid and unpaid leave. It lays out that a committee will oversee an appeals process and lays out a timeline for those appeals. The revisions also lay out what the rights of faculty are and that the conditions of the administrative leave should be specifically communicated to the faculty member. Believe it protects both the rights and responsibilities of the University and to individuals in these cases, but it also protects the due process of the employees who are under administrative leave. Expessed appreciation for Eykholt, who assisted in moving this forward after we submitted a report last year, where we looked into how this might fall under state law and state statutes where many of these concepts are defined. Eykholt also worked with the Office of General Counsel. It is important to point out that this was worked on in collaboration with the Office of General Counsel. This is also the only such policy at a major university in Colorado. This is a big step. Expessed hope that it will be supported.

Chair Smith: Thanked Antolin. Hearing no further questions or discussion, 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 Sections F.3.14 through F.3.17 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Martin: As a follow up to the recently adopted changes to Section F.3.7, on behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty move the approval of the proposed revisions to Sections F.3.14 through F.3.17 as shown in the agenda packet.
Martin: The change only occurs in Section F.3.15, with some renumeration of the remaining sections, but this reflects the change that has just been approved with Section F.3.7 with the use of administrative leave. The proposed revision changes the phrase of leave for administrative officers to unpaid special leave.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin. Asked if there was any discussion regarding this motion.

Craig Partridge: It is usually a broken feature of a document in which there are cross-references like this that are not changed automatically. Assume the reason we have to do this is because there was not a clean way to get rid of the cross-referencing.

Martin: Correct.

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.

F. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Vice Provost Susan James

Chair Smith: Indicated that Provost Marion Underwood is out of town today, so Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Susan James will present the Provost’s report.

Vice Provost Susan James: We recently lost a very important member of the CSU community, faculty member and University Distinguished Professor Diana Wall. It is hard to process this information and it has affected many of us. Wall was one of the world’s most internationally respected environmental scientists and was the director of the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability here at CSU. Could spend an hour talking about Wall’s impacts. Wall was a University Distinguished Professor, a member of the National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Wall was a role model for women in STEM and we will miss her very much. Know the people in the School of Global and Environmental Sustainability and biology, as well as across campus are mourning her loss. We do not have any information at this time about a memorial service, but that will hopefully come soon.

Vice Provost Susan James: We also lost Kimberly Cox-York, who passed away unexpectedly a few days ago. Cox-York was an assistant professor in the Department of Food Sciences and Human Nutrition in the College of Health and Human Sciences. She was also a research integrity officer in the office of the Vice President for Research. Last year, Cox-York came to Faculty Council to discuss efforts around open scholarship, which she was passionate about. We will certainly carry on that work as part of her legacy. We do not have information about a service at this time but will send that information forward when we have it.

Vice Provost James: In the leadership search for the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences, finalists have been identified and the open forums for these will begin on April 9th. Expressed hope that we can have wide campus engagement for those open forum. Information, including the candidate’s cover letter and CV, will be posted one day prior to the open forum. A
recording of each forum will be made available. Encouraged members to complete the feedback forms for the search committee so they can get feedback on the finalists.

Vice Provost James: The search committee for the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts is making great progress, and they hope to begin conducting semi-finalist interviews late next week. For the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, Provost Underwood has decided to temporarily put this search on hold. It was determined that an expansion of the job description was needed, and that is being worked on now. We expect to have the job description completed soon, and an updated search timeline will be provided as well. We will again invite nominations and applications for the modified job description once it is posted. We will also communicate with those already in the pool. We want to get this search right, and Provost Underwood felt it made sense to take a pause and think about that job description more thoroughly. The search committee will still be chaired by Steve Dandeneau.

Vice Provost James: We are still working on the budget model redesign. We will be holding an open forum tomorrow, April 3rd, from 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in the Lory Student Center rooms 304-306. There will also be a Zoom link available. The open forum will be members of the Steering Committee talking about the process and answering questions from the audience. Encouraged members to attend and engage in discussion around the process.

Vice Provost James: On April 18th, the Faculty Success team will be offering a promotion and tenure best practices workshop. This will be recorded and posted on the website for people who cannot attend. The audience for this is aimed at continuing, contract and adjunct faculty and tenure-track faculty who are early in their career and getting prepared for promotion and tenure. Everyone is invited to attend, particularly those involved in the tenure and promotion process. Provost Underwood will be joining the discussion as well.

Vice Provost James: On the Provost’s website, you will also find the call for professional development for contract and continuing faculty. The submission deadline is at the end of this month. Encouraged members to look at this if they are interested and to encourage colleagues to apply.

