

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, e-mail immediately to Amy Barkley.

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

MINUTES
Faculty Council Meeting
May 6, 2025 – 4:00pm – Administration 106/Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

Chair Smith requested a motion to extend the Faculty Council meeting by thirty (30) minutes to accommodate the full agenda. The motion was made and seconded. Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and by a virtual poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed.

Chair Smith reminded members of the rules of engagement.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS:

I. FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA – May 6, 2025

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- a. Next Faculty Council Meeting – September 2, 2025 – Location TBD/Microsoft Teams – 4:00pm
- b. Faculty Needs Survey – The Institute for Learning and Teaching
- c. TILT Summer Conference – May 21 & 22, 2025
 1. [Link to Registration](#)
- d. Harry Rosenberg Award – Announcement of Winner

Chair Smith: The Harry Rosenberg Distinguished Service Award is part of an endowment that was established in 2016 by Dr. Sue Davis Pendell, who was the fourth Faculty Council chair. This is named after Dr. Harry Rosenberg, who was the first Faculty Council chair and faculty member in the Department of History. Annually, a faculty member is recognized for significant contributions to Faculty Council. This year's winner is Alexandra Bernasek.

Chair Smith: This award recognized Bernasek's outstanding contributions and dedication to her colleagues, friends, and associates at CSU through her service. Bernasek has served in a variety of roles for Faculty Council for nearly fifteen (15) years and has made a significant impact on our institution. Congratulated Bernasek on receiving this award.

B. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

a. Faculty Council Meeting – April 1, 2025

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from April 1st.

Hearing none, the Faculty Council minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

C. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. UCC Minutes – March 28, April 4, 11, 18 & 25, 2025

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any items that needed to be pulled from the consent agenda.

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

E. PRESIDENT’S REPORT – President Amy Parsons

President Amy Parsons: Congratulated everyone for making it through these unprecedented time and semester together. Expressed appreciation for the work everyone has done this semester together and the role of shared governance that we have seen in new ways this semester.

President Parsons: We have had a lot of open forums this semester on a variety of issues, as well as meetings regarding issues around the federal administration. We have also done forums on the Strategic Roadmap. Expressed appreciation for everyone’s engagement with the Strategic Roadmap, which we presented to the Board of Governors. The Strategic Roadmap will continue to evolve. We also had open forums on the budget and budget model.

President Parsons: We have also held a lot of meetings with the Incident Management Team (IMT). We continue to meet every day, with multiple meetings throughout the week and doing communications. This will not stop at the end of the semester and will continue through the summer as the federal issues continue. We have dealt with a deluge of issues from the federal administration, from executive orders, temporary restraining orders, guidance from federal agencies, as well as contradictory advice and directives. We have been dealing with that uncertainty and impact, as well as the real stress on our community in different ways. We are focusing on understanding the impacts, reacting to them, and assessing them and figuring out the best ways to communicate them and where the appropriate places are to address our concerns. We have joined forces with other universities to sign some letters, and we have joined the University of Colorado system with letters directed at the Colorado federal delegation on impacts

to research. We have also combined forces with institutions in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), including the Cooperative Institute for Research in the Atmosphere (CIRA) on letter. We have rallied with our Chamber of Commerce in the business community throughout Colorado so they can lobby on our behalf. It is not just universities speaking with this voice but getting our allies to join us. Believe we have four (4) lawsuits at this point, with three (3) of them submitting declarations of impact to CSU. Expressed appreciation for the attorney general in Colorado that has been willing to take this up and fight for Colorado and its universities. We have seen many helpful temporary restraining orders and injunctions, which have allowed us time to organize and figure things out. Expressed additional appreciation for Marketing and Communications division for highlighting the great work of our faculty and researchers through more articles and highlighting the research and impacts in a positive way.

President Parsons: The chaos and uncertainty of this last semester has had an unanticipated impact on our budget. We have to hold on to our capacity in our budget, since we do not know what the impacts will be and hold space for some austerity measures and hiring while we wait to see what is ahead for us so we can be nimble. The biggest disappointment is that we are not able to make progress with compensation like we wanted to. That was our top priority going into the year, and we were not able to do it, so that has to change. This will be a major focus going forward. We cannot predict what will happen with the federal government going forward, and impacts remain to be seen.

President Parsons: We also do not want to lose sight of all the positive momentum here at the University. Our students are succeeding, and we will see them at commencement next week. Our enrollment for fall looks strong. We completed our biggest CSU Day of Giving ever, doubling our donors who donated to CSU a year ago. If you look at our donor numbers, engagement, alumni engagement, that trajectory is doing great things right now. That means people believe in the value of CSU and want to be here, and they are investing in us. We are doing well on our building projects and have seen jumps in our rankings for some of our programs. Athletics has resulted in positive visibility for us.

President Parsons: Our commencement ceremony is on Friday. We have Eugene Daniels coming as our commencement speaker. Daniels is the president of the White House Correspondents Association and got his start at the Collegian here at CSU.

President Parsons: The plan for summer is to spend time visiting faculty and staff around the state at our Extension offices and Ag Experiment Stations. Encouraged members to reach out with ideas of other areas to visit.

Chair Smith: Thanked President Parsons for the report. We appreciate hearing from you and all that you do for CSU and commitment to shared governance. Asked if there were any questions.

Peter Jan van Leeuwen (WSCOE): Have a specific question about the federal government and the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP). We are seeing more agencies cancel grants, as well as

the indirect cost reduction from 55% to 15%. Noted that there is an appeal procedure and we can typically appeal within thirty (30) days. The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) seems overworked, which is understandable. It would be great if we can work to speed up getting the appeal process going. The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) needs help and now the question is how to do that. One suggestion is to automatically appeal any grant that is affected and the communication could be better.

President Parsons: Will not speak for Vice President Cassandra Moseley, who has been deeply involved in this issue, but there are some strategies in play. Asked Chief of Staff Matthew Tillman to speak to this.

