

To Faculty Council Members: Your critical study of these minutes is requested. If you find errors, please call, send a memorandum, or E-mail immediately to Diane L. Maybon, ext 1-5693.

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

MINUTES
FACULTY COUNCIL
May 4, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

The Faculty Council meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m. by Mr. C. W. Miller, Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Miller thanked all the Faculty Council members for their continued support of shared governance, and their dedication and participation to Faculty Council. He expressed special thanks to all members of the Faculty Council standing committees, especially to the chairs who spend many hours during the academic year preparing for and conducting meetings. In addition, he extended thanks to the members of the Faculty Council Executive Committee members for their contributions throughout the academic year.

Mr. Miller announced that the next regularly scheduled Faculty Council meeting will be held on September 7, 2004 in Room A103 Clark Building at 4:15 p.m.

Mr. Miller announced that the Administrative/Faculty Dialogue for September 7, 2004 will be presented by President Larry E. Penley. Mr. Miller announced that Mr. Rick O'Donnell, Chair, Colorado Commission on Higher Education, is also planning to attend this meeting.

MINUTES TO BE APPROVED

A. FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES - APRIL 6, 2004

Mr. Richard Eykholt MOVED TO APPROVE THE APRIL 6, 2004 FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES.

THE APRIL 6, 2004 FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES WERE APPROVED.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. FACULTY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEES ELECTIONS - COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

Mr. Stephen Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, was recognized to present the Committee on Faculty Governance nominations for Faculty Council Standing Committees.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, nominated on behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, the following people to serve on Faculty Council Standing Committees:

Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
Mark Brick Agricultural Sciences 2007

Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty
James Warner Engineering 2007

Committee on Teaching and Learning

David Grainger (Replace K. Klopfenstein) Natural Sciences 2007

Mr. Miller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

Mr. Mark Brick was elected to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, Mr. James Warner was elected to the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty and Mr. David Grainger was elected to the Committee on Teaching and Learning for the term July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2007.

B. GRIEVANCE PANEL ELECTIONS - COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, was recognized to present the Committee on Faculty Governance nominations for the Grievance Panel.

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, explained that no new nominations have been received for the Grievance Panel. He noted that there are three remaining openings on the panel that need to be filled.

REPORTS TO BE RECEIVED

A. PROVOST/ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT REPORT - MR. PETER NICHOLLS, PROVOST

Mr. Miller recognized Mr. Peter Nicholls, Provost to present the Provost/Academic Vice President Report.

Mr. Peter Nicholls reported that the College Opportunity Fund has been approved by the legislation and is awaiting the Governor's approval. This means vouchers will be used in higher education beginning Fall Semester 2005. He noted that he will be working closely with the Colorado Commission on Higher Education on this issue. Mr. Nicholls announced that the FY05 Long Bill was signed on April 26, 2004 by the Governor. This means flat funding for higher education and a 1.1 percent tuition increase. Mr. Nicholls explained that the salary exercise for faculty and administrative professionals is in progress. He urged Faculty Council members to attend the budgets hearings scheduled on Thursday, May 6, 2004 in Room 203 at 1:00p.m. or on Friday, May 7, 2004 in room 203 at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Nicholls reported that the dean searches for the College of Applied Human Sciences and Natural Resources are in the last stages and appointments will be announced soon. He announced that candidates for the Director of Continuing Education are interviewing on campus this week and next week. In addition, Mr. Nicholls noted that he is appointing members to serve on a search committee for the Dean of Engineering.

MR. NICHOLLS' REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

B. COMMENT ADVISORY BOARD REPORT - MS. HALCYON ENSSLE, CHAIR, COMMENT ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. Miller recognized Ms. Halcyon Enssel, Chair, *Comment* Advisory Board.

Ms. Enssel noted that the *Comment* Advisory Board Report is found on pages 18-20 of the Faculty Council agenda materials.

MS. ENSSEL'S REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

C. REPORT/PRESENTATION - "RAMPOINT" - MR. BILL HAID, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ENROLLMENT SERVICES

Mr. Miller recognized Mr. Bill Haid, Executive Director Enrollment Services. Mr. Bill Haid, Mr. Pat Burns, and Ms. Linda McNamara joined the Faculty to present an update on the implementation of the new student

information portal system and to demonstrate the new portal system. The student information system will be upgraded in Fall 2006 and the portal will be launched "quietly" in Fall 2004 with an initial focus on students. The portal, called "RAMPOINT," will give students, faculty, and staff a customized web interface. The student information system, called ARIES, will provide more stability and enhanced functionality. There are still many issues to be worked out, including potential needs and requirements due to the Colorado Opportunity Fund (vouchers).

MR. HAID'S REPORT WAS RECEIVED.

SPECIAL ACTIONS

A. PROPOSED RESOLUTION - DOMESTIC PARTNER BENEFITS - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (p. 21)

Mr. Miller recognized Mr. F. Brent Reeves, Vice Chair of Faculty Council/Executive Committee.

Mr. Reeves MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Council of Colorado State University supports the University Benefits Committee recommendation to extend all University benefits and privileges, which are available to the spouses of academic faculty and non-classified staff, to domestic partners, except in cases where the insurance underwriting policies or State or Federal laws or rules bar such benefits."

Mr. Reeves noted that the Resolution resulted from recommendations received from the University Benefits Committee. The University Benefits Committee asked to obtain the position of Faculty Council before submitting its recommendations to Mr. Gerry Bomotti, Vice President for Administrative Services. The University Benefits Committee noted that surveys conducted in 1994 and 2001 indicated majority support from faculty to extend benefits to domestic partners. In addition, the University of Colorado Board of Regents extended health coverage to domestic partners and their dependents in 2003. In January 2001, PERA extended dependent medical coverage to domestic partners of retirees and has for many years allowed retirees to designate domestic partners as beneficiaries for joint or survivor benefits.

Mr. Reeves pointed out that the University Benefits Committee identified the following criteria for domestic partners - who may be either same-gender or opposite gender partner and must: 1) share an exclusive, committed relationship with the CSU employee; 2) be unmarried and have no other domestic partner; 3) be financially responsible for the other partner and for debts to third parties; 4) have no blood relationship with the Colorado State University employee which would proscribe marriage under Colorado law; and 5) share a residence with the Colorado State University employee. In addition, faculty seeking to enroll their domestic partner for benefits must: 1) identify themselves and their domestic partner; 2) identify dependent children of both; 3) assert under penalty of perjury that the relationship satisfies the criteria for domestic partner status; and to provide written notice to the University within 30 days of the termination of the partnership.

A discussion ensued. It was pointed out that this policy may give preferential treatment to families and discriminate against singles. It was suggested that University benefits be distributed to "individual employees" to make the system fair, not base it on marital status or family status. It was also noted that if the State of Colorado would allow same sex marriages this resolution would be more viable. It was pointed out that the resolution would enhance diversity, as sexual orientation is still a problem on campus.

Mr. James Lindsay MOVED TO REFER THE RESOLUTION BACK TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO BRING THE PROPOSAL BACK AS A POLICY AND ADDITION TO THE *MANUAL*.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS NOT ADOPTED.