Vice Provost James: This is the Year of Democracy, and there are a bunch of events going on this April. The ACT Human Rights Film Festival starts tomorrow. The Democracy Summit is also coming up next week, with an opening keynote and conversation with President Amy Parsons and Kamau Bell. President Ron Daniels from Johns Hopkins will also be here on April 18th, and we have conversations with our senators and former senators coming up later this month. There will also be a conversation with Donna Brazile at the end of this month. Encouraged members to look at the website for the Year of Democracy to see all the things that are going on.

Vice Provost James: Will provide some updates about plans around changing commencement. President Parsons and Provost Underwood sent an email to the University community last Wednesday, mentioning the intention for an all-University commencement beginning in Spring 2025. There are many factors that went into this decision, and one was that some of the colleges were outgrowing Moby Arena for the college-based ceremonies. Another factor is that an all-
university commencement aligns with what other leading universities are doing and brings opportunities for memorable traditions and broad campus engagement. There will be no changes to the Spring and Winter 2024 ceremonies. These will be the final college-based ceremonies before CSU transitions to this new format. With the new format, departments or academic units will host supplementary celebrations where graduates receive their diploma covers and have their names read. College coordinators will still assist with coordinating. As planning moves ahead, we will continue to offer updates about what is going on. There is also a commencement website. They are putting together some committees and are looking for participation, particularly from faculty, on committees like the Traditions Committee. Expressed hope that members will engage in the process.

Vice Provost James: An announcement came out of the selection of our newest University Distinguished Professor, Dr. Jeff Collett, who is a professor in the Department of Atmospheric Science. Collett is internationally recognized for research on cloud and precipitation chemistry, and the sources and effects of atmospheric nitrogen pollution.

Chair Smith: Thanked Vice Provost James. Asked if there were any questions.

Partridge: There was some ambiguity about whether there would be departmental ceremonies or higher units, because it was mentioned that college coordinators would coordinate. In a department that graduates hundreds of people every semester, we have already discussed how we might do a more intimate event. Wondering whether we should be doing this or holding off until people decide whether it is college-level or smaller events.

Vice Provost James: Understanding is that this planning should be happening. In general, we are envisioning this at the department level, but could see how colleges might want to coordinate. A lot of it depends on the size of department. Think you will want to coordinate with your college and your college will coordinate with Advancement. Think we are envisioning it at the unit level when it makes the most sense there.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: First comment is about commencement. Have mentioned this in previous meetings but am concerned about the financial impacts this may have on students that are not able to return to Fort Collins for a graduation in spring. The question about commencement is that with these new ceremonies that departments will need to run, wondering who will be financially responsible for making these happen. Asked: Will you be subsidizing these ceremonies?

Vice Provost James: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. We have heard this concern from multiple places about less privileged students, as well as international students, with having only one ceremony. This is something we are taking under consideration. We are early in the planning process, so we can get this kind of feedback from everyone so we can figure out how we can help departments that will need assistance with cost. It is not meant to be an unfunded mandate, but do not know more details since it is still in the planning stages. With respect to hardship for students, understanding is that graduating students can attend an earlier graduation before they graduate, as well as after they graduate. That is something that we do now with our current
commencements. Someone who graduates in the summer can attend in the spring, so think we will still be open to that kind of arrangement.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern about the financial impact of the ceremony. Wondering if this will be equivalent to the amount of money we were spending on commencement before or if this will have more of a financial impact on the institution. Assume we will be paying for the use of the stadium, and that might not be a minimal charge and be an additional subsidizing of the stadium.

Vice Provost James: Thanked Pedros-Gascon for expressing this concern. Do not have an answer for this since we are still in the planning stages. Given where we are in the tight budget process and considering budget reallocation, am sure that financial impact and cost is top of mind. Will certainly relay these concerns to leadership.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions or discussion, thanked Vice Provost James.

G. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: The first update is with respect to the inclement weather leave status and pay policy that was brought to Faculty Council’s attention last month. The University Policy Review Committee received over 400 responses from the CSU community. Those responses will be considered by the University Policy Review Committee and be shared with the drafting committee as well. Will keep everyone updated on this.

Chair Smith: Received an update from Dean of Libraries Karen Estlund that the contract with Elsevier has been signed. Dean Estlund indicated that the resolution that was passed at Faculty Council was helpful in the negotiation process.

Chair Smith: The proposed Manual revisions for Section E.2.2.7.1 and Section E.6 have received final approval and are advancing to the Board of Governors. Section E.6 was about the potential for extending contracts from three (3) years to five (5) years. Thanked the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty as well as the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty for their work on these revisions.