Matthew Tillman (Chief of Staff): We are looking hard at this and how we can appeal every one that we can. It really is just a bandwidth issue for the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) specifically. We talked about how we can leverage artificial intelligence to help with some of the higher volume appeals as we work through this. Dean Karen Estlund is helping us work through this issue.

Provost Marion Underwood: Do not have much to add besides being sorry that we are facing these challenges. Vice President Moseley is working hard on coming up with a system for how to respond, how to appeal, and doing this in a way that is respectful of everyone's time and energy. Appeals require effort from investigators too. Vice President Moseley is working on a process. Expressed appreciation for her team and all their work.

van Leeuwen (WSCOE): We as faculty and staff want to help with this process. We understand that this is not just on our plate, but on the University as a whole, so we all need to deal with this. Whatever we can do to streamline this process.

Provost Underwood: Thanked van Leeuwen. We cannot do successful appeals without collaborating with the principal investigators. Expressed appreciation for willingness to work with us on this.

Dean Karen Estlund: Vice President Moseley's team is doing amazing work. Each agency has a different appeal process, so there is a lot that has to go into that as well. It is not as easy as it would seem because they all have different processes that they require.

Jennifer Martin (BOG Representative): Acknowledged that we have talked a lot about compassion on the people side of all that is happening, but the sense from colleagues across campus is that the human impact of what is happening is less acknowledged by our administration. Expressed gratitude for the recent letter signings. Think these happening, in some respects, because that targets our ability to do our job as an institution when they are targeting our funding, but they have been targeting our people from day one (1). Asked how we can, in light of potential repercussions, acknowledge that members of our campus community have been

targeted and how we are acknowledging the impact to our people that is not tied to our finances or ability to do our job.

Ray Black (Guest-CLA): These might be unprecedented times for you, but we have been pointing this out for this administration since before he ever left. This is not a surprise, and this is not unprecedented for everyone. What is unprecedented is the scale and scope. Building on that, students of color are targeted, faculty of color are targeted, and various groups on campus have not heard from the Office of the President speaking specifically to them.

President Parsons: Expressed disagreement on some points. Have been meeting directly with the cultural center directors, as well as alumni from cultural centers. Have been meeting with many groups without publicizing it to talk about impacts and how we can help. Am not trying to be defensive and say we are doing everything right. We are trying to do what we can for our community, and we are open to how we can continue. Communication has been the single biggest challenge of the semester. We have communicated broadly and on websites and have had many meetings with various groups around campus to show support. We can appreciate that we are still not quite hitting the mark on it. We hear you and we will continue to try to get better, because we are a team here and we are trying to do the right thing by our community.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon (CLA): There is clear concern by faculty and students of color that we are pawns in a chess game that can be easily played in favor of bigger prizes. This sounds bad, but there is a lack of commitment to faculty and students of color by our perspective. This is something that needs to be addressed by the Office of the President. There have been students receiving letters about self-deportation. These students approach CSU to help them understand what is happening and feel unsupported. We are failing these students by not standing next to them while facing these situations. This is the price we are paying by not taking a clearer stand on all these things.

Martin (BOG Representative): Acknowledged that this is hard. The only way we get through this is to work together and come to the table as peers and partners and collaborators in what we are building. We can lean into these conversations, even when they are hard. Expressed hope that moving forward, we continue to have conversations with each other and value the perspectives we all bring. Authoritarian regimes try to break us down from inside, and we do not want them to be successful in doing that and we have to work together to keep it from happening.

President Parsons: Hopefully we can continue that when we all come back in the fall and have productive conversations. Am happy to meet any time. Encouraged members to reach out with concerns. With regard to the comment about the student, agreed that maybe that student did not have a good experience, but have seen the staff in Student Affairs do Herculean work to help some of the students, including adopting pets and driving them to the airport. There is amazing work being done to help these impacted students. People are really doing their best and doing extraordinary things to keep us moving in the right direction. Would hope that we can continue

to give each other the benefit of the doubt that we all care about and love our students and our community and are doing the best we can.

Chair Smith: Expressed appreciation for coming to Faculty Council and all the work being done for CSU. We recognize it and we are here to help.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, the President's report was concluded.

F. ATHLETICS UPDATE – Director of Athletics John Weber

Director of Athletics John Weber: Introduced himself. Am a 1991 alum of the College of Business at CSU, followed by a career in high tech, both in software and hardware. After retirement, got involved in Dean Beth Walker's Global Leadership Council and spent several years as a volunteer in various places across campus. Care deeply about CSU and see the full potential of all the work being done by faculty.

Weber: Would like to talk about how he views Athletics, which might be different from conversations around Athletics in the past. Early on, set a vision for the department, which is to become to most loved, most watched, and most innovative program in the West. When we talk about love, there are obvious things around alumni sentiment, but that also means faculty and student sentiment, and the sentiment of the student athletes, coaches, and administrators. There are questions involved around how effective we are at what we do, how many people do we reach, and what kind of brand affinity we are building. From an innovative perspective, we ask what we can do differently to limit our expenses and maximize our impact. We also ask how we can leverage technology and industry expertise.

Weber: The mission statement we developed has three (3) parts. The first part is to relentlessly pursue competitive and personal success, the second one is to courageously champion our University, and the last is to passionately connect with our community. Regarding the second point, Athletics at its real purpose is to magnify and amplify all the work that you do. When we compete at the highest level of collegiate athletics, it impacts CSU as a whole and can affect enrollment, donations, and community engagement. We are the premier engagement engine for our community on this campus. For the last one, we want to make sure we provide an opportunity for people to have an enjoyable interface with CSU, because that reflects the work that all of us do.

Weber: Conference realignment has been a topic talked about for a while. In September of last year, there was an announcement that we would be moving to the Pac-12. Oregon State and Washington State were already there, four (4) institutions from the Mountain West will be joining us, and Gonzaga from the West Coast Conference is coming over as well. That is a total of eight (8) schools and we need at least one (1) more all-sport program that also plays football in order for the NCAA to re-instate the Pac-12 conference as valid. We are at the end of

finalizing our media deal with several different providers. Once that is done and announced, we will work on the final membership details of the Pac-12.