MR. REEVES' MOTION TO ADOPT THE RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED.

B. CHANGES IN CURRICULUM TO BE APPROVED: UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES: MARCH 5, AND 26, APRIL 2, AND 9, 2004

Mr. Miller recognized Mr. James Lindsay, Chair of the University Curriculum Committee.

Mr. James Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE CHANGES IN CURRICULUM ACTION ITEMS FOUND IN THE MARCH 5, 26 AND APRIL 2, 9, 2004 UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES.

Mr. Lindsay noted the following exemptions in the University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes:

March 5, 2004: Request to edit the Minimum Grade Requirement - Social Work
April 2, 2004: Request to drop the major in Botany; Request to Change Minimum Grade Requirement for Undergraduate Chemistry Majors; Request to add accelerated BS/MS track in Department of Mechanical Engineering

MS. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

C. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *MANUAL*, SECTION E.10.7.4 - HEARING - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Miller recognized Mr. Richard Eykholt, Chair Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty.

Mr. Richard Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, MOVED, THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *MANUAL* SECTION E.10.7.4 - DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOR TENURED FACULTY, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

E.10.7 Disciplinary Action for Tenured Faculty

E.10.7.4 Hearing

- a. *no change*
- b. *no change*
- c. *no change*
- d. *no change*
- e. *no change*
- f. *no change*

g. The Faculty Member and the Hearing Committee ~~will~~ shall have the right to ~~confront and cross-examine~~ hear all testimony and question all witnesses. Furthermore, the Faculty Member must be afforded the opportunity to question the person(s) filing the Statement. If such a person refuses to appear as a witness, then the Hearing shall conclude immediately

and no disciplinary action shall be taken as a result of this Hearing (although the same allegations may be considered again in a newly initiated Hearing). If it is deemed appropriate by at least two-thirds of the Committee members, the questioning of one or more witnesses may occur with the parties being in different physical locations, but the questioning must occur in a real-time, spontaneous format (e.g., a video conference or a teleconference). ~~Where the witnesses cannot or will not appear, but the committee determines that the interests of justice require admission of their statements, the committee will identify the witnesses, disclose their statements, and if possible provide for interrogatories from both the Faculty Member and the Committee.~~

h. The person(s) filing the Statement shall not be present during the testimony of others, unless specifically invited to do so by the Committee. Such an invitation must be agreed to by at least two-thirds of the Committee members. Such an invitation does not include the right to question either the Faculty Member or any other witnesses, unless stated explicitly in the invitation. If such an invitation is made, the invited person shall be permitted to have an academic advisor and/or legal counsel present. Such advisors and counsels may provide advice and assistance, but they may not actively participate in the proceedings.

hi. no change

Mr. Eykholt explained that the new wording ensures that the Faculty Member and the Hearing Committee have an opportunity to question the person(s) filing the Statement (i.e., that the Faculty Member has the right to confront his or her accuser), and that written statements cannot be admitted without the opportunity for interrogatories. Mr. Eykholt stated that in addition, the person(s) filing the Statement may possess pertinent knowledge unknown to the members of the Hearing Committee. However, the current language does not allow the person(s) filing the Statement to hear testimony or question witnesses. Mr. Eykholt noted that the University Grievance Officer, feels that this is awkward, and that it would be easier to uncover the relevant facts if the person(s) filing the Statement were allowed to ask questions of witnesses. The new wording allows this to occur if the members of the Hearing Committee feel that it is appropriate.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

D. PROPOSED NEW ADDITION TO THE *MANUAL*, APPENDIX 4 - DISCRIMINATION POLICY - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Eykholt, Chair Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE ADDITION TO THE *MANUAL* APPENDIX 4 – PROCEDURES FOR RESOLUTION OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS (OTHER THAN SEXUAL HARASSMENT), TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are Underlined

**APPENDIX 4: PROCEDURE FOR RESOLUTION OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS
(OTHER THAN SEXUAL HARASSMENT)**

I. Policy

It is the policy of Colorado State University that no member of the University community may discriminate against another member of the community on any basis for which discrimination is prohibited by state or federal law or University policy, including, but not limited to, race, color, religion, gender, age, national origin, veteran status, sexual orientation, and disability. Therefore, this appendix provides an internal mechanism at Colorado State University for the expeditious resolution of complaints of discrimination involving actions that are either unlawful or violate University policy, excepting claims of sexual harassment, against the University or any of its academic faculty, administrative professionals, state classified employees, or student employees (separate and apart from this policy, claims of sexual harassment are dealt with in accordance with Appendix 1). It is also possible to pursue complaints through avenues external to the University. These avenues have their own restrictions and time limitations. However, the pursuit of any outside remedy precludes invoking the provisions of this appendix.

II. Applicability of Policy

A. Students

Complaints against students shall be handled in accordance with procedures set forth in Student Rights and Responsibilities in the *University General Catalog*.

B. State Classified Staff

Complaints against State Classified Staff shall be handled in accordance with procedures set forth in Chapter 8 of the State Personnel Board Rules.

C. Academic Faculty, Administrative Professionals, Other Non-Student Employees (Excepting State Classified Staff), and Student Employees

Complaints against these individuals will be handled in accordance with the policy set forth in this appendix.

III. Definitions

A. Complainant

A complainant is a current or former Colorado State University: 1) student, 2) student employee, 3) academic faculty member, 4) administrative professional, or 5) employee who files a complaint. Volunteers and others who encounter issues covered by this policy are encouraged to contact the Office of Equal Opportunity for guidance regarding appropriate channels to pursue.

B. Respondent

A respondent is a Colorado State University: 1) academic faculty member, 2) administrative professional, 3) employee, or 4) student employee against whom a complaint is filed.

C. Discriminatory Act or Policy

A discriminatory act or policy is an act or policy that violates state or federal law or University policy with regard to discrimination, including, but not limited to, discrimination based on race, color, religion, gender, age, national origin, veteran status, sexual orientation, and disability.

D. Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO)

This office is a unit of the University that reports to the Provost. It is administered by the Director and Associate Director, it attempts to conciliate informal complaints of discrimination, and it investigates and hears formal complaints of discrimination.

E. Associate Director

The Associate Director of OEO receives all complaints, both informal and formal, extends all deadlines as deemed appropriate, coordinates the procedures listed under this policy, and informs all parties of the procedures and deadlines under this policy.

F. Director/Hearing Officer

The Director of OEO shall serve as the Hearing Officer for formal complaints that are referred for a hearing. Any party to the Hearing may submit to the Provost a written statement claiming that the Director has a conflict of interest. If the Provost agrees, then he or she shall appoint a different Hearing Officer after consultation with the Office of the General Counsel. If the Provost is a party to the Hearing, then this duty shall be assumed by the President.

G. Complaint

A complaint is a written, signed allegation by a Complainant that one or more Respondents has committed one or more discriminatory acts and/or pursued one or more discriminatory policies against the Complainant during the performance of the Respondent's official duties as a University employee. Complainants are advised that there are some instances in which the University has a responsibility to act, even if the Complainant request that no action be taken, such as, for example, where other members of the University community may be at risk.