Chair Smith: The final Faculty Council meet and greet is on April 18th from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Encouraged everyone to attend if they are able. We have invited deans, department chairs and heads, and directors, and Vice President for University Operations Brendan Hanlon will also be there later during the event.

Chair Smith: We are almost done with the Faculty Council website redesign, and it should be live around mid-April. We are excited about this and think it will be a big improvement. The spring Faculty Council newsletter will also be sent out in April. That will also provide updates on some of the standing committee activities that are going on.
Chair Smith: Have a few task force updates. Reminded members of the survey that was sent out on March 20th by the Interdisciplinary Task Force. The deadline for that survey is April 5th. Encouraged members to complete that survey. Know the task force would appreciate input from the CSU community about interdisciplinary approaches that people are taking across campus. The Task Force on Principles of Community has been charged, and they will proceed to carry out that charge. In particular, they have been charged with scoping out the need for a potential new standing committee on Principles of Community or DEIJ. Finally, the Task Force on Standalone Certificates will be charged on April 11th and will be underway soon.

Chair Smith: Employee Appreciation Week will be April 20th through 26th and kicks off with the spring football game. There will also be an event on April 25th on the Plaza. Faculty Council and the other employee councils will have tables at both the football game and on the Plaza. This is an opportunity to come chat with the employee councils. Some of the benefits during Employee Appreciation Week include a free cup of coffee, as well as a 35% discount at the bookstore and Eileen’s cookies at various locations. Thanked Provost Underwood for providing support on behalf of Faculty Council. The contribution of $1,500 goes a long way in allowing these appreciation benefits to happen, as well as contributions from the other employee councils and the Vice President for University Operations.

Chair Smith: Participated in the Student Affairs in Higher Education Capstone in Higher Education Administration with Vice Provost James on April 1st, and that was interesting. It called to our attention some of the issues that might be underlying the way in which some forces are delivered on campus. Will be reporting more on that. Also participated in the first Commencement Executive Committee meeting and have been tasked with finding faculty representatives to serve on the Traditions and Recognitions Committees. Encouraged members to reach out if interested in serving.

Chair Smith: Will be presenting at the CSU Postdoctoral Association (CSU PASS) on Friday, April 5th. This group is an advocacy group for postdocs and is an important group on campus. Expressed excitement about connecting with them and working with them through Faculty Council and the other employee councils.

Chair Smith: Along with the chair of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, will be attending the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics conference on April 19th. This is a group of faculty senate representatives from across the country that help us understand the changes in collegiate athletics and how we can support the health and welfare of student athletes. Will be reporting back on this because the landscape is changing so much with intercollegiate athletics. Keeping informed is important.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Andrew Norton: Over the years, frustration has been expressed regarding access to Board books. The Board materials are now available going back to at least 2021. There are also some older materials on the Mountain Archive. Thanked Melanie Geary, the executive assistant to the Board of Governors, for working on this. People can go to the “Meeting and Events” page on the Board of Governors website and the materials should be available.
Norton: Have a meeting tomorrow with Amy Barkley and Rachel Baschnagel to work on the new Faculty Council website. We hope to have links to these materials to provide easier access.

Norton: The next Board of Governors meeting is on May 2nd and 3rd here on campus.

**H. DISCUSSION**

1. Syllabus Bank Update – Theo Reese, ACSU Director of Academic Affairs

Theo Reese: Have previously presented this project to Faculty Council and received a lot of constructive feedback. We were able to do research on this feedback.

Reese: To refresh everyone’s memory, the purpose of the syllabus bank is to have a searchable repository of past syllabi for all classes and all professors that students can access in order to foster student success through increased preparedness. The primary points of feedback we received were that different professors have different syllabi even if they teach the same class. There are also some existing syllabus banks run by departments, and there was the caveat that it was necessary to protect academic freedom and the intellectual property of faculty members. We were able to hopefully solve, or at least address, all of these concerns and issues.

Reese: Regarding different professors having different syllabi although teaching the same class, one of the key benefits for having this kind of searchable repository is that students will be able to look up either the professor or the class. They will be able to see a distinction between professors even though they teach the same class. For the existing syllabus banks, there were very few CSU departments who had syllabus banks, and they were somewhat outdated, with the most recent updates being from 2020 and 2021.

Reese: With academic freedom and intellectual property, this was brought back to superiors in ASCSU, and it was agreed that these are two (2) important caveats. We can tell students that the syllabi in the bank are not necessarily word-for-word guidelines of what will happen, but simply examples of what has happened in the past. In our research, we found that Stanford was able to place their syllabus bank through Canvas. We talked with them a lot, and part of the benefit of having the syllabus bank in Canvas was that only people with active CSU credentials will be able to access this service. Provided links for examples about how this would look and how it looks at Stanford.