Weber: The evolution of the NCAA is also top of mind for many people. There was preliminary approval granted for the House vs. NCAA case. Part of the settlement came back to court in April, so we are anticipating final approval of the settlement details. There has been some conversation back and forth between the court and the NCAA around roster limits and whether some of those are going to go into effect now, meaning that we reduce the number of athletes on some programs but allow it to fully scholarship if you wanted to. If the House settlement gets approved, it provides compensation for past athletes and allows for an optional, direct revenue-sharing with student athletes with a proposed cap of \$20.5 million annually. That is a significant number, but it is something that other power institutions are going toward. It might also remove scholarship limits and may impose roster limits, but we will need to see what happens.

Weber: Regarding academic achievements, the GPA for the student athletes in 2024 was 3.229 and was 3.181 for the general student population. The academic pursuits of the student athletes continue to be good, and they are outpacing the general student body from a GPA perspective, while doing all their athletic responsibilities as well. We have student athletes that represent every college on campus, so they are a good representation of the student body.

Weber: Presented a slide that provided financial context for where CSU is in comparison with others. There are eleven (11) schools on the chart, which are the ones that have been selected by the Board of Governors as our peer institutions. To compare CSU from a financial perspective, we remove the debt cost and financial aid costs because those are highly variable between institutions and just focus on the money that is spent inside of athletics for these programs. Noted that this is FY23 data. CSU is sitting at about \$42 million, which is second from last. CSU measures up well against these schools from an academic and research perspective, but they play in a different league from an athletic perspective. CSU is spending roughly \$164,000 per student athlete. It is double that at CU Boulder. If you look at our alumni numbers, which is over 265,000, we measure up against some of the other schools, and if you look at the measures of a power institution which are alumni size, student body size, facilities, academic rankings, research status, we are a power school by all those definitions.

Weber: Presented a slide with how CSU compares to other schools within the Pac-12. CSU still appears as second to last for funding for athletics, in terms of operational budget. The peer institutions of Boise, Fresno, and Utah State have us clumped together, but there is a gap between what we are doing and what others are doing in terms of investment for student athletes. We compare well for alumni sizes.

Weber: Provided some additional budget information. Noted that in the budget for FY24, we had budgeted around \$8.8 million for University support, but it came to close to \$8.2 million, which is roughly \$600,000 less. The goal is \$6.6 million, so we are on track. For CSU Day of Giving, we did four (4) times what we did last year, and nearly half of all that was raised was by

Athletics. Discussed ticket sales. Since the stadium opened in 2017, ticket sales had reduced every year until last year. We were able to reverse this trend. We were averaging about 8,400 students, and this year, we averaged about 11,000 students and had four (4) sell-outs. Athletics is fortunate to be able to control much of what we do from a revenue generation perspective, given that we can sell tickets, and we have donors, as well as being able to engage with sponsorships and selling names. This is an example of the work we are doing to make sure we are not a financial burden on the University and doing all this in a financially prudent manner.

Weber: Provided some additional updates and successes.

- We are hosting our first non-football event in Canvas Stadium with Tim McGraw, John Purdy, and PBR professional bull riding coming to campus on July 21st and 22nd. Ticket sales are strong, and we are almost halfway sold out at this point, with almost three (3) months to go.
- During our NCAA appearances, the ad value equivalency was about \$4.2 billion. Getting ourselves out of conference or regular season play and onto the national stage is when the value starts to accelerate.
- Gave overviews of the volleyball tournament and the Snoop Dogg Arizona Bowl, as well as the men's basketball team going to the NCAA tournament.

Black (Guest-CLA): Asked if the GPA rates also include persistence and graduation rates.

Weber: Yes, there are graduation success rates (GSR), and there is also the NCAA metric that is a multi-year number. When someone transfers into an institution, they may have already graduated from somewhere. That is an academic challenge that we will need to figure out how to deal with a little differently in the industry. We have been working with colleagues on campus about how we create an academic experience for people like that, whether it is a certificate program or minor program, where there is an incentive to stay in school and finish that last piece.

Elena Windsong (CLA): Given all the trends we have been shown, particularly about the trends for men's basketball and GPA and academic performance, there is a noticeable decline alongside the rise in profile. Wondering what Athletics is doing to ensure both the transfer portal and recruitment, academic standards, and academic support. The other sports seem to have more success in their academic performance, so wondering where academic supports are being reconsidered for men's basketball in particular.

Weber: This goes back to what we were just discussing. Basketball season can end in March, or as early as March, and someone may be in a position where they have already graduated from another institution, and they can choose not to continue their academic pursuits. We are starting work with our colleagues on campus about how we can create programs that create an incentive for them to stay. We will have to see how some of the other things shake out relative to potential contract fill ratios.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, Athletics update was concluded.

G. REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

Chair Smith: We have a number of reports we are receiving. Reminded members that a vote is not required for receipt of reports by Faculty Council. There will be opportunity to ask questions regarding each report if there are any.

1. Report on CSU Programs for Childcare and Housing Assistance and Leadership Training – Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning – Gamze Cavdar, Chair

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding the report on CSU Programs for Childcare and Housing Assistance and Leadership Training from the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning.

Hearing no questions or discussion, report was received.

2. 2024 Biennial Reviews – Committee on University Programs – Day Halsey & Tian Wang, Co-Chairs

Chair Smith: Each year, the Committee on University Programs conduct biennial reviews of existing centers, institutes, and other special units (CIOSUs). This report is a summary of those biennial reviews. Asked if there were any questions regarding the report.

Hearing no questions or discussion, report was received.

3. Faculty Success Report: Onboarding and Mentorship, Faculty Perspectives – Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty – Ryan Brooks, Chair

Chair Smith: This report comes from the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. This is a follow-up of the report we received last May on faculty success, onboarding and mentorship. This one was focused on faculty perspectives based on a survey that was conducted. The report includes important information that will help inform the onboarding process at CSU. Asked if there were any questions regarding the report.

Hearing no questions or discussion, report was received.