There are two types of complaints:

1. *Informal Complaint*

If the Complainant designates the complaint as informal, he or she thereby requests the Associate Director to review and conciliate the matter with the Respondent(s) in the alleged

discrimination. The Complainant may change his or her informal complaint to a formal complaint at any time during the process in Section VI or within thirty (30) calendar days after the completion of the process in Section VI, even if this extends beyond the time limit of 180 calendar days mentioned in Section V.A. A failure to file a formal complaint within this time frame constitutes a waiver of the right to file a formal complaint.

2. Formal Complaint

If the Complainant designates the complaint as formal, he or she thereby requests a hearing before the Hearing Officer with the right to appeal the decision to the Vice President who oversees the Respondent's area of employment (or the President, if the Respondent is a Vice President).

IV. The Form of the Complaint

To file either an informal or formal complaint, a prospective complainant must submit to the Associate Director a written signed dated document containing the following information:

- A. Identification of the Complainant and Respondent(s) and the nature of their relationships to the University;
- B. the type of discrimination alleged (see Section III.C);
- C. a description of the circumstances of the alleged discrimination, including the date(s) and location(s), witnesses, and supporting documents, if available; and
- D. a designation of whether the complaint is informal or formal.

V. Time Restriction and Conditions for Filing Either an Informal or Formal Complaint

- A. Both informal and formal complaints shall be submitted to the Associate Director within one hundred eighty (180) calendar days from the time the Complainant becomes aware of the alleged discrimination. The OEO has the discretion to consider a complaint outside this time frame, but compelling reasons must be given for extending the deadline.

- B. The Associate Director shall, within ten (10) working days after the filing of a formal complaint, review the complaint and determine whether the issues raised are of a discriminatory nature (but not whether the claims are true or whether any action is required). If, in the opinion of the Associate Director, discriminatory issues are not present in the complaint, the complaint will not be forwarded to the Hearing Officer, and the Complainant and Respondent(s) shall be notified in writing of this decision. Otherwise, the Associate director will certify in writing that the issues raised are of a discriminatory nature.

- C. A Complainant who has filed a formal complaint that has been heard and resolved has invoked these procedures in lieu of any other internal procedures.

VI. Resolution of Informal Complaints

Informal resolution of discrimination complaints is encouraged whenever possible. In order for an informal complaint to proceed, the parties must have agreed to participate. When an informal complaint is received by the Associate Director, the following steps shall be completed within twenty (20) working days of receipt:

- A. The Associate Director shall interview the Complainant.
- B. The Associate Director shall notify each Respondent in writing that an informal complaint has been filed against him or her and arrange for an interview with each Respondent.
- C. The Associate Director shall interview each Respondent.
- D. The Associate Director shall interview relevant witnesses as identified by the Associate Director, including, but not limited to, witnesses named by the Complainant and Respondent(s).
- E. After the Associate Director conducts the above investigation, the Associate Director will examine the evidence. If the Associate Director finds the complaint to be without merit, it will be dismissed, and all parties shall be notified in writing of the dismissal. If the Associate Director finds merit in the informal complaint, the Associate Director shall attempt to negotiate and conciliate the matter in a manner satisfactory to all parties. Possible outcomes of an informal resolution may include, but are not limited to, an explicit written understanding about future conduct, changes in workplace assignment, or the substitution of one class for another.
- F. Any written understanding that is created to resolve an informal complaint requires mutual acceptance by the Complainant, the Respondent(s), and the Associate Director. Such a written understanding shall state that the acceptance of the document by the parties does not imply an admission of wrongdoing or a clearance of charges. It shall also state which issues are being resolved by the document and which issues remain unresolved. Only issues that remain unresolved may be raised later in a formal complaint.
- G. If an informal resolution is not achieved, the Associate Director shall notify all parties in writing that the informal process has terminated without a resolution. The Complainant has thirty (30) calendar days from the date that this notification is received to file a formal complaint.

A brief summary of the informal process shall be kept on file in the archives of the OEO for the duration of the employment of the Complainant and Respondent(s), and it shall be

considered to be part of the official Personnel Files of the Complainant and Respondent(s). If the Complaint is dismissed, the summary shall include the reasons for dismissal. If an informal resolution is achieved, the summary shall include the conditions of the resolution, including any written understandings. If a resolution is not achieved, the summary will include a statement to this effect.

VII. Resolution of Formal Complaints

A. Notification

When a formal complaint is filed within the allowed time frame (see Sections III.G.1 and V.A), the Associate Director shall send a written acknowledgment to the Complainant and provide a copy of the formal complaint to each Respondent within five (5) working days after certification of the complaint as set forth in V.B.

B. Respondent's Reply

Each Respondent shall submit a written reply to the Complaint to the Associate Director within fifteen (15) working days from the date of receipt. A copy of each reply shall be sent to the Complainant by the Associate Director within five (5) working days from the date of receipt.

C. Complaint and Reply

The Complaint and the Reply shall define the issue(s) to be addressed at the Hearing. The Associate Director shall inform the Complainant of this limitation prior to the filing of the Complaint. The Respondent shall be informed of this limitation when the Complaint is sent to him or her. The Associate Director shall forward the Complaint and Reply and other appropriate materials to the Hearing Officer within five (5) working days from the date of receipt.

D. Notification of Hearing

The Hearing Officer shall notify all parties of the date, time, and location of the hearing at least thirty (30) working days prior to the Hearing date.

E. Submission of Names of Witnesses and Exhibits by the Parties

Within ten (10) working days of being notified of the Hearing date, each party shall submit to the Associate Director a list of proposed witnesses, together with the relevance of each, and all exhibits that he or she intends to present at the Hearing. The Associate Director shall make this material available to all other parties and the Hearing Officer within five (5) working days of the date of receipt. Within five (5) working days after receipt of this material, the parties shall provide a list of rebuttal witnesses to the Associate Director, who will then forward them to the Hearing Officer.

F. Hearing Proceedings

1. Rights of Participants

a. Hearing Officer

The Hearing Officer shall be advised by a representative from the Office of the State Attorney General or the Office of the General Counsel.

b. Complainant and Respondent(s)

Each party may seek the aid and assistance of counsel, both legal and peer, at his or her expense. Legal counsel refers to those counselors selected by the parties who are licensed to practice law, whether or not they are members of the University Community. Peer counsel refers to a member of the University community at the time the complaint was filed. A member of the University community is a current employee or a matriculating student. Each party may select one legal counsel and one peer counsel to serve as advisors during the Hearing.

c. Questioning of Witnesses

The Complainant, each Respondent, and the Hearing Officer shall have the right to hear all testimony and question all witnesses. Furthermore, each Respondent must be afforded the opportunity to question the Complainant. If the Complainant refuses to appear as a witness, then the Hearing shall conclude immediately, and no disciplinary action shall be taken as a result of this Hearing. If the Hearing Officer decides that special circumstances warrant it, the questioning of one or more witnesses may occur with the parties being in different physical locations, but the questioning must occur in a real-time, spontaneous format (e.g., a video conference or a teleconference).

d. Role of Advisors

All advisors shall have the right to be present during the proceedings, to advise their client(s), and to present written material on behalf of their client(s), but they may not speak on behalf of their client(s) during the proceedings.