Reese: We have submitted an official campus project request form to IT, and they will be discussing the initiative on Thursday, April 4th. We hope to have an update after that. Other than that, we are hoping for support from Faculty Council to show support for this project.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions or comments for Reese.

Pedros-Gascon: Spoke in favor of the project. Am personally more comfortable with this information being available through Canvas.
Greg Griffenhagen: Asked why the syllabi need to be confidential. If a class is being taught well and we want others to know how we are doing it, wondering why we would not want to share that information.

Reese: The question was mainly to allay some fears and concerns from faculty about their intellectual property being stolen. With it being in Canvas, it also offers the benefit of faculty being familiar with it as well as students.

Partridge: Would like to comment on Griffenhagen’s question. Imagine that someone has a DEI module in their course. There are people outside the University who routinely look for those sorts of things and register complaints, as well as show up in the classrooms to see if you will say something that they consider inappropriate. Have dealt with this as a former department chair. There are perfectly valid reasons for wanting to keep your syllabus within the University.

Chair Smith: Think that the use of Canvas makes a lot of sense but given that Canvas is not mandated for use by faculty, wondering what the impacts will be for the syllabus bank for those instructors that do not use Canvas.

Reese: Experience says that about 75-80% of professors use Canvas, even if it is just to upload the syllabus or supporting documents or make announcements. The hope would be that professors would see the incentive to use Canvas with the syllabus bank being present.

Chair Smith: Read a question from the chat that asked if syllabi could be printed from Canvas. If so, not sure why the Canvas protection is necessary.

Reese: This is something we can look into when we are getting this implemented through Canvas. We asked Stanford if there were any complaints by students about the syllabus bank, whether it was that they were inaccurate or anything, and there were no reports of anything like that. This is something we could discuss with IT if there is concern there.

Norton: Think the concern would not be so much that students are taking our intellectual property but that some would be bought and scraped and put into subgroups and large language models. Think the fear is not around what students are doing with them.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if Reese could transmit to ASCSU a request to consider ways by which we can maximize the input from students in annual evaluations. If we are trusting Canvas to provide for the syllabus bank and have more faculty engaged with it, would like to have more students be engaged when it comes to annual evaluations.

Chair Smith: Read another question from the chat. A member is asking how difficult it would be to upload a new syllabus. Understanding is that every time a syllabus is uploaded for a course, it would be automatically placed in the syllabus bank. There would be no extra work for faculty.
Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions or comments, thanked Reese for providing an update on this project. Expressed appreciation for the efforts of Reese and ASCSU. We look forward to seeing this come to fruition.

2. Changes in Faculty Annual Review Ratings and Department Code Templates and Review – Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

Vice Provost James: The hope is to start this discussion, take this information back to share with others and digest this information, and continue the discussion in May.

Vice Provost James: The Council of Chairs and Heads began pre-COVID and consists of one department chair or head from each college and they meet every two (2) weeks. For quite a few years, they have been discussing faculty annual review and have worked together to consult a number of different sources on how we might improve. The ratings we use now have been in use for about thirty (30) years. We have consulted with human resources experts in the College of Business, Human Resources, and the Office of General Counsel. We also learned a lot from the Presidential Leadership Fellows who worked on revamping and rethinking the way we handle reviews and ratings.

Vice Provost James: The Council of Chairs and Heads also surveyed all the chairs, heads, and unit directors, including Special Academic Units, in the summer of 2020. Directed members’ attention to slide deck for results. Some of the things heard in the feedback was that they wanted it to go fully electronic, have it automatically populated, and having this kind of stuff coming to us via Interfolio. We are getting close to having that fully working. They also wanted to limit the word count, and we are trying to decrease the amount of effort going into this. More of them also disagreed that the current rating system was useful for evaluating faculty and were split on whether it was useful for determining merit raises. They did support the idea of looking at a new rating system.

Vice Provost James: Directed members’ attention to a pie chart of the feedback from chairs and heads about what the goals for annual evaluation are. Continuous improvement is a big part of that. Some departments do goal setting, but not all. Progress toward previous goals is important, as well as professional development. We got quite a bit of feedback about why we separate progress for promotion and tenure from the annual review process. There are reasons we do this. Annual review is about a single year, and it is not cumulative. Tenure and promotion reviews are cumulative and tend to cover more than one year. That said, the two should be in alignment, and if they are not, that is a problem. One of the goals of revamping this is ensuring that the alignment works better.