4. Task Force on Department Code Review and Approval Final Report – Ryan Brooks & Susan James, Co-Chairs

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions about the report. This report will move on and inform departmental code review.

Hearing no questions or discussion, report was received.

5. Task Force on Revising the Program and Curriculum Approval Processes at CSU Final Report – Gamze Cavdar, Christopher Gentile, & Michelle Stanley, Co-Chairs

Chair Smith: Indicated that the plan is to make sure these task force reports and recommendations get to the appropriate stakeholders and that we move forward with any actions or recommendations put forward in these reports.

Hearing no questions or discussion, report was received.

6. Task Force on Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Degrees Final Report – Shawn Bingham & Sarah Badding, Co-Chairs

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding this report. The task force identified many barriers to interdisciplinary degrees, but lots of opportunity as well.

Hearing no questions or discussion, report was concluded.

7. Task Force on Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) and Revising the AUCC Final Report – Shawn Bingham & Lisa Dysleski, Co-Chairs

Chair Smith: Reminded members that this appeared as a discussion item on last month's Faculty Council agenda. We are now receiving the report. Noted that a memo was included in the action items further in the agenda to officially vote on the Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs). Asked if there were any questions regarding the report.

Hearing no questions or discussion, report was received.

8. Task Force on Faculty Student Mentoring Final Report – Lisa Dysleski & Graham Peers, Co-Chairs

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding the report.

Hearing no questions or discussion, report was received.

9. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Thanked Faculty Council representatives, the Executive Committee, the Faculty Council standing committee chairs and members, as well as the task force members and their co-chairs for your continued engagement in shared governance. Thanked the leadership of the employee councils for their partnership and engagement throughout this year. It has been important, and we have had some successes through shared governance articles published earlier

in the year, as well as the open forums we held recently. This commitment to shared governance is important, particularly in light of the current impacts on our institutions of higher education. Expressed appreciation for the engagement from Provost Marion Underwood and her commitment to shared governance. Thanked the leadership of the Incident Management Team (IMT) for their engagement with Faculty Council and the other employee councils. Expressed additional thanks for being elected by Faculty Council for a third year. Thanked Joseph DiVerdi for service as vice chair.

10. Board of Governors Report – Jennifer Martin

Martin (BOG Representative): Thanked faculty for the opportunity to be your voice to the Board of Governors, especially this year.

Martin (BOG Representative): The Board of Governors will have their June meeting in Fort Collins. It is a difficult time to engage with the Board because of all the things around us that are changing and the role they play in mitigating the federal and regulatory landscapes, as well as potential legal implications and financial considerations both at the federal and state levels. Have tried to express to them concerns from faculty and staff. The stakes are so much higher, and we need them to be strong allies and advocates for us, because our voices on the collective are relatively minor. We need them to fight for us in arenas that we do not have access to or are not protected from potential repercussions from engagement. Will be sharing the resolution that Faculty Council will vote on during the action items portion of the agenda. Encouraged members to reach out with things that should be communicated to the Board of Governors.

Pedros-Gascon (CLA): Asked if there have been any conversations in the Board of Governors in acknowledgement of the loss of the president of CSU Pueblo and putting their own Board member in as interim president. Feels this gives a bad image to the institution.

Martin (BOG Representative): At the Board of Governors meeting last week, there was specific conversation about the future of the role at CSU Pueblo, and feedback from their faculty was part of that conversation. Do not think it is common for boards to engage since it is personnel matters that are confidential, especially around what happened and what was communicated with their president. The CSU Pueblo faculty senate is pushing forward to have an engaged and transparent conversation around what leadership looks like in the future. The more we can support our colleagues in Pueblo with their desire for that and helping them lean into their shared governance structures will help, since their structures are not as strong as they are here. Think there is an appetite for us to partner with Pueblo and help them position themselves better.

Pedros-Gascon (CLA): Expressed hope that it does not result in another situation where only one (1) candidate is advanced and that we have more than one (1) candidate being presented.

Mary Van Buren (CLA): Am the president of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) here at CSU. We have an initiative called “Tell Your Story” and it is specifically meant to solicit stories from everyone at CSU, regarding both the federal initiatives and their impact on us, as well as the state level budget impacts on us. Would be happy to share those stories next semester.

H. ACTION ITEMS

1. Academic Faculty Nominations to Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Steve Reising (CoFG): On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, we are putting forth these academic faculty nominations for Faculty Council standing committees as seen in the agenda packet.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed.

2. Academic Faculty Nominations to University Benefits Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Reising (CoFG): On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the nomination of Samantha Conroy for a four-year term to the University Benefits Committee (UBC), as seen in the agenda packet.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed.

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 (CoFG): On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move the proposed revision to Section C.2.3.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. This portion of the Manual lists departments throughout the University, which include schools. We have proposed to strike “Chemical and Biomedical Engineering” and add “Systems Engineering” and the “School of Biomedical and Chemical Engineering”. In 2019, the Department of Systems Engineering was added and was not added to the Manual in an oversight. The second part of this change is to add the School of Biomedical and Chemical Engineering. Asked Dean Allen Robinson to speak to this.

Dean Allen Robinson: This proposal is to align the Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering that has existed in the college for a couple decades with a special academic unit

called the School of Biomedical Engineering. This would create one (1) unit, bringing faculty, students, and staff together. We have undergone a process over the last year and a half to engage all those different communities in this realignment, to create a larger academic unit that will better support both the research and educational missions of the department. We decided to call this a “school” to reflect the broader mission.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed. Will be sent to the Board of Governors for final approval.

4. New CIOU: Criminal Justice and Victimization Institute –
Committee on University Programs – Day Halsey & Tian Wang,
Co-Chairs

Day Hasley (CUP): On behalf of the Committee on University Programs, we move that Faculty Council approve the new Criminal Justice and Victimization Center. Indicated that Tara Opsal is in attendance in case there are questions.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed.