2. Rules of Evidence

The Hearing Officer shall not be strictly bound by state law governing the use and admissibility of evidence. However, he or she shall not allow evidence that is irrelevant to the issues defined by the Complaint and Reply.

3. Identification of Witnesses and Exhibits

The Hearing Officer shall review the list of witnesses submitted by the Complainant and Respondent(s). The Hearing Officer may add additional witnesses that he or she believes may have knowledge of facts pertinent to the charge. The Hearing Officer shall submit to all parties the names of all witnesses, together with the relevance of each, at least ten (10) working days prior to the Hearing date. Each party shall have five (5) working days from the date of receipt to submit to the Hearing Officer a list of additional rebuttal witnesses, together with the relevance of each. The Hearing Officer shall make this material available to all other parties within five (5) working days of receipt, and at least two (2) working days prior to the Hearing date.

4. *Notification of Witnesses*

Each proposed witness shall be informed in writing by the Associate Director of the date and place of the formal Hearing and the approximate time the witness is expected to give testimony.

5. *Role of Hearing Officer*

During the Hearing, the Hearing Officer shall call witnesses, receive exhibits into evidence, and rule on objections, as needed.

6. *Hearing*

a. Attendance at the formal Hearing shall be limited to the Hearing Officer, Complainant, Respondent(s), advisors, representative from the Office of General Counsel, representative from the Office of the State Attorney General, recorder, and any others the Hearing Officer may deem appropriate (the Hearing Officer shall provide a justification for each such additional attendee).

b. Witnesses other than those persons listed in Section VII.F.6.a shall not be present at the formal Hearing, except when giving testimony before the Hearing Officer.

c. The duplication and dissemination of the formal Complaint, Reply, list of proposed witnesses, and exhibits to be presented at the formal Hearing shall be limited to the Complainant, Respondent(s), Hearing Officer, Associate Director, and advisors. Witnesses may be given access to relevant materials as deemed appropriate by the Hearing Officer. All documents shall be considered confidential to the extent permitted by law.

d. A verbatim record of the Hearing shall be taken, and a printed copy shall be made available, without cost, to the Complainant and each Respondent at his or her request. The University shall bear the cost.

7. *Issuance of Hearing Officer's Written Report*

The Hearing Officer shall issue a written report within ten (10) working days after the close of the Hearing. The report shall include the Hearing Officer's factual findings and conclusions of law. If the Hearing Officer finds that discrimination did occur, the report shall also contain recommended remedial or disciplinary action, which may include, but is not limited to, training, letter of reprimand, salary reduction, demotion, suspension, or termination of employment. The report shall be sent to all parties and the Vice President who oversees each Respondent's area of employment (or the President, if the Respondent is a Vice President).

8. *Written Records*

All written records, including the Complaint and each Reply; the verbatim record of the Hearing; supporting documents; the written report of the Hearing Officer; administrative reviews of the Hearing Officer's recommendations; appeals, replies, and results of appeals; and final actions, shall be kept on file in the archives of the OEO for the duration of the employment of the Complainant and Respondent(s), and these shall be considered to be part of the official Personnel Files of the Complainant and Respondent(s).

VIII. Appeals and Administrative Review

A. Appeals

1. *Appeal of Hearing Officer's Recommendations*

If either the Complainant or any Respondent wishes to appeal the Hearing Officer's recommendations, he or she must file such an appeal in writing with the Hearing Officer and the Vice President charged with overseeing each Respondent's area of employment (or the President, if the Respondent is a Vice President) within ten (10) working days of the receipt of the Hearing Officer's report. The Hearing Officer shall prepare a written reply to the Appeal within ten (10) working days after receipt. No remedial measures or disciplinary action related to this complaint shall occur until the appeals process has been completed.

2. *Vice President's Review of Hearing Officer's Report*

Within ten (10) working days of receipt of the Appeal, the Hearing Officer shall forward the Appeal, the reply, and the record of the Hearing to the Vice President charged with overseeing each Respondent's area of employment (or the President, if the Respondent is a Vice President). The Vice Presidential (Presidential) review shall be completed within twenty (20) working days. Each party and the Hearing Officer shall be provided with the written result of the Vice Presidential (Presidential) review, specifying in writing the reasons for support or modification of the Hearing Officer's recommendations with regard to the Respondent(s) overseen by him or her.

3. *Administrative Action Following Review of Hearing Officer's Report*

If remedial measures are recommended, the Vice President (President) will work with the Respondent's supervisor to implement these measures. In the event that disciplinary action is recommended, the Vice President will forward the matter to the Respondent's supervisor for consideration of appropriate action as provided for in the *Manual* or the *State Personnel Rules*.

B. Administrative Review

1. *Vice President's Review of Hearing Officer's Report*

If the Hearing Officer's report is not appealed pursuant to Section VIII.A, the Vice President (or the President, if the Respondent is a Vice President), at his or her sole discretion, may send a written statement to all parties and the Hearing Officer making modifications to the recommendations contained in the report with regard to the Respondent(s) overseen by him or her and providing a written rationale for these modifications.

2. *Administrative Action Following Review of Hearing Officer's Report*

If remedial measures are recommended, the Vice President (President) will work with the Respondent's supervisor to implement these measures. In the event that disciplinary action is recommended, the Vice President (President) will forward the matter to the Respondent's supervisor for consideration of appropriate action as provided for in the *Manual* or the *State Personnel Rules*.

IX. Expectations for Members of the University Community

A. Cooperation and Participation by Members of the University Community:
Cooperation and participation by the members of the University community in the resolution of a Complaint under these procedures is necessary.

B. Truthful Testimony: The Complainant, Respondent(s), and all witnesses shall be truthful in their testimony. This includes statements made in the Complaint and each Reply. Failure to comply with this expectation may result in the implementation of established University sanctions.

C. Protection of Participants: No person shall restrain, interfere with, coerce, attempt to intimidate, or take any reprisal against a participant under these procedures. Failure to comply with this expectation may result in the implementation of established University sanctions.

D. False or Malicious Charges: Intentionally making false or malicious charges may result in the implementation of established University sanctions against the Complainant.

Mr. Eykholt explained that Colorado State Law requires the University to have a discrimination policy. Due to an oversight, no discrimination policy has ever been approved by Faculty Council. Mr. Eykholt noted that this document has been a work in progress for over three years. In addition, the document has been reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel, the Office of Equal Opportunity, and the Administrative Professional Council and the Provost. He added that this document has been a work in progress since 1998.

Mr. Miller asked for unanimous consent to move into "informal discussion" ad seriatim because of the length of this proposal. Without objections the Faculty Council moved into informal discussion.

Mr. Miller asked for discussion on Section I. Policy.

Mr. Steve Shulman asked why the Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Policy can not be combined into one policy. Mr. Eykholt explained that each mandate different legal requirements and different standards are used to determine discrimination or sexual harassment. Mr. Lindsay asked why the term "gender" was used and not "sex." Mr. Eykholt explained that either term could be used, however State and Federal laws regarding discrimination use the term "gender."