Vice Provost James: Showed members the current Manual language about annual reviews, as well as the language proposed by the Council to the other department chairs and heads. The language proposed was as follows: “Annual reviews are intended to promote communication and provide useful feedback about job performance, to facilitate better working relationships, and to provide a historical record of performance and contribute to professional development.”
Vice Provost James: Another piece of feedback we received, which we have heard before, is that the annual evaluation process should be based on academic years rather than calendar years. We operate on academic years, so it has always been a little strange that we do annual reviews on calendar years. The reason for that, based on understanding from discussing this with colleagues in our budget office as well as human resources, is that this is related to our budget systems, as well as the process and timing of the salary exercise process. At this point, it is not possible for us to switch over to the academic year system. However, this point is well taken. As we upgrade things like our human capital management systems and our budget systems, there might be time in the future to rethink this.

Vice Provost James: Another piece of feedback we received was to allow for comments on department citizenship as part of the evaluation, so that the department chairs and heads have an opportunity to provide comments on both positive and negative contributions to the unit mission that are not captured in other categories.

Vice Provost James: Showed members the current annual review form and rating system that has been in use for about three (3) decades. Showed members the new rating system, which is borrowed from the work of the Presidential Leadership Fellows and the Administrative Professional evaluation. That is to go to four (4) ratings, which is also best practices in human resources and performance management. This will all go into the Interfolio system. We will still have the same categories, which includes instruction, advising and mentoring, research, scholarship and creative activity, and service. The main addition is where we will have SMART goal setting, which would have people communicate with department chairs and heads about goals set for last year and discuss progress on those goals. Then, goals would be set for the next year and they would get some feedback and help from the chair on whether those goals are reasonable and how chairs can help you meet those goals. There is also the opportunity to further describe diversity, equity, and inclusivity efforts in each category as in alignment with the department code and job description. This does not bring in additional performance ratings at this time, and is not required, but we wanted to put this there for those people who are doing DEIJ work and we want to make sure that this is in their annual evaluation. There are also sections on whether the faculty member has demonstrated citizenship reflective of the Manual Section D.9 code of ethical behavior.

Vice Provost James: The things at the bottom of this form are more about efficiency and trying to bring the reappointment process into annual review rather than making it separate. We would still have a place for faculty response, and it could attach the promotion and tenure memo from the promotion and tenure committee, so it goes along with the annual review.

Partridge: Question is about the attempt at realignment. Having been a department chair, the promotion and tenure committee made it clear that what they did was not to be part of what the chair did, and now they are being pulled together. Noted that the chair is also required to do an annual promotion and tenure progress letter, which is not included in this process. Wondering about this, since promotion and tenure committee would give its reports well after the chair reviews had to be submitted. Wondering how we are planning to align those and whether it is also being planned to sweep together the chair’s promotion and tenure annual progress towards tenure letter, which was independent of the promotion and tenure committee’s report.
Vice Provost James: Think it would be meant to include both. It is not meant to say that the chair or head is changing the report from the committee, just that they are included. The timing is a good question. There are a lot of details to work out there that we have not gotten to yet.

Abigail Shupe: Asked: In a situation where someone has DEIJ items on their report and the chair is trying to make decisions about who gets a merit raise and who doesn’t, then will those be actually optional? It does not seem like it will be option if you are trying to do everything you can to get a raise.

Vice Provost James: Right now, the way we have it written is to talk about how it aligns with the mission of the unit that you are in and your job description. If the department is communicating that they want everyone to do this, think that people would want to fill that out. If you are in a unit where it is not part of the mission and it is not something that works well in your job category, then it would not be required. The idea would be to align with unit goals and mission, but this is a great point.

Vice Provost James: Showed examples of SMART goals.

Vice Provost James: Encouraged members to take this information back to people in their units. The idea would be to possibly implement this in the next cycle of reviews.

Chair Smith: Read a question in the chat. A member indicated that on the administrative professional side, we created a system with the Presidential Fellows, and we have not seen that roll out.

Vice Provost James: We have been working on this for two and a half years or so, and we have received approval from Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel to roll this out this coming year. The idea is that we will start training sessions at the end of this month. We wanted to wait until the current annual review period was over. We will start working with chairs and heads about how to do this, and have open forums and discussions with faculty. Unsure what is being done with the administrative professional side, but believe Human Resources is also trying to roll this out this calendar year, but not sure.

Pedros-Gascon: Noticed that only thirty-four (34) chairs and heads responded to the survey previously mentioned, but know we have way more than that. Wondering if we could aspire to a more representative number of respondents. Believe that is only two-thirds of people in those positions.

Vice Provost James: That is a pretty good survey response rate. Think the way we will get feedback from them now is through the training sessions that we will run before finalizing the document. We will widely invite those people.