5. Proposed Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin:
Academic Standards and Policies, “Registration, Credit
Overload, Credit Load” – Committee on Scholarship, Research
and Graduate Education – Rob Schonlau, Chair

Joseph DiVerdi (Vice Chair): Will be presenting the motion since Chair Rob Schonlau is currently teaching. On behalf of the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education, move that Faculty Council approve the proposed revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin for admissions requirements and procedures on registration, credit overload, and credit loan as seen in the agenda packet. Asked if there were any questions.

Sanjay Rajopadhye (CNS): In the document, it says that an advisor can give override permission for up to eighteen (18) credits, and then to go up to twenty-one (21) credits, it required Graduate School approval. Asked if this was intentional.

Dean Colleen Webb: In the past, the cutoff was nineteen (19) credits, and anything above that required the Graduate School to give permission. We are proposing a change so that the Graduate School would have to give permission to anything above twenty-one (21) credits. The

idea is that we would reduce some of the administrative burden associated with approving these. We chose a threshold that is consistent with the undergraduate threshold.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed.

6. Proposed Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Admissions Requirements and Procedures, “Accelerated Master’s Degree Programs” and “Dual and Joint Master’s Degree Programs” – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – Rob Schonlau, Chair

DiVerdi (Vice Chair): On behalf of the Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education, move that Faculty Council approve the proposed revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin for admissions requirements and procedures on accelerated master’s degree programs and dual and joint master’s degree programs, as seen in the agenda packet.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed.

7. Proposed Revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin: Graduate Study, Graduate Thesis and Dissertation Policy – Committee on Scholarship, Research and Graduate Education – Rob Schonlau, Chair

DiVerdi (Vice Chair): On behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, move that Faculty Council approve the proposed revisions to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin regarding sections on graduate study and graduate thesis and dissertation policy, as seen in the agenda packet.

Hearing no questions or discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed.

8. Motion regarding CSU Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs)

DiVerdi (Vice Chair): On behalf of the Executive Committee, move that Faculty Council approve the proposed CSU Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) as described in the agenda packet.

Tracy Brady (CLA): Questions among colleagues were about how to link these to the All-University Core Curriculum (AUCC) courses that may be revised down the road. Would like more clarity on how these would be used as courses are being revised. Asked: Do you need to meet all these objectives and who decides? Would like more information about implementation.

Shawn Bingham (Co-Chair): These are guiding principles and you do not have to fit into all these. These were the first steps to revising AUCC, but these are not draconian orders. They are an effort to create things that were CSU-specific versus more generic.

Pedros-Gascon (CLA): Expressed discomfort when we are asked to vote for something that we will work out later on how to approach. Asked if it would be possible to have this group come back in September to present more on how this will be implemented. Additionally asked if there could be more acknowledgement in these Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) of the linguistic landscapes in the state of Colorado.

Lisa Dysleski (Co-Chair): The task force had a conversation about revising the AUCC. We felt that these Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) were the foundation upon which the AUCC would be built. Maybe we were imagining it too linearly, but we felt we needed to understand these learning objectives first before building the AUCC. We were not expecting these to be something prescriptive that people would have to meet every single one of the objectives. In the report, the task force recommended that there be a period of time where we meet with departments and colleges to help people craft their program learning outcomes in light of what these Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) are. There would be discussions on campus around how we want to ladder up to these objectives.

Andrew Norton (CAS): Spoke in favor of the motion. Reminded members that the current Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) were presented in 2019 and we never officially passed those. We were dinged for not having essential learning outcomes on our previous accreditation, as well as the most recent round of accreditation, because we do not really have a way of assessing student learning outcomes.

Pedros-Gascon (CLA): Proposed an amendment to the Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs). Asked that “linguistic landscapes” be added to the section on “Understanding Our History and Heritage.”

The motion was seconded. Chair Smith asked if there was any discussion regarding the motion to amend.

Bingham (Co-Chair): Stated that this is just step one (1) and that if Faculty Council wants to create another task force, that is their prerogative. Moving forward with this would require coming back to Faculty Council and going through the procedures for how we envision this.

Hearing no further questions or discussion regarding the motion to amend, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion to amend passed.

Chair Smith: We can return to the motion at hand, which is the adoption of the Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs), now with the amendment.

Black (Guest-CLA): Requested clarification on whether or not we are bound to the Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) when we are proposing a new course or program.

Bingham: Believe that would be up to Faculty Council.

Chair Smith: Something we are requiring right now is a mapping to the Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) but what is not clear is how tight that mapping needs to be.

Vice Provost Susan James: Do not believe it is a tight map, but there is mapping that is done. As we move forward, we can be clear on what that expectation is and we need to be, partly related to the accreditation process and how our curriculum lines up.

Black (Guest-CLA): This goes back to the point brought up by Pedros-Gascon about voting on something happening in the future and we are deciding as we go along.

Chair Smith: Right now all we are doing is adopting without indicating how they are being applied or what the expectations are.

Martin (BOG Representative): Stephanie Foster from Institutional Research commented in the chat that programs are expected to respond to the Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) but are not required to respond to all of them.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion, as amended, passed.

9. Resolution to Establish a Mutual Defense Compact for Colorado Institutions to Higher Education to Defend Academic Freedom, Institutional Integrity, and the Research Enterprise

Chair Smith: The final action item is a resolution to establish a mutual defense compact for Colorado institutions of higher education to defend academic freedom, institutional integrity, and the research enterprise. This resolution was brought forward by Van Buren in her role as the president of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) chapter at CSU. This was brought to the Faculty Council Executive Committee to endorse the resolution and place on the Faculty Council agenda. Noted that the Associated Students of CSU (ASCSU) voted to support their own resolution, which endorsed this resolution and articulated the need for stronger collaboration between ASCSU and Faculty Council. The same or a similar resolution has been either endorsed or is being considered by other Colorado institutions of higher education.

Chair Smith: On behalf of the Faculty Council Executive Committee, move to support the resolution to establish a mutual defense compact for Colorado institutions of higher education to defend academic freedom, institutional integrity, and the research enterprise.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions or discussion regarding the resolution.