Mr. Miller asked for discussion on Section II. Applicability of Policy

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Miller asked for discussion on Section III. Definitions - A. Complainant.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Miller asked for discussion on Section IV. The Form of the Complaint.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Miller asked for discussion on Section V. Time Restriction and Conditions for Filing Either an Informal or Formal Complaint.

There was no discussion on this section.

Mr. Miller asked for discussion on Section VI. Resolution of Informal Complaints.

Mr. Jerry Eckert asked if an informal complaint and informal resolution are different. Mr. Eykholt explained that since informal proceedings are not binding there is no need to distinguish between an informal complaint or informal resolution. Mr. Eckert asked if it would be necessary to go through the informal process before a formal process. Mr. Eykholt responded no because they are independent policies.

Mr. Miller asked for discussion on Section VII. Resolution of Formal Complaints.

Mr. Shulman asked why formal complaints were not heard by a panel. Mr. Eykholt noted that there are many problems with panels. He added that faculty can go through process in Section E.10.7 before any disciplinary actions are taken.

Mr. Miller asked for discussion on Section VIII. Appeals and Administrative Review.

There was no discussion.

Mr. Miller asked for discussion on Section IX. Expectations for Members of the University Community

There was no discussion.

By unanimous consent the informal discussion was closed and the Faculty Council body returned to formal discussion.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

E. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *MANUAL*, SECTION B.2.6 - UNIVERSITY CENTERS, INSTITUTES AND OTHER SPECIAL UNITS - COMMITTEE ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND STANDING OF ACADEMIC FACULTY

Mr. Miller recognized Mr. Eykholt, Chair, Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty.

Mr. Eykholt, Chair Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE REVISIONS TO THE *MANUAL* SECTION B.2.6 – UNIVERSITY CENTERS, INSTITUTES, AND OTHER SPECIAL UNITS, TO BE EFFECTIVE UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are underlined, and deletions are indicated by ~~strikeouts~~.

B.2.6 University Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units

Centers, Institutes, and Other Special Units (“CIOSUs²”) exist to promote ~~scholarship in teaching; training and/or or~~ research, provide academic support services, ~~and/or or~~ perform service or outreach functions consistent with the mission of the University. The enhancement of undergraduate and graduate education is an important function of CIOSUs. However, CIOSUs normally do not offer courses for credit ~~unless cross-listed with regular academic departments or colleges~~, do not admit students, and do not have faculty positions that exist outside regular academic departments.

B.2.6.1 Definitions

The CIOSUs are units which extend beyond a single academic department. These units may be labeled “Center,” “Institute,” “Office,” “Facility,” “Program,” or “Laboratory,” but other labels may also be used as appropriate. A unit which is completely contained within a single academic department does not need to apply for CIOSU status as long as it indicates its departmental affiliation whenever its title is used. The terms “Center” and “Institute” are synonymous at Colorado State University and may be used to designate research, teaching, training, or other programs within/between/among departments, colleges, or the libraries. Other Special Units, such as laboratories, may be affiliated with Centers and Institutes.

B.2.6.2 Courses for Credit

The CIOSUs normally do not offer courses for credit. Exceptions are CIOSUs that administer or coordinate University Interdisciplinary Studies Programs (ISPs) that have been submitted and approved through regular curricular channels as prescribed in the Curriculum Handbook. The CIOSUs that administer such ISPs may offer courses for credit that are cross-listed with regular academic departments or colleges. These courses must be approved through the regular curricular channels of the departments, colleges, and university.

The CIOUSUs that administer or coordinate ISPs may offer courses for credit that are not cross-listed with regular academic departments only if such courses are interdisciplinary courses that are appropriate to the relevant ISP, but cannot be identified with a unique regular academic department. Interdisciplinary courses appropriate to an ISP that cannot be identified with a unique regular academic department, but can be identified with a unique college, must be submitted and approved through that college's regular curricular channels. Interdisciplinary courses appropriate to an ISP that cannot be identified with a unique college shall be forwarded directly to the Office of the Provost for approval. In all of the above cases, courses must be submitted to and approved by the University Curriculum Committee.

B.2.6.23 Procedures for Approval of CIOUSUs

Procedures for approval are intended to facilitate the establishment of appropriate CIOUSUs and to avoid the creation of programs that unnecessarily duplicate existing programs. Faculty ~~will~~ shall submit a proposal for the establishment of a CIOUSU to their department ~~chair(s) head(s)~~ head(s) and dean(s) for initial review and signature. The proposal ~~will~~ shall then be forwarded to the Office of Faculty Council, which ~~will~~ shall forward it to the appropriate standing committee(s). ~~These committee(s) shall to recommend action to the appropriate Vice President~~ Vice President for Research and Information Technology (VPRIT) and transmit a report of its these recommendations to Faculty Council. The Provost will have responsibility for CIOUSUs with predominantly teaching, training, service, or outreach missions. CIOUSUs with a predominantly research function will be the responsibility of the VPRIT. After consultation with the Provost, the VPRIT shall decide which of the two of them shall serve as the Responsible Administrator for the CIOUSU. For a CIOUSU whose primary mission is research, the Responsible Administrator shall be the VPRIT. For a CIOUSU whose primary mission is teaching, service or outreach, the Responsible Administrator shall be the Provost. The Faculty Council Executive Committee will shall be the designated standing committee during the summer.

In order to facilitate the funding of pending proposals, initial Temporary approval for a CIOUSU may be obtained by submitting the proposal described in Section B.2.6.35 directly to the VPRIT appropriate Vice President to facilitate pending funding proposals. The proposal for the establishment of the CIOUSU must be submitted simultaneously to the Office of Faculty Council.

If the CIOUSU proposal requests University resources (see Section J.2) other than faculty time, funding from external agencies, or cost recovery activities, it also must be reviewed by the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning and submitted to Faculty Council for action. ~~Final~~ Formal approvals ~~will~~ shall rest with the ~~appropriate Vice President~~ Responsible Administrator.

B.2.6.4 CIOUSU Oversight

Administrative oversight of a CIOUSU rests with the appropriate department head, dean, Provost, or Vice President (hereafter referred to as the Overseeing Administrator). Final authority for a CIOUSU rests with the Responsible Administrator.