Griffenhagen: Expressed support for this effort. Wondering if this could be tied to an actual mandate that departments, units, etc. tell people what defines performance levels. This is something that comes up a lot. Perhaps this would be the stimulus to say that this change is here and departmental codes need to define what these performance levels are.
Vice Provost James: The short answer would be yes. Whether it is mandated in codes is something we need to discuss, which we will do in May. We are trying to simplify codes and code review, and are suggesting that things not mandated in codes from the Manual be placed in a handbook that would be available to all faculty and the departments so they understand what is expected of them. Thanked Griffenhagen for this comment. It will definitely be discussed.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further discussion, thanked Vice Provost James. We will be hearing more about this at the May Faculty Council meeting.

3. Budget Update – Brendan Hanlon, Vice President for University Operations

Vice President Brendan Hanlon: We are still going through the process. While the long bill has not been completed, there are indications that the state legislature is going to look at an approximately 9% increase in state funding. As you may remember, it was 3.5% in the governor’s proposal. Doubling that would be around 6%, and the Institute of Higher Education leadership proposed 11%. If the state were to provide 11%, we could cap our resident undergraduate tuition level at 2%. The 9% increase came with a cap of 3% for our undergraduate tuition. In some ways, this scenario is a hybrid of the second and third scenarios we worked through. It is a positive in terms of the state providing additional funds, but then there is the limitation on our budget with the 3% cap that was installed, because we had modeled after a 4% increase for both resident undergraduate and non-resident. We will continue to monitor and observe.

Vice President Hanlon: We are continuing to work on reviewing the reduction proposals. Those meetings have been completed and many of us have gone through the proposals. We were asking for 2%, 4%, and 6% reduction scenarios and there was this perception that we would select one and it would be applied across the board. We are reading through the individual proposals from the deans and vice presidents across the University and trying to select the proposal level, rather than at a percentage scenario level. We are trying to choose the least impactful proposals relative to our mission and our people. Those are our two guiding principles, to avoid impacts to the mission and to our people. Because of that, there are some areas where that is a more painful proposition than others, and we are trying to calibrate that now that we have these state numbers.

Vice President Hanlon: We are working on an email communication that will come from the Office of the President. There is still a possibility that things could change, but the letter will essentially communicate everything that has been discussed here and provide an update on what we are hearing from the state.

Vice President Hanlon: We are also looking to schedule some budget open forums. Am also happy to come back to the Faculty Council meeting that aligns closest to the Board of Governors meeting to talk about the conclusions of the fourth version of the budget. There will also be a budget forum on April 30th that will provide a sneak peek of the version of the budget we will be taking to the Board of Governors just a few days later. After the presentation to the Board of Governors, we will then release detailed information to campus. We want to give the Board of Governors an opportunity to weigh in and vote to adopt the budget before we start sending it out.
Think we will be relatively well-positioned to go with what we submit to the Board of Governors, but they have the discretion to change and modify, so we need to respect that process.

Norton: Asked if there were any updates on the recommendations from the Capital Construction committee on the Veterinary Teaching Hospital or Clark.

Vice President Hanlon: All indications are that we are on the right track with Clark and the state support is there. For those not aware, the plan was a two-year payment for the Clark building, and then it was extended to three (3) years. With the Veterinary Teaching Hospital, there was an announcement that there is a $50 million contribution that would come from the state, and this will buy down the amount of money we have to bond. We have already issued the first installment of those bonds, which is $100 million in this fiscal year, and we plan on issuing bonds in the fall of this year, for FY25. The $50 million will reduce the amount we would have to bond for next year and bring down the forecasted payment.

Partridge: Salary increase guidelines have been circulating around campus and there is messaging about salary which was based on the more conservative numbers. Asked if Vice President Hanlon envisioned the increase changing the guidance for department chairs so they can start to try to figure out what they are doing with the upcoming annual budget, or if they will need to wait until May.

Vice President Hanlon: Clarified if the question was whether a change was anticipated of the 1% salary increase due to the state allocations.

Partridge: Confirmed.

Vice President Hanlon: At this point in time, we are staying the course with the 1%, even with the updated information.

Partridge: That is a severe message, to get the increase we are getting, and still stay with the 1% increase when the cost of living is higher.

Vice President Hanlon: Expressed understanding. The last time we talked, we discussed that 1% was low relative to the cost of living, and we received feedback in the listening sessions that if it was going to be that low, we should just take it down to 0% and reduce budget impacts. We have chosen to stay the course with the 1%, because at least it is an increase that could help people a little bit.

Mary Van Buren: Asked if Vice President Hanlon had any data on the discrepancy between the level of inflation and the amount of increase for faculty and staff salaries, specifically faculty salaries over the last ten (10) years. Even when we received a 5% increase, inflation was at 8.5% and we are still dealing with the effects of that.

Vice President Hanlon: Happy to follow up with Human Resources about this. This is something that we do look at to help inform the increases, and Human Resources also looks at
benchmarking of other institutions, not just market institutions or higher education institutions across the state. Budget capacity is also a significant contributor to defining what we can increase in terms of compensation each year. Happy to follow up on other inflationary benchmarks and other compensation in the market, as well as that history with Human Resources.

Van Buren: Asked if the capacity includes Board reserves and whether those reserves could be used for other purposes. That would take some weight off the general budget.

Vice President Hanlon: What might be being referenced here are the Treasury funds that are invested. If you were to liquidate those, those are one-time dollars, and what we try to do is match our one-time dollars to one-time commitments relative to spending one-time reserves for permanent base increases in compensation. Would advise against using the one-time money, because this could create a structural issue where our base revenue is not sufficient to support base increases over a long period of time.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if it was being considered to apply a differential percentage. For someone getting paid $50,000, a 1% increase is not the same as when you are making $150,000. The idea of giving a single percentage may not be the most equitable.

Vice President Hanlon: This is not something that is being contemplated in the structure at this point in time, but we did have a conversation about 1% and the level of effort that goes into administering that 1%. We wanted to reduce the administrative burden, which is why we are going through a somewhat modified merit process. We are trying not to get into a situation where we are splitting percentage points or incremental dollars between different levels of performance. We have left it at the percentage allocation at this point in the hopes of leaving the administrative burden as low as possible, with the understanding that the increase is rather modest.

Van Buren: Expressed support for what Pedros-Gascon is saying. We have recommended this for a long time, and have always been told that a cost-of-living or graduated increase is not being considered. Would like to know why. For last question, was asking whether the reserves could be used for pay increments. Instead of using this for different initiatives, wondering if it can be used to cover things like deferred maintenance on campus that would then take the pressure off the budget in order to use that money for fair compensation.

Vice President Hanlon: Thanked Van Buren, had misunderstood the question. If we brought down one cost, the question would then be whether that would change our structural capacity to do other things over time, and there could be instances where that is possible. One thing about the Treasury and those funds that should be mentioned is that money represents not only CSU Fort Collins, but also CSU Pueblo funds, as well as Board of Governors funds, CSU Global funds, and the System Office. There is a combination of money for different campuses that is combined there, as well as different flavors of money. Not all of it is state-appropriated dollars. There are also auxiliary funds. We would need to do an evaluation of the type of money and availability of those funds for a specific purpose and go through a multi-step analysis. This is not to say it is impossible, just that it would take time.
Norton: The Board of Governors did make a policy change last fall to put some of the System-
reserved funds into income-bearing investments rather than strictly capital continuation
investments. Believe the intent was to give the Board of Governors more flexibility for the kinds
of things Van Buren was asking about.

Chair Smith: Asked if Vice President Hanlon would be willing to speak to how many more years
of these kinds of cuts are potentially in our future, given the clear structural issues in the budget.

Vice President Hanlon: This is a question that has been asked many times. Am trying not to
speculate on future years, because there are at least three (3) main assumptions, which are how
much the state will provide in appropriations, how much the cap will be for tuition increases, and
finally, how much our enrollment is changing over this time period. WE need to be thinking
strategically and ask ourselves where we should be investing right now that could help our
revenue proposition this year and into future years. We should ask where the programs are that
we should be expanding on, which will help with enrollment and create a greater base of tuition.
Imagine that the governor’s proposals will remain modest, and hope that the legislature helps
champion the cause of higher education in the state. We have caps on how our tuition can grow,
and we have to think about how that impacts our students and the affordability of coming to
CSU. We are certainly not alone in this. Other institutions are grappling with this problem.
Happy to share those other comparables.

Sue Doe: Speaking of comparables, we tend to look just down the road. Am trying to understand,
since they are under the same state appropriation issues, same tuition cap issues, yet CU is
reporting a 4% pay raise for their employees and no anticipation of enrollment dips through at
least 2027. Wondering what is different here.

Vice President Hanlon: Not an expert on CU structures, but understanding is that while they do
receive state appropriated support, their dependence on state appropriations is structurally
different than ours. Would be happy to follow up with CU peers. Have also heard that CU
Denver and CU Colorado Springs are not in the same financial position as the campus in
Boulder. They have a different financial structure and financial profile than other institutions in
that organization. Will follow up with this, because we might get questions about that and the
University of Northern Colorado and seeing what others are doing.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions or discussion, thanked Vice President Hanlon. We
look forward to hearing another update at the May Faculty Council meeting.

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

Meeting was adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

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

#### Agricultural Sciences
- **Stephan Kroll**
  - Representing: Agricultural and Resource Economics
  - Term: 2025
- **Jennifer Martin**
  - Representing: Animal Sciences
  - Term: 2024
- **Jane Stewart**
  - Representing: Agricultural Biology
  - Term: 2024
- **Kelly Curl**
  - Representing: Horticulture & Landscape Architecture
  - Term: 2025
- **Esten Mason**
  - Representing: Soil and Crop Sciences
  - Term: 2026
- **Bradley Goetz**
  - Representing: College-at-Large
  - Term: 2026
- **Andrew Norton**
  - Representing: College-at-Large
  - Term: 2026

#### Health and Human Sciences
- **Ruoh-Nan (Terry) Yan**
  - Representing: Design and Merchandising
  - Term: 2024
- **Neha Lodha**
  - Representing: Health and Exercise Science
  - Term: 2025
- **Susan Baker**
  - Representing: Food Science and Human Nutrition
  - Term: 2026
- **Blake Naughton**
  - Representing: Human Development and Family Studies
  - Term: 2026
- **Erin Arneson**
  - Representing: Construction Management
  - Term: 2024
- **Aaron Eakman**
  - Representing: Occupational Therapy
  - Term: 2026
- **Sharon Anderson**
  - Representing: School of Education
  - Term: 2024
- **Elizabeth Kiehne**
  - Representing: School of Social Work
  - Term: 2025
- **Brian Butki**
  - Representing: College-at-Large
  - Term: 2024

#### Business
- **Nate Nguyen**
  - Representing: Accounting
  - Term: 2026
- **John Hoxmeier**
  - Representing: Computer Information Systems
  - Term: 2024
- **Bharadwaj Kannan**
  - Representing: Finance and Real Estate
  - Term: 2025
- **Rob Mitchell**
  - Representing: Management
  - Term: 2024
- **Jonathan Zhang**
  - Representing: Marketing
  - Term: 2026

#### Engineering
- **Peter Jan van Leeuwen**
  - Representing: Atmospheric Science
  - Term: 2024
- **Ashok Prasad**
  - Representing: Chemical and Biological Engineering
  - Term: 2025
- **Hussam Mahmoud**
  - Representing: Civil and Environmental Engineering
  - Term: 2024
- **Steven Reising**
  - Representing: Electrical and Computer Engineering
  - Term: 2025
- **Soheil Fatehiboroujeni**
  - Representing: Mechanical Engineering
  - Term: 2026
- **Thomas Bradley**
  - Representing: Systems Engineering
  - Term: 2026
- **Sybil Sharvelle**
  - Representing: College-at-Large
  - Term: 2026
Pinar Omur-Ozbek  College-at-Large  2026

Liberal Arts
Mary Van Buren  Anthropology & Geography  2026
Emily Moore  Art & Art History  2027
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
Madeline Harvey  Music, Theatre, and Dance  2025
Eirik Harris  Philosophy  2026
Marni Berg  Political Science  2024
Laura Raynolds  Sociology  2025

James Fielder  College-at-Large  2026
  (substituting for Alexandra Bernasek, Spring 2024)
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
Troy Ocheltree  Forest and Rangeland Stewardship  2024
  (substituting for Chad Hoffman, Spring 2024)
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
Del Leary  Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences  2026
Tony Schountz  Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology  2024
Katriana Popichak  College-at-Large  2025
Fiona Hollinshead  College-at-Large  2025
Doreene Hyatt  College-at-Large  2024
Tara Nordgren  College-at-Large  2025
RoxAnn Karkoff-Schwiezer  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  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  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
Anna Ferri  Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty  2025
(substituting for Scott Wiebensohn, Spring 2024)

Ex Officio Non-Voting Members
Amy Parsons  President
Rico Munn  Chief of Staff
Marion Underwood  Provost/Executive Vice President
Derek Dictson  Vice President for Advancement
James Pritchett  Vice President for Engagement & Extension
Kevin MacLennan  Interim 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
Cassandra Moseley  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 Youngblad  Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Colleen Webb  Dean, Graduate School
Elissa Braunstein  Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Karen Estlund  Dean, Libraries
Janice Nerger  Dean, College of Natural Sciences
Susan VandeWoude  Dean, College of Vet. Medicine & Biomedical Sciences
A. Alonso Aguirre  Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources
Justin Schwendeman-Curtis  Administrative Professional Council
(substituting for Matt Klein, Chair of APC)