Ellie Lutz (ASCSU): The ASCSU resolution passed unanimously last week and is being presented again for the 55th Senate, since the 54th just completed their work. We are working on getting it passed again. We are also working on another resolution calling for a “firewall for freedom” with the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).

Sue Doe (TILT): Asked if there had been discussion with the other universities considering similar resolutions about adopting a single approach.

DiVerdi (Vice Chair): There was much discussion among the leaderships. This point was raised, and there is a plurality of thought from each of the institutions, and they could not agree on one. It was determined that it was better to go forth with multiple resolutions than none.

Pedros-Gascon (CLA): Spoke in favor of the motion. Believe it is also important to indicate support for this and come in solidarity with other institutions.

Brian Munskey (AAUP): We are all very worried about the future of our education systems, and it might be tempting to hide behind other institutions and maybe weather out the storm. This might have been a good idea in other political situations where they would perhaps be played by the standard conventions and legal rules, but unfortunately, we are not in that time and the goal posts are changing rapidly. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has made several strong legal challenges against the federal administration and have been rolling back some of the changes. This gives us an opportunity to get involved with our colleagues in Boulder and around the country.

Martin (BOG Representative): When we talk about dedication of funding, there are some restrictions on what we can use funds for. In trying to think about how this will be successful at the Board of Governors, one of their arguments might be that funding from the state cannot be spent at other institutions within Colorado.

Rajopadhye (CNS): Asked why CU Boulder was not on the list of schools considering similar or same resolutions.

Chair Smith: There is no answer to that questions.

An ASCSU representative indicated that at least on the undergraduate side, we had reached out to CU Boulder's student government, who indicated that they did not have time to do anything. They have been talking with American Association for University Professors (AAUP), as well as building undergraduate connections as the first step for something and more groundwork will be laid over the summer.

Van Buren (CLA): Would like to respond to Martin's point, which anticipates some of the resistance we might encounter with such a resolution. Overall, institutions like ours and all institutions of higher education are reluctant to give up some of their autonomy. This resolution, if passed by Faculty Council, is our statement about where we think we should go. This statement does not bind the CSU administration to anything. They would be the ones to take this forward and modify it, hopefully in concert with us. The budget situation at CSU has been opaque, but most of our funding does not come from the state and am sure there are creative ways we could help other institutions if that was needed.

Pedros-Gascon (CLA): Understanding is that a resolution is a statement from this body about what we consider a logical way forward and what we have as an expectation. It is not a binding decision for the President or administration. Would endorse it as is and do not think we need to revise it, because the Board of Governors will decide how much attention they will pay to it and what they will add.

Martin (BOG Representative): Made a motion to amend the word "funding" to "resources" in the whereas statement regarding the fund.

The motion was seconded.

Chair Smith: Asked if there was any discussion regarding the motion to amend.

Norton (CAS): Expressed concern about complying in advance at this stage and lessening the potential impact of what we are trying to do before going to the Board of Governors. Think the funding is an important aspect of this resolution.

A point of clarification was asked on which words were being changed. Martin and Chair Smith identified the words being requested to be changed.

Following discussion, Martin withdrew the proposed amendment and motion.

Hearing no further questions or discussion on the main motion, Chair Smith requested a vote by hand for those in the room and through a digital poll for those on Microsoft Teams.

Motion passed.

I. IMT UPDATE – Chief of Staff Matthew Tillman

Tillman (Chief of Staff): As President Parsons stated earlier, we are continuing to refine what the Incident Management Team (IMT) is doing with each section and with specific tasks. We will have a modified schedule through the summer.

Tillman (Chief of Staff): Encouraged members to use the two websites that are available regarding federal updates and research updates. The most recent update we are working on is how we can systematically inform everyone when updates are on those sites. In an effort to be better with communication, encouraged faculty members, staff and students, to go to the websites with any questions. Those can be submitted and if we received two (2) similar questions, we generate a new FAQ section on them.

Tillman (Chief of Staff): Discussed areas that they are continuing to watch. There are continued research impacts. Expressed appreciation for the questions on appeals and trying to make sure we use the staff resources that we have that are limited in the best way we can. We have our federal legislative team working on some items. Expressed appreciation for all those working with the Incident Management Team (IMT).

Tillman (Chief of Staff): For those that have students who have concerns, asked that those students be directed to the Office of International Programs, because they do care and have resources and will help as much as they can. We also have legal resources on campus to help students. The Provost will talk about working groups called “think tanks” that will help solicit some of the brain power of this institution to help us weather this storm. Routine updates will continue to come out as they have been over the summer. We will continue to meet with the chairs and vice chairs of the employee councils, as well as ask for cascading communication through University leadership, including the deans, vice presidents, and the Executive Leadership Team (ELT).

J. PROVOST/EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT REPORT – Provost Marion Underwood

Provost Underwood: Thank everyone for everything you have done and continue to do during this very challenging semester. One of the reasons for wanting to join Colorado State University was the strong shared governance. While we may not always agree, have never been disappointed in the commitment to shared governance. Thanked everyone for their willingness to engaged with us and our teams, as well as sharing ideas.

Provost Underwood: We have launched several Incident Management Team (IMT) engagement groups to take advantage of faculty and staff expertise. The groups have been established to support the Incident Management Team as it adapts our structures and processes to higher education impacts stemming from federal action. These groups will focus on academic freedom, tenure and promotion, institutional values and access, campus and community impact, and research continuity.

Provost Underwood: Provided some additional updates.

- We began public forums for the four (4) finalists for the position of Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs at CSU Spur. More information can be found on the Office of the Provost website under the CSU Spur drop-down menu.
- The Ram Leadership Collaborative is a new professional development program designed to cultivate and identify emerging leaders within the CSU community. This program will be administered by Chief of Staff Kimberly Miloch and is being offered in collaboration with Talent Development and Human Resources. The deadline for applications is May 12th.
- The next Provost's Ethics Colloquium will be held on Thursday, September 18th. This colloquium will feature two (2) Purdue economists and longtime academic leaders.
- Welcomed Michael Galchinsky to CSU, who started in the role of Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Affairs on May 1st. Dr. Michelle Stanley will continue to serve as a special advisor through August to help with this transition and continue to assist with the academic aspects of all the federal challenges.
- There has been an updated to the CSU homepage that invites website visitors to click on a link to a section called "Explore Our Research" that features CSU research across numerous disciplines.
- Two (2) CSU faculty members were selected as senior members of the National Academy of Inventors this spring. Congratulated Dr. Amy Prieto and Dr. Tod Clapp.