B.2.6.35 Guidelines for Preparing Proposals for CIOUSU Establishment

Faculty interested in creating a CIOUSU should prepare a proposal that addresses the following items:

- a. ~~T~~the name of the CIOSU and the name(s) of its proposed Aadministrative Ddirector(s);
- b. ~~T~~the mission of the proposed CIOSU and how this mission relates to the mission and strategic goals of Colorado State University;
- c. ~~A~~ a statement of the goals and objectives of the proposed CIOSU;
- d. ~~E~~vidence that the proposed CIOSU does not duplicate or compete with existing CIOSUs or academic programs and, if applicable, how it will be coordinated with other CIOSUs with complementary functions;
- e. ~~A~~ a description of the organizational and administrative structure and responsibilities, the faculty involved, ~~and~~ how the CIOSU will be internally governed, and the identification of the Overseeing Administrator; and
- f. ~~A~~ a list of funding sources and amounts, space, personnel, and equipment required to initiate and sustain the CIOSU for a period of at least five years;

Each CIOSU must be administered by a person whose responsibilities include assuring that the CIOSU conducts its operations consistent with its mission and goals; and in accordance with University policies and applicable laws, and that all required reports are submitted. The method for the selection of the ~~CIOSU~~ Aadministrative Ddirector of the CIOSU shall be stated in the program proposal. Appointment of the ~~CIOSU~~ Aadministrative Ddirector shall be made by the President. This position is "at will," and can be terminated by the President at any time. Normally, such This appointments shall consider recommendations by the faculty in the CIOSU, ~~the department head, the dean or Vice President having responsibility for providing administrative oversight~~ the Overseeing Administrator, and the Vice President with final authority for the CIOSU Responsible Administrator.

~~B.2.6.4~~ CIOSU Oversight

~~Administrative oversight of CIOSUs rests with the appropriate chair, dean or Vice President. Final authority for a CIOSU rests with the appropriate Vice President.~~

~~B.2.6.5~~ Procedures for Periodic Evaluation of CIOSUs

- a. ~~Annual~~ Biennial Reports

The Aadministrative Ddirector of each CIOSU ~~will~~ shall submit a brief ~~annual biennial~~ report of its activities and accomplishments to the ~~Vice President with final authority~~ Overseeing Administrator and the Responsible Administrator. Copies of all ~~annual biennial~~ reports ~~will~~ shall be deposited in the Office of the VPRIT, who ~~will~~ shall be responsible for maintaining an updated list of all CIOSUs.

- b. ~~Comprehensive Review~~

~~Each CIOSU and its administrative director will be comprehensively evaluated every five years, or upon the request of any approving entity listed in Section B.2.6.2. For these reviews, the administrative director of the CIOSU will prepare a report that~~ These reports shall includes each of the following:

1. ~~A~~ a list of current CIOSU faculty and other personnel;
 2. ~~A description of the goals and objectives of the CIOSU as related to the original purpose;~~
 - 3~~2~~. ~~A~~ a brief description of the activities, services, ~~training~~, or research performed, as related to the function/mission of the CIOSU in the past 24 months;
 - 4~~3~~. ~~A~~ a budget summary for the previous 24 months; and
 - 5~~4~~. ~~A detailed~~ a brief list of accomplishments and contributions, ~~including pending and approved such as~~ grants and contracts, refereed and non-refereed publications, and effects on teaching and outreach in the past 24 months;
 - 6~~5~~. Plans for the next ~~five years~~ 24 months.
- eb. ~~These reports will be submitted to the chair, dean or Vice President with administrative oversight for the CIOSU who~~ After receiving the report, the Overseeing Administrator will shall recommend one of three possible courses of action to the Committee on University Programs:
1. Continue the CIOSU with a recommendations either to reappoint the ~~A~~A ~~Administrative D~~irector or to appoint a new ~~A~~A ~~administrative D~~irector, and ~~to~~ with suggested changes (if any) in the mission, goals, objectives, and/or organization of the CIOSU.
 2. Consolidate with existing CIOSUs with similar missions and goals. This recommendation ~~will~~ shall require resubmission and approval of a new proposal for the proposed consolidated unit.
 3. Terminate the CIOSU. If there is loss of funding or key faculty, or the CIOSU is otherwise deemed to be no longer ~~viable~~ appropriate, the ~~decision~~ recommendation may be made to eliminate the CIOSU.
- c. The Committee on University Programs ~~will~~ shall report ~~a~~ its recommendation to Faculty Council. After action by Faculty Council, the final recommendation for ~~final~~ action ~~will~~ shall be reported to the ~~appropriate Vice President~~ Responsible Administrator, who shall then decide what action to take.

B.2.6.6.7 Scheduling Periodic Evaluations

The ~~Vice President with final authority~~ Responsible Administrator for each CIOSU ~~will~~ shall schedule the biennial reports ~~five year evaluations~~ of the CIOSUs.

B.2.6.8 Non-Profit Corporations

The formation of Special Units as separate non-profit corporations is a complex process with many additional procedures and regulations, and requires approval by the Board. If faculty wish to create a CIOSU as a non-profit corporation, they must

work closely with the Responsible Administrator and the Office of the General Counsel to ensure that all requirements are met. Approval of the formation of a CIOSU does not imply the approval of the formation of a non-profit corporation.

Mr. Eykholt explained that this proposal was initiated by the Committee on University Programs, and that committee prepared the initial draft. This draft was then revised by the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, in consultation with the Committee on University Programs and the Office of the General Council. In the original language, the definition of what constituted a CIOSU was too vague, the procedure for CIOSUs offering courses was too vague, and non-profit corporations were not mentioned. The new language corrects these problems and modifies the reporting requirements. Mr. Eykholt added that when the University is contacted with inquiries regarding Centers, Institutes, etc., it is important to be able to identify and locate that unit. If a unit is not registered as a CIOSU, and it does not indicate a departmental affiliation when using its title, this causes problems for the University (e.g., communication with the media and external stakeholders). Hence, units are required to either list a departmental affiliation or register as a CIOSU.

MR. EYKHOLT'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

F. SEXUAL HARASSMENT PANEL ELECTIONS - COMMITTEE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE

Mr. Davies, Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance, was recognized to present the Committee on Faculty Governance nominations for the Sexual Harassment Panel.

The following nominations were made by the Committee on Faculty Governance:

Ms. Ellen Brinks	Liberal Arts	2007
Deborah Valentine	Applied Human Sciences	2007

Mr. Miller asked for further nominations from the floor. Hearing no objections, the nominations were closed.

THE MEMBERS NOMINATED FOR THE GRIEVANCE PANEL, WITH TERMS BEGINNING FALL SEMESTER 2004 AND ENDING FALL SEMESTER 2007, WERE ELECTED.

G. REQUEST TO REVISE THE MINIMUM GRADE REQUIREMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE CHEMISTRY MAJORS - UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Mr. Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE MINIMUM GRADE REQUIREMENT FOR UNDERGRADUATE CHEMISTRY MAJORS AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are Underlined

Chemistry majors must achieve a minimum grade of C₋ in all the listed courses required for the major in chemistry. To be effective Fall Semester 2004 and published with the chemistry programs of study in the 2004-2006 *University General Catalog*.

Mr. Lindsay explained that the rationale for this proposal is provided by the Department of Chemistry and can be found on page 43 of the Faculty Council meeting agenda materials.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

H. REQUEST TO REVISE THE MINIMUM GRADE REQUIREMENT FOR MAJOR IN SOCIAL WORK - UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Mr. Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE MINIMUM GRADE REQUIREMENT FOR MAJOR IN SOCIAL WORK AS FOLLOWS:

Additions are Underlined - Deletions are ~~Overscored~~

After progression in the major, students must continue to maintain a 2.0 overall GPA, and a 2.5 GPA in Social Work with no grade less than C₋ in any social work course. Students will be required to retake any social work course (~~SW-prefix~~) in which a grade of C₋ or better is not achieved. This change would be effective Fall Semester 2004.

Mr. Lindsay explained that under the current policy, a student who received a C- in a Social Work course may have a hold placed on his/her progression in the program. The School hopes to alleviate that problem by defining the minimum acceptable grade for Social Work courses as C-.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

I. REQUEST TO ADD AN ACCELERATED BS/MS TRACK IN DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING - UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Mr. Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REQUEST TO ADD AN ACCELERATED BS/MS TRACK IN DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING AS FOLLOWS:

Undergraduate students in the Department of Mechanical Engineering will be allowed to pursue an accelerated BS/MS degree in Mechanical Engineering. Exceptional third year undergraduate students would apply to the MS program using the Graduate School's Track III admission process and would count nine credits of technical electives (500 level courses with a grade of B or better) taken in the senior year of the undergraduate program toward the graduate degree. The effective date for students to enter the accelerated BS/MS program will be Fall Semester 2004.

Mr. Lindsay explained that according to materials submitted by the Department of Mechanical Engineering, the department has long felt its undergraduate students should be more effectively encouraged to continue in a program of graduate education. Graduate study serves their professional interest by extending their technical knowledge and it serves the department's interest by enlarging the base of qualified applicants for its graduate teaching and research programs. Furthermore, such an accelerated track to the Master's degree will also aid in the recruiting of freshmen and transfer students, who will view this program as an inducement to enroll at a school which offers an efficient and seamless transition to graduate study. Mr. Lindsay explained that the undergraduate BS degree in Mechanical Engineering requires a total of 130 credits, which is more than the minimum of 120 credits for an undergraduate degree. The major also requires a minimum of 12 credits of upper division technical electives in the senior year.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

J. REQUEST TO DROP THE MAJOR IN BOTANY - UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Mr. Lindsay, Chair, University Curriculum Committee MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REQUEST TO DROP THE MAJOR IN BOTANY EFFECTIVE SPRING SEMESTER 2008.

Mr. Lindsay noted that according to the form, submitted by the Department of Biology, low enrollments necessitate dropping Botany as a major. A Botany concentration in the Biological Sciences major will be

added to accommodate students interested in an identified Botany program. The effective date of Spring Semester 2008 would allow students currently enrolled to complete their degrees with a Botany major.

MR. LINDSAY'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

K. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *GENERAL CATALOG* - GRADUATION WITH DISTINCTION (Page 110) - COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

Mr. James Madl, Chair, Committee on Teaching and Learning, MOVED THAT FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE *GENERAL CATALOG* - GRADUATION WITH DISTINCTION (Page 110) AS FOLLOWS:

Additions - Underlined - Deletions - ~~Overseored~~

GRADUATION WITH DISTINCTION

Colorado State recognizes outstanding scholarship by granting the baccalaureate degree "Cum Laude," "Magna Cum Laude," and "Summa Cum Laude" to those students in each college who have achieved unusually high academic excellence in their undergraduate programs. ~~Distinction designations are determined according to the following criteria:~~ To be eligible for graduation with distinction, students must meet the following requirements:

~~1. "Summa Cum Laude" - Top one percent of graduates in each college; "Magna Cum Laude" - Next three percent of graduates in each college; "Cum Laude" - Next six percent of graduates in each college.~~

Minimum grade point average required for graduation with distinction.

To qualify for graduation with distinction, a minimum of 60 credits completed at Colorado State University is required. Students who have been granted Fresh Start must have completed 60 credits after the Fresh Start designation to qualify for graduation with distinction.

Transfer credits are not considered when determining a) candidacy for graduation with distinction or b) graduation with distinction.

<u>College</u>	<u>Summa Cum Laude</u>	<u>Magna Cum Laude</u>	<u>Cum Laude</u>
<u>Agricultural Sciences</u>	<u>3.99</u>	<u>3.91</u>	<u>3.74</u>
<u>Liberal Arts</u>	<u>3.96</u>	<u>3.87</u>	<u>3.70</u>
<u>Business</u>	<u>3.96</u>	<u>3.85</u>	<u>3.72</u>
<u>Engineering</u>	<u>3.95</u>	<u>3.86</u>	<u>3.72</u>
<u>Natural Resources</u>	<u>3.98</u>	<u>3.89</u>	<u>3.72</u>
<u>Applied Human Sci</u>	<u>3.97</u>	<u>3.89</u>	<u>3.74</u>
<u>Natural Sciences</u>	<u>3.98</u>	<u>3.93</u>	<u>3.83</u>
<u>Veterinary Medicine</u>	<u>3.97</u>	<u>3.92</u>	<u>3.77</u>

These minimum cumulative grade point averages will be reviewed every four years and may be changed if needed to maintain appropriate academic standards. Such changes will become effective

the semester following approval by Faculty Council and publication in the General Catalog. Each of the minimum grade point averages needed to graduate with distinction will be adjusted at the end of each four year period only if the percentage of students graduating with distinction in a distinction category and college have shown a statistically verifiable deviation from the target percentages of:

<u>Summa Cum Laude</u>	<u>1%</u>
<u>Magna Cum Laude</u>	<u>3%</u>
<u>Cum Laude</u>	<u>6%</u>

~~2. The grade point average minimums used to determine each category are established after graduation, based on the cumulative grade point average at the time of graduation. At the end of the spring and fall semester, the minimums for each category in each college are established, using the actual number of students graduating in this term. The grade point averages, as established for the spring semester, will also apply to students who graduate at the end of the summer session. Graduation with distinction is indicated on the diploma and the transcript of the student.~~

~~3- Candidates for graduation with distinction are recognized at the time of commencement. The grade point average minimums used to determine candidacy status for each category are established each spring semester based on the cumulative grade point average through the preceding fall semester of the spring graduating class for each college. The same grade point averages are also used to determine candidacy for the following summer. A student's candidacy is determined by their cumulative grade point average through the semester preceding graduation. "Candidacy" for graduation with distinction does not guarantee graduation with distinction. Graduation with distinction which is based on the student's cumulative grade point average percentage as established at the time of graduation.~~

~~4. To qualify for candidacy for graduation with distinction, a minimum of 45 semester credits completed at Colorado State is required prior to the graduation term. To qualify for graduation with distinction, a minimum of 60 credits completed at Colorado State is required. Students who have been granted Fresh Start must have 45 credits to qualify for candidacy and 60 credits to qualify for graduation with distinction completed *after* the Fresh Start designation.~~

~~5. Transfer credits are not considered when determining candidacy for graduation with distinction or graduation with distinction.~~

~~6. Students seeking a second bachelor's degree are eligible for distinction designation. To qualify for candidacy for graduation with distinction, a minimum of 45 semester credits completed at Colorado State is required after completion of the first degree and prior to the graduation term for the second degree. To qualify for graduation with distinction, a minimum of 60 credits completed at Colorado State is required after the first degree. In determining the grade point average of the student, only grades earned after the first degree are considered.~~

Mr. Madl explained that the registrar's office requested that the Committee on Teaching and Learning examine the Colorado State University's policy for graduation with distinction. Most universities use a method of awarding distinction based on fixed GPAs. Under the current Colorado State University policy, students do not know the GPA needed to earn distinction until after commencement. In some cases, candidates for graduation with distinction were recognized at the time of commencement but then did not receive that distinction despite maintaining their high GPA in the last semester. This "moving target" GPA for distinction

was frustrating to students. After an examination of the last 10 years data, it was found that the GPAs used to determine distinction did not vary greatly over a four-year period of time. In collaboration with the registrar's office The Committee on Teaching and Learning have proposed changes in the method by which graduation with distinction is determined to establish the GPA needed to graduate with distinction before commencement. We have also incorporated a method to allow adjustments in the GPAs needed for distinction if significant changes occur in the percentage of students achieving these GPAs.

MR. MADL'S MOTION WAS ADOPTED.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 6:00 P.M.

C. W. MILLER, CHAIR
F. BRENT REEVES, VICE CHAIR
DIANE L. MAYBON, RECORDING SECRETARY

ATTENDANCE
BOLD INDICATES PRESENT AT MEETING
UNDERLINE INDICATES ABSENT AT MEETING

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

Jerry Eckert	Agricultural and Resource Economics
<u>J. Daryl Tatum</u>	<u>Animal Sciences</u>
Louis Bjosted	Bioagricultural Sciences & Pest Management
S. Newman for Stephen Wallner	Horticulture & Landscape Architecture
Patrick Byrne for K. Paustian	Soil and Crop Sciences
Phil Westra	College-at-Large
<u>Dana Hoag</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
Dennis Lamm	College-at-Large

APPLIED HUMAN SCIENCES

Molly Eckman	Design, Merchandising, and Consumer Sciences
Brian Tracy for R. Gotshall	Health and Exercise Science
David A. Sampson	Food Science and Human Nutrition
S. Haddock for D. MacPhee	Human Development and Family Studies
Michael Nobe	Construction Management
David Greene	Occupational Therapy
Carike Makela for W. Timpson	School of Education
Robert Seiz	School of Social Work

BUSINESS

William Mister	Accounting
F.C. "Ted" Weston	Computer Information Systems
Timothy Gallagher	Finance and Real Estate
<u>Raymond Hogler</u>	<u>Management</u>
Joe Cannon	Marketing

ENGINEERING

<u>Chris Kummerow</u>	<u>Atmospheric Science</u>
A. Ted Watson	Chemical Engineering
Ramchand Oad	Civil Engineering
H. J. Siegel	Electrical Engineering
William Duff for A. Yalin	Mechanical Engineering
B. Bienkiewicz for R. Meroney	College-at-Large
Darrell Fontane	College-at-Large

LIBERAL ARTS

Norberto Valdez	Anthropology
Peter Jacobs	Art
Steven J. Shulman	Economics
<u>Pam Coke</u>	<u>English</u>
Michael Abeyta	Foreign Languages and Literatures
Diane C. Margolf	History
Jamie Switzer	Journalism and Technical Communication
<u>Michael Thaut</u>	<u>Music, Theater, and Dance</u>
<u>Michael Losonsky</u>	<u>Philosophy</u>
<u>Brad MacDonald</u>	<u>Political Science</u>

LIBERAL ARTS (continued)

Evan C. Vlachos	Sociology
Eric Aoki	Speech Communication
Alexandra Bernasek	College-at-Large
Ellen Brinks	College-at-Large
Eric Prince	College-at-Large

NATURAL RESOURCES

<u>Barry Noon</u>	<u>Fishery and Wildlife Biology</u>
<u>Douglas Rideout</u>	<u>Forest, Rangeland, and Watershed Stewardship</u>
Sally Sutton	Geosciences
Alan Bright	Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism
<u>Glenn Haas</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>

NATURAL SCIENCES

<u>David Fahrney</u>	<u>Biochemistry and Molecular Biology</u>
Bruce Wunder	Biology
<u>Rich Finke</u>	<u>Chemistry</u>
<u>Dale H. Grit</u>	<u>Computer Science</u>
<u>Kenneth Klopfenstein</u>	<u>Mathematics</u>
R. "Steve" Robinson	Physics
<u>Jack Hautaluoma</u>	<u>Psychology</u>
<u>Philip Lee Chapman</u>	<u>Statistics</u>
<u>Norman Curthoys</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
<u>Donald Estep</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
Richard Eykholt	College-at-Large
Zinta Byrne	College-at-Large

VETERINARY MEDICINE AND BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES

John E. Rash	Biomedical Sciences
<u>David Twedt</u>	<u>Clinical Sciences</u>
Susan LaRue	Environmental and Radiological Health Sciences
Robert L. Jones	Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology
<u>Gerald Callahan</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
<u>Barbara Powers</u>	<u>College-at-Large</u>
Edward Dudek	College-at-Large
Carol Blair	College-at-Large
Julie Inamine	College-at-Large

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Donnice Cochenour	Libraries
Lou E. Anderson	At-Large
Michelle Wilde	At-Large

EX OFFICIO VOTING MEMBERS (**Indicates Member of Faculty Council*)

Stephen Davies	Chair, Committee on Faculty Governance
Jackie Hartman	Chair, Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics
<u>Jerry Magloughlin</u>	<u>Chair, Committee on Libraries</u>
Richard Eykholt*	Chair, Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty
Jerry Eckert*	Chair, Committee on Scholarship Research & Graduate Education
Marianne Bickle	Chair, Committee on Scholastic Standards and Awards
<u>Kirk Hallahan</u>	<u>Chair, Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning</u>
James Madl	Chair, Committee on Teaching and Learning
<u>Philip Chapman*</u>	<u>Chair, Committee on University Programs</u>
James Lindsay	Chair, University Curriculum Committee

OFFICERS OF FACULTY COUNCIL

C. W. Miller	Chair, Faculty Council
F. Brent Reeves	Vice Chair, Faculty Council
Paul Kugrens, Excused	BOG Representative/Parliamentarian

NON-ELECTED NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Larry Edward Penley, Excused	President
Peter J. Nicholls	Provost/Academic Vice President
<u>Anthony Frank</u>	<u>Vice President for Research and Information Technology</u>
<u>Linda Kuk</u>	<u>Vice President for Student Affairs</u>
<u>Marc Johnson</u>	<u>Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences</u>
<u>Nancy K. Hartley</u>	<u>Dean, College of Applied Human Sciences</u>
<u>Heather Hardy</u>	<u>Dean, College of Liberal Arts</u>
<u>Ajay Menon</u>	<u>Dean, College of Business</u>
<u>Steven R. Abt</u>	<u>Interim Dean, College of Engineering</u>
<u>Joyce Berry</u>	<u>Interim Dean, College of Natural Resources</u>
<u>Rick Miranda</u>	<u>Dean, College of Natural Sciences</u>
<u>Lance Perryman</u>	<u>Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences</u>
<u>Catherine Murray-Rust</u>	<u>Dean, University Libraries</u>
Patrick Pellicane	Acting Dean, Graduate School