Marilee Long (CLA): The application for the leadership program does not indicate whether someone needs to be a full-time member, whether continuing, contract, or adjunct faculty (CCAF) or tenure-track. Have a faculty member that is asking and is wondering whether they qualify for the collaborative.

Provost Underwood: Encouraged those with questions to contact Chief of Staff Miloch.

Hearing no further questions or discussion, Provost's report was concluded.

K. BUDGET UPDATE – Vice President for University Operations and Chief Financial Officer Brendan Hanlon

Ceded time for other discussions. Chair Smith stated that Vice President Brendan Hanlon had provided a budget update to the Faculty Council Executive Committee prior to the Board of Governors meeting.

L. DISCUSSION

1. IT Accessibility Campaign – Dean of Libraries Karen Estlund, Executive Director of TILT Sue Doe, & Director of Assistive Technology Resources Marla Roll

Dean Estlund: We will talk a lot about compliance and some of the financial impacts, but want to point out that working on accessibility is an excellent opportunity to live our Principles of Community. With so much out of our control, this is something that we can control that supports inclusion and access for our full community.

Dean Estlund: We have some new legal policy mandates that we have to follow. Fines for not following these will start in July and we have been moving to implement as much as we can to support getting ready for this. For the Colorado bill, fines can be around \$3,500 per complaint per person. The American Disabilities Act (ADA), Title II had a 2024 update from the Department of Justice which extended and clarified web accessibility. These pieces of legislation run parallel and reference the same standards. In preparation for this, we have been working and have updated our technology and policy standards.

Dean Estlund: It is important to note that accessibility is the responsibility of the content creator. The items included for the state of Colorado include all technology hardware. If you are going to process it or access it through your phone or screen, it needs to be considered for evaluation. The compliance levels that are being referred to include the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1AA for HTML, which are both the state and federal regulations. At CSU, we are aiming for 2.2 and the additional items there are mostly technical. It would not affect much faculty work. We are trying to ensure our technical policy follows the most current WCAG guidelines and give longevity to our policy, so it continues to use new standards. The Assistive Technology Resource Center (ATRC) has developed an electronic accessibility rubric. We are aiming for a universal design goal. We are encouraging everyone to do all they can, knowing that there is not an expectation to make all your content instantly accessible. We will continue to use accommodations through the Student Disability Center, as well as the Office of Equal Opportunity, to make sure we are providing information to users in a reasonable way.

Marla Roll: Within the universal design lens, the idea is that you will be proactively planning ahead and it reduces the need for accommodations if you design accessibility as part of your workflow. One (1) in four (4) Americans report having some kind of disability that qualifies

them as disabled under the American Disability Act (ADA) and about 19.4% of higher education students report having some type of disability. About 75% are non-apparent disabilities, such as learning disabilities, attention deficit, autism spectrum, and neurodiverse. Two-thirds of college students with a disability do not identify to receive accommodations. We are trying to get campus to think about making things feasible for all people to the greatest extent, without the need for adaptation.

Roll: We have a campaign coming out of the Office of the Provost called RAM. The first step is to remove any old content that you are not using or teaching with. The second step is to adapt your current content for accessibility and the third step is making new content and thinking about accessibility for the creation of new content as part of your workflow.

Roll: For faculty responsibility, we have a rubric for what universal design looks like. We are expecting base level accessibility. If you have a student that requires full accessibility, the Student Disability Center is there for you. The Institute of Learning and Teaching (TILT) has a number of supports around captioning and some PDF remediation. These groups will help with this as part of their accommodation. The rubric is intended to be a tool to help identify your own journey in this process. Described some of the items to look for in different programs, such as headings in Word and making links descriptive.

Roll: Provided background on what CSU is doing and the process that has been followed. We had our first accessibility policy in 2016, and we have been working to set CSU up for success. We have purchased some tools, including SiteImprove and Anthology Ally, which will plug into Canvas to provide an accessibility score on your course content. We are in the process of testing it. We also have a new ticketing system where people can email individuals where the request can be triaged. We are also working on the Accessibility Center, which brings together the Student Disability Center, the Assistive Technology Resource Center and some of the aspects of TILT that do remediation. The search for the director of that center are ongoing. There are many resources available for faculty, as well as trainings.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions.

Stephen Coleman (CAS): Asked if there was any consideration for the additional workload on faculty and whether it will be addressed or considered as part of annual evaluations.

Roll: This is something we want everyone to consider, now that faculty evaluations have SMART goals and can look at your instruction as something to be evaluated on. The hope is that this is something that will become part of your work and not extra.

Van Buren (CLA): Think the amount of effort and time that this is going to take is being radically underestimated. Cannot even imagine what our continuing, contract and adjunct faculty who have four-four teaching loads are facing, all with no salary increases. Feel that there is

contradictory statements being made here with the “work as you go” approach but then indicating that we will be fined if someone complains.

Dean Estlund: Clarified that no one will individually be stuck with a fine. The discrepancy is the law in Colorado, which we have discussed with our legislators and the Office of Information Technology, as well as the Colorado Department of Higher Education (CDHE). It is nearly impossible to do it all at once. We want to acknowledge that it is work, which is why we are focusing on progress and not perfection. It does not mean that someone could not file a complaint. We are looking at risk as well, so maybe the larger classes are the ones we focus on and we take it one (1) week at a time and see where things go. We know it is work and we do not want to shortchange that, because it is labor and it is labor that needs to happen.

Dean Estlund: The request we are looking at here is the universal design level and we have been working with different colleges. The more students in your class, the higher the risk is, while smaller classes have lower risk. If things get up to the universal design level, it reduces the need for individual accommodations and will lessen the burden on the faculty member and instructor when those come up.

Chair Smith: Acknowledged that there were additional questions online and in the chat. Asked any remaining questions to be posted to the chat to be forwarded along, as we are over our allotted time for the meeting.

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

Meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Melinda Smith, Chair
Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair
Jennifer Martin, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING
2024-2025

Chair: Melinda Smith

Vice-Chair: Joseph DiVerdi

Executive Assistant: Amy Barkley

BOG Representative: Jennifer Martin

Professional Registered Parliamentarian: Lola Fehr

ELECTED MEMBERS	REPRESENTING	TERM
Agricultural Sciences		
Stephan Kroll	Agricultural and Resource Economics	2025
Catie Cramer	Animal Sciences	2027
Lisa Blecker	Agricultural Biology	2027
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
Stephen Coleman	College-at-Large	2027
Health and Human Sciences		
Kevin Kissell	Design and Merchandising	2027
Neha Lodha	Health and Exercise Science	2025
Susan Baker	Food Science and Human Nutrition	2026
Day Halsey	Human Development and Family Studies	2026
Svetlana Olbina	Construction Management	2027
Aaron Eakman	Occupational Therapy	2026
Daniel Birmingham	School of Education	2027
Elizabeth Kiehne	School of Social Work	2025
Leann Kaiser	College-at-Large	2027
Business		
Nate Nguyen	Accounting	2026
Seth Kinnett	Computer Information Systems	2027
<u>Bharadwaj Kannan</u> (excused)	Finance and Real Estate	2025
Rob Mitchell	Management	2027
Jonathan Zhang	Marketing	2026
Engineering		
Peter Jan van Leeuwen	Atmospheric Science	2027
Ashok Prasad	Chemical and Biological Engineering	2025
<u>Hussam Mahmoud</u>	Civil and Environmental Engineering	2027
Steven Reising	Electrical and Computer Engineering	2025
Soheil Fatehiboroujeni	Mechanical Engineering	2026
<u>Thomas Bradley</u>	Systems Engineering	2026

<u>Sybil Sharvelle</u>	College-at-Large	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
Alexandra Bernasek	Economics	2027
(substituting for Martin Shields)		
Genesea Carter	English	2026
Ernesto Sagas	Race, Gender, and 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	2027
Elena Windsong	Sociology	2025
(substituting for Laura Raynolds, on leave Spring 2025)		

Forest Greenough	College-at-Large	2027
Antonio Pedros-Gascon	College-at-Large	2025
Daniela Castillo	College-at-Large	2026
(substituting for Emily Morgan, on leave Spring 2025)		
Wesley Longacre	College-at-Large	2027
(substituting for Abigail Shupe, on sabbatical Spring 2025)		
Frankie Wilcox	College-at-Large	2027
Sanam Emami	College-at-Large	2026
Jessie Harney	College-at-Large	2026
(substituting for Fabiola Ehlers-Zavala, at Semester at Sea Spring 2025)		
Mohammed Hirchi	College-at-Large	2026

Natural Resources

Randall Boone	Ecosystem Science and Sustainability	2026
Troy Ocheltree	Forest and Rangeland Stewardship	2027
<u>David Koons</u>	Fish, Wildlife, & Conservation Biology	2027
<u>Ellen Wohl</u>	Geosciences	2027
(substituting for Dennis Harry, on sabbatical Spring 2025)		
Christina Cavaliere	Human Dimensions of Natural Resources	2026

Natural Sciences

Olve Peersen	Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	2025
TBD	Biology	2027
Brittney Morgan	Chemistry	2026
Sanjay Rajopadhye	Computer Science	2027
<u>Julia Gehrlein</u>	Physics	2027

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

<u>DN Rao Veermachaneni</u>	Biomedical Sciences	2025
Shari Lanning	Clinical Sciences	2025
Del Leary	Environmental & Radiological Health Sciences	2026
<u>Christie Mayo</u>	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology	2027
Katriana Popichak	College-at-Large	2025
<u>Fiona Hollinshead</u>	College-at-Large	2025
Doreene Hyatt	College-at-Large	2027
<u>Tara Nordgren</u>	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	2025
Joseph DiVerdi	Vice Chair, Faculty Council	2025
Jennifer Martin	BOG Faculty Representative	2025
Steve Reising, Chair	Committee on Faculty Governance	2025
Gregg Griffenhagen, Chair	Committee on Information Technology	2025
<u>Shane Kanatous</u>, Chair	Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics	2025
<u>Jon Clark</u>, Chair	Committee on Libraries	2025
Ryan Brooks, Chair	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025
<u>Bharadwaj Kannan</u>, Chair	Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty	2025
<u>Rob Schonlau</u>, Chair	Committee on Scholarship, Research, and Graduate Education	2025
<u>Alan Kennan</u>, Chair	Committee on Scholastic Standards	2025
Gamze Cavdar, Chair	Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning	2025
<u>Lumina Albert</u>, Chair	Committee on Teaching and Learning	2025
Day Halsey, Co-Chair	Committee on University Programs	2025
<u>Tian Wang</u>, Co-Chair	Committee on University Programs	2025
Brad Goetz, Chair	University Curriculum Committee	2025
<u>Karen Montgomery Moore</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2027
<u>Olivia Arnold</u>	Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty	2025

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

Ex Officio Non-Voting Members

Amy Parsons	President
Matthew Tillman	Chief of Staff
Marion Underwood	Provost/Executive Vice President
Scott Roberts	Vice President for Advancement
James Pritchett	Vice President for Engagement & Extension
Kevin MacLennan	Vice President for Enrollment and Access
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
Michael Galchinsky	Vice Provost & Dean for Undergraduate Affairs
Kyle Henley	Vice President for University Marketing & Communications
Brendan Hanlon	Vice President for University Operations
Carolyn Lawrence-Dill	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
Kjerstin Thorson	Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Karen Estlund	Dean, Libraries
Jacob Roberts	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	Administrative Professional Council
Kyle Saunders	NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative