COMPREHENSIVE REPORT

ON

CHANGE & REFORM

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

December 1995

Comprehensive Report on Change & Reform

December 1995

CONTENTS

THE PRESIDENT'S INTRODUCTION

Beginning in the Summer of 1994, the university undertook steps to define and recommend Change and Reform (C&R) to meet the significant internal and external challenges it faces. Beginning with reaffirmation of the rationale for C&R and definition of the principles for identifying changes, a process was activated that has involved the entire university in the identification of candidate strategies and formulation of recommendations for action.

Two subcommittees of the Strategic Planning Committee - the Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform and Subcommittee on Academic Support - have worked long and hard over the past 18 months to formulate three reports (January 13, May 5, and September 6, 1995). Each report's recommendations were subject to rigorous review by the university. All comments were considered by the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) prior to its finalization of the recommendations and subsequent forwarding to me.

I have received and accepted the recommendations, as forwarded, modified and/or clarified by the Strategic Planning Committee. I am asking each individual or unit charged with the responsibility for follow-up and implementation of the recommendation(s) to provide me with an expected timeline for completion of the charge. I further expect that significant progress, including the completion of a number of the recommendations, will be made during calendar year 1996.

This document, the **Comprehensive Report on Change & Reform (December 1995)**, represents another milestone in the C&R process. Organized by major recommendation topic area, the report provides a summary by topic area of the recommendations and actions underway to implement these changes and reforms, and also the the following detail for each recommendation:

   a. **Subcommittee Recommendation:** Original text of the subcommittee recommendation
   b. **SPC Recommendation:** Recommendation forwarded to the President
   c. **Rationale:** Rationale for any difference between SPC recommendation and original text
   d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** President's response and charge
   e. **Current Status:** Status of consideration/implementation of recommendation

Please join me in thanking the C&R Subcommittees on Academic Program Reform and Academic Support for their important work in developing excellent recommendations, the implementation of which will make our university more effective, efficient and constituency oriented. I also wish to thank the Strategic Planning Committee for its work in gathering and considering university input on the subcommittees' original recommendations and subsequent formulation of the final recommendations.

Our next challenge is to implement the change and reform recommendations in effective ways. This will require the additional efforts and involvement of the entire university. When completed, we will all be able to take pride in this significant activity directed toward improving and sustaining our university.

Albert C. Yates
President

RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REFORM

January 1995 Report/May 1995 SPC Recommendations: 1AP.xx or 1AS.xx
May 1995 Report/October 1995 SPC Recommendations: 2AP.xx, 2AS.xx, or 2AP/AS.xx
September 1995 Report/December 1995 SPC Recommendations: 3AP.xx or 3AS.xx

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY & EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS:

3AP.01   **Faculty Responsibility**
1AP.02   **Faculty Workload (extended by 3AP.01)**
3AP.02   **Post-Tenure Review**
3AP.03   **Senior Reduced Appointment**
3AP.04   **Annual Review**

The SPC concurs in general with the five recommendations, but feels they are closely related and should be considered in the context of an overall set of polices and procedures regarding faculty responsibility and evaluation. The SPC recommends that the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council committees, to develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures to effect the basic tenets of the subcommittee recommendations: to articulate and implement a Faculty Responsibility Policy; conduct thorough annual evaluations of all faculty and develop and implement a comprehensive post-tenure review process that builds upon these annual evaluations; implement a policy permitting well defined Senior Reduced Appointments of benefit to the faculty member and university; and that the documentation for a faculty member's annual departmental review parallels that used for tenure and promotion in order to both simplify paperwork and contribute to uniform, comprehensive annual evaluations.

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY (3AP.01)

   a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that Colorado State University should adopt and implement the following Faculty Responsibility Policy:*

   1. *Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty members at Colorado State University. Teaching occurs: 1) in a variety of classroom settings and in other interactions with students, including advising and mentoring; 2) in research/scholarship/artistry activities; and 3) in outreach and professional service activities. These three categories traditionally define the dimensions of a faculty member's responsibilities as an educator.*

   2. *This Faculty Responsibility Policy is stated as the normal responsibility for full-time regular faculty members. Consistent with overall University objectives and the mission of the unit, college deans or departmental administrators may vary the duties of individual faculty members, taking into consideration individual talents and professional goals. A faculty member's distribution of effort should be stated clearly in writing, used as a framework for evaluation, and reviewed annually and adjusted as appropriate. Effort distributions for untenured faculty must provide sufficient opportunities to demonstrate appropriate levels of competency and accomplishment in all components of faculty responsibility.*

   3. *The normal distribution of effort for full-time regular faculty members in each major area is as follows:*

   Classroom Instruction, Advising, and Mentoring (50%): The normal instructional load for an academic year is 15 credits, of which 12 credits are regular classroom courses. The remaining 3 credits can be either regular classroom courses or credit hours of one-on-one instruction, such as independent studies, direct supervision of doctoral theses, clinical training, art or music instruction, or similar activity equivalent to a 3-credit course. Advising and mentoring, which take many forms, also are required of all faculty members. All aspects of instruction (including

time preparing for lecture, grading, and meeting with students), advising, and mentoring constitute approximately 50% of the normal effort.

Research/Scholarship/Artistry (35%): All faculty members are expected to contribute to the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. These activities range from the basic to the applied and generally are judged by the consensus standards of the discipline. To the fullest extent possible, these activities should include substantial student participation. Such activities constitute approximately 35% of the normal effort.

Service/Outreach (15%): All faculty members are expected to play a service role in the activities of the institution and of their profession as well as an outreach role in the community, state, nation, or world. The usual pattern for beginning faculty should be a modest effort in this area that expands as careers become more established. These activities constitute approximately 15% of the normal effort with at least 10% focused on professional service and outreach.

The performance standards within each of the three areas and the flexibility of individual distributions will be set by the department with oversight by the dean and the Provost. Appropriate demonstrations of the amount and quality of such work must be required for meaningful evaluation.

4. *Faculty with administrative appointments will have a higher percentage of effort devoted to service and have corresponding reductions in one or more other areas. However, departmental administrative faculty should have continuing responsibility for some effort in each area. Similarly, faculty members whose salary is paid in part from external sources will have distributions reflecting those commitments but also should retain some effort in each category.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): The President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council committees, to develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures to effect the basic tenets of the subcommittee recommendation.**

c. **Rationale:** Faculty responsibilities need to be defined on a consistent basis, including clearly articulated effort distributions in instruction, scholarship and service/outreach. These distributions need to reflect the differences in responsibility that exist among faculty in a research university such as Colorado State University. The polices defining effort distribution need to be flexible and recognize different modes and types of instruction, the different uses of faculty time directed toward teaching (with the need to maintain appropriate balance in undergraduate- and graduate-level instruction), research, and service/outreach existing currently and in the future. Well defined faculty responsibilities are the basis for all forms of performance evaluation.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

FACULTY WORKLOAD (1AP.02, extended by 3AP.01)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends the development of a Faculty Workload Policy for Colorado State University within the following framework.*

The articulation of Faculty Workload should:

- *Reflect and express the totality and essence of the faculty's professional responsibilities;*

- *Be based on high professional standards;*

- *Capture the unique form and impact of the faculty's responsibilities in teaching, advising, research, artistry, outreach, and service;*

- *Relate appropriately to the mission of Colorado State University both as a land-grant and a Carnegie Class I institution;*

- *Recognize the necessary diversity of ways in which faculty teach, investigate, and serve, as well as the necessary diversity of balances among these professional activities; and*

- *Provide a credible benchmark for equity within the university and for legitimacy with those served by the university.*

Faculty Council Executive Committee should form a Special Committee, consisting of one faculty member from each college and the libraries and chaired by the Provost, to formulate a draft Faculty Workload Policy by May 1, 1995.

The Faculty Workload Policy, in its draft form, should be presented directly to the faculty for their consideration and discussion prior to presentation to Faculty Council for action.

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Concurs and encourages expeditious Faculty Council consideration.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** To assure the development of a comprehensive faculty workload policy, Faculty Council deliberations should be conducted in the context of the extended recommendation 3AP.01 of the Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Chair, Faculty Council.

The CCHE has circulated a draft policy on faculty productivity for all Colorado institutions of higher education that is being viewed as a broad statement concerning this area. In the Spring of 1995, the Faculty Council Executive Committee appointed a Subcommittee on Faculty Productivity, chaired by Dr. Penelope Bauer, and consisting of six faculty, a Dean, the Provost/Academic Vice President and the Director of the Office of Budgets & Institutional Analysis (OBIA), which has developed a recommendation. The Subcommittee on Faculty Productivity's recommendation was forwarded to the Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty (CORSAF) of the Faculty Council. After consideration, CORSAF is recommending significant changes to Section E.10 of the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual.* The C&R Subcommittee on Academic Reform subsequently produced recommendation 3AP.01, which updates its initial recommendation 1AP.02.

POST-TENURE REVIEW (3AP.02)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the University implement a post-tenure review policy containing the following elements:*

1. *Post-tenure reviews will be conducted for all tenured faculty. Normally, these reviews will be conducted at five-year intervals and should be coordinated with the annual review process.*

2. *Each review is to be based on the standard promotion and tenure document, with emphasis on accomplishments since the last review, including a performance plan for the next review period.*

3. *Each review is to be conducted by a committee of three Full Professors, two from the faculty member's college (one from the department), and one from another college.*

4. *There are to be three review levels for Full Professors following promotion to that rank. A major evaluation is to be conducted to go to the third review level, and those who advance to this level will be designated as Meritorious Professors. The purpose is to recognize and reward those who have performed at an exceptional level of excellence and productivity after their promotion to Full Professor. Normally this evaluation will occur no earlier than 15 years after promotion to Full Professor. This evaluation should be conducted with the same formality as the process used for promotion and tenure and include external evaluations of the person's contributions and professional reputation.*

5. *Reviews will be used to ascertain whether or not a professor should be advanced to the next level. The evaluation committees may recommend advancement to the next review level or above or against advancement to the next level in this review cycle. If deficiencies are identified during the review process, a plan to correct the problems will be implemented by the professor and the departmental administrator.*

6. *Recommendations by evaluation committees will be submitted to the faculty member's department for its recommendation to the dean, the Provost, the President, and the governing board, where necessary.*

7. *Salary increases should accompany each advancement. The salary increase for advancement to Meritorious Professor will be at least $2500 in addition to the annual merit increases and will be funded from the annual salary exercise. In the event that no increases are allotted to the University in any given year, any automatic salary increases will be deferred until such funds become available.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Thorough annual evaluations of faculty need to be uniformly conducted across all academic units at Colorado State University. These annual evaluations shall form the basis for a periodic, comprehensive post-tenure review process. Procedures for conducting a comprehensive post-tenure review, directed toward both evaluation and professional development, should be developed and implemented expeditiously. However, the SPC does not recommend that these comprehensive reviews be combined with a new, unique academic rank and salary compensation system.**

c. **Rationale:** The requirement for annual reviews is stated in Section C.2.5. of the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual*, but is not uniformly applied across all academic units. When conducted in a consistent, rigorous and thorough manner, these annual reviews can form an effective

basis for a comprehensive post-tenure review system, directed toward both evaluation and professional development.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

The Provost/Academic Vice President is working with the Council of Deans to implement procedures that will assure consistency in the application of the current policy.

SENIOR REDUCED APPOINTMENT (3AP.03)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the University establish a policy authorizing Senior Reduced Appointments. The appointment and its terms must be determined to be in the best interests of the unit and the University by the department administrator, the dean, and the Provost. This appointment will require the following:*

   1. *Agreement of the faculty member, department, college, and Provost.*

   2. *Specification of the portion of appointment reduction, which can be fixed or phased. If the portion of reduction is fixed, the appointment may not exceed a half-time appointment. If the portion of reduction is phased, the appointment may exceed a half-time appointment only during the first two years.*

   3. *Articulation of a detailed plan for the faculty member and for his/her department that defines an appropriate level of instructional responsibility for the faculty member.*

   4. *Only tenured faculty members who have reached 55 years of age and have provided 10 years of service to Colorado State University will be eligible.*

   5. *Reduced appointments can be approved only if they are for a specified term of at least one year and no more than five years.*

   6. *Upon the completion of the specified term, the faculty member will be fully retired.*

   7. *Upon retirement, former faculty members will continue, as they are now, to be eligible for annual temporary appointments.*

   8. *The tenure of the faculty member on a reduced appointment will be continued during the period of the specified term.*

   9. *The dean of the college of the faculty member proposing a Senior Reduced Appointment may request of the Provost, to whom all salary lines return, that the released portions of the faculty member's salary be retained.*

   Senior reduced appointment is not a faculty right but a benefit. Not all requests will necessarily be approved and not all terms will necessarily be approved for five years.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs, after modifications to assure consistency with current retirement programs and policies and that the term of the senior reduced appointment (SRA) be defined in a manner consistent with the transition of faculty from full-time to full retirement, that a policy of allowing SRAs be implemented, and that it be closely tied to policies concerning faculty responsibility and annual performance evaluations.**

Item 8 should be amended to read as follows by the addition of the italicized sentence: "The tenure of the faculty member on a reduced appointment will be continued during the period of the specified term. *At the end of the specified term, tenure will be terminated.*"

Addition of Item 10: "Persons on a SRA will not be eligible for sabbatical leave."

c. **Rationale:** SRAs can be designed to be of significant benefit to both the university and faculty persons by assisting transition to full retirement while performing useful functions at the university. As currently written, however, the recommendation is not consistent with PERA and DCP retirement requirements.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans, Faculty Council and Vice President for Administrative Services, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation early in calendar year 1996.

ANNUAL REVIEW (3AP.04)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the Provost, through the Council of Deans, develop a single form for faculty to complete for annual department reviews. This form should be consistent with the form used for tenure and promotion applications and include a one-page summary and a performance plan.*

b. **SPC Recommendation: Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS:

3AP.05   Academic Core
1AP.01   Academic Core
3AP.06   Academic Advising

The SPC recommends that: the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, working in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council committees, to develop a new Academic Core that is consistent with the general principles contained in the subcommittee's recommendations, focusing on the Core's role as the coherent foundation of each student's program of study; and each College Dean work with their faculty and students to develop a College Academic Advising Plan to be submitted to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

ACADEMIC CORE (3AP.05)

   a.   **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends:*

   1.   *The University Curriculum Committee develop an Academic Core for all Colorado State University undergraduate students.*

   2.   *The general purpose of the Academic Core will be to articulate a set of curricular requirements that constitutes the essential, developmental foundation for every Colorado State University student's overall program of study; gives coherent direction and integration to students' general and specialized learning; and defines the academic foundation for educated citizenship as well as for competency in specialized areas of study.*

   3.   *The Academic Core should be developed and delivered within the framework of the following guiding principles.*

   •   *Students must have the opportunity to develop an understanding of various forms of knowledge, methods of inquiry, and skills, particularly communication and logic and critical thinking.*

   •   *Students must have the opportunity to develop an understanding of their cultural heritage, its complexities and diversity, and its relationship to other cultures and to international life.*

   •   *Most subject matter is interrelated, complex, varied, dynamic, and international. It should be taught accordingly, rather than as if it were isolated, one-dimensional, uniform, static, or parochial.*

   •   *Teaching should be guided by how students learn so that it will foster the development of knowledgeable, competent, and responsible citizens.*

   4.   *The Academic Core should:*

   •   *be approximately equivalent to one year of studies, primarily in the arts and sciences;*

   •   *encourage colleges and departments to build within and beyond Core requirements in order to formulate foundations specifically relevant to their disciplines;*

   •   *be composed of a limited number of targeted courses substantively designed to implement the general purpose and guiding principles of the Academic Core;*

   •   *be organized so that all identified Academic Core courses will be reviewed regularly to ensure that they are effectively serving the purposes for which they were designated;*

   •   *ensure that all multi-sectioned Academic Core courses will be taught with common course descriptions, objectives, and syllabi;*

   •   *incorporate "state of the art" technology where appropriate;*

- *encourage faculty-student interactions both in and outside the classroom, including direct experiences with the processes and products of scholarly research and creative expression;*

- *be completed by students prior to earning junior classification;*

- *be publicized to high school students to encourage appropriate preparation; and*

- *be scheduled so that all qualified students needing a Core course to attain Junior status will be accommodated, and so that any qualified student denied access to a Core course will be guaranteed registration the following semester.*

5. *The college deans should initiate a comprehensive, substantive reconsideration of the curricular structure of all undergraduate majors within their jurisdictions. The purpose of this exercise is to focus and integrate the curricular structure of each undergraduate major, to ensure that each undergraduate major is grounded in a sound academic foundation, to achieve efficiencies to the greatest extent possible by reducing curricular duplications and excessive fragmentation, and to link more coherently students' general learning in the Academic Core with their specialized learning in the major.*

6. *The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) should formally designate the Commission on the Undergraduate Experience subcommittee on Infrastructure, Curriculum, and Instruction as a subcommittee of the UCC. In addition to other responsibilities, this subcommittee could provide significant preparatory and support work for the development and implementation of the Academic Core.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): The President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, working in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council committees, to develop and implement a new academic core that is consistent with the general principles contained in the subcommittee's recommendations.**

c. **Rationale:** There is a need to develop an innovative academic core for all Colorado State University undergraduates. To do this will require that we recognize the many unique features and constraints that characterize the existing major degree programs at the university, and the special needs of transfer students. Implementation of a new academic core may require bold initiatives regarding how the first two years of undergraduate instruction are organized at Colorado State University.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

ACADEMIC CORE (1AP.01)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that there should be a general sense of urgency regarding curricular reform, but not at the expense of appropriate discussion and investigation.*

Curriculum is and should be predominantly a faculty responsibility, but this principle does not preclude accepting input from faculty committees, administrators, or any other source.

Faculty Council and the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) should move forward with Commission on the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) recommendations and proposals for further study.

There are significant advantages to a coherent and rigorous academic core curriculum. As an initial step toward this goal, the Subcommittee supports elimination of the "B" list and streamlining of the "A" list in the University Studies Program (USP).

In addition, the University Curriculum Committee is asked to initiate a systematic and purposeful consideration of the University Studies Program that directly focuses on the challenge of how USP should respond to both the diverse academic needs of a comprehensive university and the common need to provide a shared knowledge foundation for educated citizens.

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Faculty Council to consider the recommendation in the context of the Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform's recommendation 3AP.05 concerning the Academic Core.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Chair, Faculty Council, for implementation.

   A special meeting of Faculty Council was held on April 18, 1995 to consider the recommendations in the Commission of the Undergraduate Experience (provided as Appendix A to the first C&R Report). The Faculty Council took no action on recommendations 1, 2 and 3, which had already been approved. Recommendation 4, dealing with modifications of the current Category I of the University Studies Program, Communication and Reasoning, was rejected. Recommendations 5 and 6 were passed. Recommendations 7 and 8 were sent back to committee, with a request for a definition of a Capstone Course, what is meant by significant communication component and for cost estimates associated with implementation of these recommendations. In addition, the UCC continues to examine other aspects of the University Studies Program.

ACADEMIC ADVISING (3AP.06)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends:*

   1. *The dean of each college should engage departmental administrators and their faculty and students in the development of a College Academic Advising Plan, to be submitted to the Provost, that articulates advising commitments, expectations, and delivery arrangements in the context of the following issues:*

      • *what are the most effective current academic advising practices?*

      • *what are the primary limitations or inadequacies in current academic advising practices?*

      • *what modifications of current academic advising could preserve effective practices and improve problem areas?*

      • *what role should University academic support units play in the advising process?*

- *what should be done to better integrate academic advising in the College with other academic programs and academic support units?*

- *what mechanisms for implementing, evaluating, and rewarding academic advising have been put in place?*

2. *Academic advising should be defined as an ongoing process, based on a collaborative relationship of students and advisers, that assists students in achieving their educational, career, and personal goals through the appropriate and effective use of relevant information and resources. Components of comprehensive academic advising include:*

   - *clarifying the interrelatedness of learning;*

   - *identifying the specialized knowledge and practices unique to every discipline;*

   - *promoting the application of this learning and knowledge into the shaping of students' personal, professional, and intellectual objectives;*

   - *assisting students with immediate concerns related to University policies and procedures.*

3. *The following guidelines for achieving high quality comprehensive academic advising, based on the 1993 Task Force Report on Undergraduate Advising, should be adopted. Academic advising:*

   - *can be accomplished successfully in a variety of ways;*

   - *is both a collaborative responsibility and the specific responsibility of an assigned adviser;*

   - *should encourage students to critically select, organize, and utilize varied information to pursue and accomplish their goals;*

   - *is built on personal contacts that include the articulation of students' individual needs and goals;*

   - *is the responsibility of students, faculty, and staff, all of whom must take an active and informed role in the advising process.*

b. **Subcommittee Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs with the addition that the development of College Academic Advising Plans will address coordination with the advising activities performed by the HELP/Success Center.**

c. **Rationale:** The HELP/Success Center is currently advising all students who have not declared a major and provides advising to many others. It is important, therefore, that each college's plan be coordinated with HSC activities in an appropriate manner.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Vice President for Student Affairs, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

<center>**STRATEGIC PLANNING RECOMMENDATIONS:**</center>

2AP.01	**Strategic Planning (which includes 1AP.03, Strategic Planning)**
2AP.02	**Mission & Goals**
2AP/AS.01	**Retirements**
3AP.07	**Academic Structure & Coordination**
3AP.08	**Resource Distribution Study**
3AP.09	**Academic Calendar & Enrollment**
3AP.10	**University Statistics**

The SPC supports the thrust of all the recommendations which deal directly with or facilitate and support effective strategic planning. Specifically, the SPC supports: streamlining the strategic planning process; clarifying our mission through a single statement; examining potential retirements to better define resource availability for reallocation; strengthening the academic program review process to better inform strategic planning and resource distributions; and examining the academic calendar and facilities utilization to identify mechanisms to assist effective accommodation of anticipated enrollment growth and increasing diversity in the university population.

STRATEGIC PLANNING (2AP.01, which includes 1AP.03)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (May 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the President immediately initiate a process that will lead to effective refinements of the University Strategic Planning process, giving special consideration to the following planning issues:*

- *Strategic planning that anticipates and is responsive to new issues, circumstances, and fiscal conditions;*

- *Clarification of administrative responsibilities for development and implementation of the Strategic Plan and formation of a Strategic Planning Committee whose composition reflects that clarification;*

- *Prioritization of Aims, and of the Goals, Objectives, and Strategies among Aims;*

- *Limitation of the number of Strategies and of their total dollar value to realistic projections;*

- *Consolidation of Aims 5, 6, and 7 into a single support Aim that is essential to the accomplishment of Aims 1 through 4; and*

- *Effective implementation of strategic planning within routine university operations, including documentation relating to the implementation of planning priorities.*

- *Focus membership of the Strategic Planning Committee on Academic Deans and Vice Presidents. (1AP.03 amended by addition of this item.)*

b. **SPC Recommendation (October 1995): Concurs, with the exception that the current membership of the SPC should be continued. The current membership is: Provost/Academic Vice President, and the Vice Presidents, two Deans, Chair of Faculty Council, Chair of CAP, Chair of B&FP, one undergraduate and one graduate student, one State Classified representative, and one Administrative Professional representative.**

c. **Rationale:** The membership, appointed by the President, represents a balance of persons from all parts of the university community. This balance is important because successful strategic planning includes all aspects of the university.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** SPC recommendation has been implemented.

e. **Current Status:** *The Context for Planning: The Future of Colorado State University FYs 97-00* was revised during Spring 1995. In response to the thrust of 1AP.03, as amended by 2AP.01, the revised process provides for more involvement from the Council of Deans (COD) and the Executive Budget Committee (EBC). At the beginning of each annual update of the University Strategic Plan (USP), the COD and EBC propose prioritized objectives organized under each of the plan's five goals to develop the strategic planning framework.

Further, each March, the revised process calls for planning/budget hearings before the SPC and EBC at which each of the Academic Deans, Provost/Academic Vice President, the other Vice Presidents and the President propose strategies for the Strategic Planning Framework to provide the necessary input for the completion of the annual update of the strategic plan. Strategies provide information [including timeframe, resource requirements and source(s), and responsible party(s)] describing specific activities directed toward the framework's goals and objectives. The proposing of strategies provides another opportunity for all the Academic Deans to actively participate in and shape the strategic plan.

University-wide input was solicited on the draft revision of the planning/budgeting process and was incorporated where appropriate. Faculty Council considered and adopted the goals in the revised document at its meeting on May 2, 1995. The revised *The Context for Planning* was approved by President Yates and published in June 1995.

MISSION & GOALS (2AP.02)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (May 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that:*

The university officially adopt and promote a single, concise statement both of its mission and of its goals.

Such statements should be utilized to build community within the university and to project a common purpose to external constituencies.

The official statement of mission should consist, in large part, of material currently in the university catalog and other existing documents.

The official statement of university goals should be identical with the goals articulated in the current strategic planning process.

b. **SPC Recommendation (October 1995): Concurs and recommends that the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, working with the Council of Deans, to develop a mission statement for consideration and adoption by the university.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

The mission of Colorado State University is defined by statute as a comprehensive teaching and research institution. This mission statement is referred to in the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual* while other mission statements appear in the *General Catalog*, the *Graduate & Professional Bulletin* and the *SBA Handbook*. The CCHE has adopted yet another mission statement for Colorado State University. These multiple statements suggest a lack of clarity making the university adoption of a single well thought out statement, consistent with the goals defined in *The Context for Planning* an important activity. The Academic Program Reform Subcommittee has developed a draft mission statement that may serve as a starting point for SPC recommended action.

RETIREMENTS (2AP/AS.01)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (May 1995):** *As a result of work done jointly, the Strategic Planning Subcommittees on Academic Program Reform and Academic Support recommend that the university plan for allocation of resources resulting from retirements.*

Given the academic mission of the university and the fact that academic faculty represent the largest category of salary dollars likely to be released by retirements, the Provost and Council of Deans should propose a plan for allocation of the significant resources likely to result from retirements over the next decade. The proposed plan should include:

- *Estimates of the likely retirements in the next 10 years and the amount of salary dollars likely to be released as a result;*

- *Recommendations for allocating resources resulting from retirements to high priority areas;*

- *Cost/benefit and feasibility analyses of incentives for retirements and, if applicable, a proposal for seeking modification of state laws and fiscal rules to permit such incentives; and*

- *Policies (including opportunities to continue to assist with advising, mentoring, teaching, or provision of other services) that will allow retired faculty to maintain their ties to university life and ease the transition from full-time employment to retirement.*

No later than December 1, 1995, the Provost should submit the proposed plan to appropriate bodies, including the Executive Budget Committee and Faculty Council Executive Committee, for review and action.

b. **SPC Recommendation (October 1995): The SPC agrees that faculty retirements deserve more attention and incorporation into planning as the university moves forward to meet future needs, challenges and opportunities. However, the SPC feels the recommendation should be broadened to include more than the academic sector. With this in mind, the SPC recommends that:**

1. **The Provost/Academic Vice President, working with the COD, develop estimates of retirements in all academic sectors in the next 10 years and the resources they would release by March 1996. In a similar manner, the other Vice Presidents will estimate potential retirements in their respective areas.**

2. **Allocation of resources coming from retirements and all other sources continue to be based on the priorities defined in the USP.**

3. **The university administration continue to look for feasible ways to encourage retirements that are programmatically effective and beneficial to both the retiree and university.**

4. **Policies providing opportunities for faculty to continue teaching, research and scholarship, advising, outreach and mentoring as a part of a planned transition from full-time employment to retirement be continued and/or improved.**

c. **Rationale:** Although the majority of personnel reside in the colleges, there are large numbers of personnel associated with administrative offices. Estimates of administrative retirements and their related resources need to be developed.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the other Vice Presidents, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

No comprehensive list of potential retirements exist for planning purposes and, therefore, needs to be assembled. Allocations of all resources are currently being made according to the priorities of the University Strategic Plan (USP) and it is expected that the revised process adopted in June 1995 will more closely link college/departmental plans with the USP. Extensive study of retirement incentives of potential benefit to both the employee and university, and meeting legal and programmatic requirements, was undertaken during Spring 1995, including extensive data and information from other institutions. Currently, State Fiscal Rules do not permit financial incentives; however, the university is looking into potential modifications it may pursue through official channels. This work provides extensive background on which future efforts can build, but no retirement incentive proposal meeting all these requirements has been defined as of November 1995. The ad hoc committee's recommended changes in the current transitional retirement program for faculty were not adopted by the Faculty Council and requests for transitional retirement for periods longer than four years are not being approved by the Provost/Academic Vice President. The Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform has recommended that a new type of transitional appointment (Senior Reduced Appointment, 3AP.03) be adopted.

ACADEMIC STRUCTURE & COORDINATION (3AP.07)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform received a variety of proposals for reorganization and better coordination among colleges in order to meet the University's academic mission. In addition, each dean responded to a series of questions posed by this Subcommittee concerning reorganization. After careful consideration of many interesting and potentially beneficial proposals for reorganization, this Subcommittee recommends:*

1. *No colleges be combined, eliminated, or added at the present time.*

2. *Ongoing plans to combine departments and/or programs within colleges be encouraged and facilitated.*

3. *All units of the University continue to increase coordination with affinity units. (Examples of units that might benefit from coordination of activities are listed in an attachment to this recommendation.)*

4. *A document be prepared and distributed across campus that details the findings of the Application of the Strategic Plan (ASP) process that occurred at St. Malo, including actions that have taken place as a result of those findings.*

5. *A University-wide evaluation similar to the Application of the Strategic Plan take place on a periodic basis to ensure that each department and college is meeting expectations and contributing to the mission of the University.*

6. *The Provost, through the Council of Deans, examine programs, courses, and degrees to identify and eliminate unnecessary duplications.*

7. *The University should develop a policy on initiating and evaluating centers, institutes, laboratories, and other similar administrative units.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs with the general recommendation of the subcommittee especially since academic structure may be an important factor in developing and implementing a new academic core. The SPC also recommends that existing program review policies and procedures be reviewed and revised to ensure that every academic program is thoroughly and meaningfully reviewed at least every five years, that productivity data be included in such reviews, and that the results of these reviews be the basis for strategic planning in the academic units and at the university level. The SPC concurs that the results of the St. Malo report (Application of the Strategic Plan) be widely circulated. The SPC recommends that the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council committees, to implement the subcommittee's recommendations.**

c. **Rationale: Rationale given in recommendation.**

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

RESOURCE DISTRIBUTION STUDY (3AP.08)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the University examine its distributive practices and policies to ensure a distribution of all resources among colleges and units that is appropriate, consistent, and open to public understanding. The President should charge the Provost to:*

1. *Determine and articulate the University basis for the distribution of resources to clarify whether distributions are to be determined by quality, productivity, market forces, equity, historical practice, or a combination of factors.*

2. *Ensure that current distribution patterns are appropriate and consistent. Among the areas to be considered are number and funding source for tenure-track positions, base upon which salary*

increases are distributed, number of and funding for state classified positions, operating expense support, space allocation, and appropriate equity for salaries.

3. *Make adjustments to University policy or practices necessary to ensure an appropriate and consistent distribution of University resources.*

b. SPC Recommendation (December 1995): The university, through the strategic planning process, comprehensive program review, and the oversight of the Provost/Academic Vice President and other Vice Presidents, should ensure that resources are appropriately distributed within the university. Accountability in this regard is extremely important.

The SPC supports the President's intent to develop and implement a functional position management system so that the university can better monitor operating expenditures vs. those for personnel (faculty and staff). A functional position management system defines the number of FTE faculty and support positions with a corresponding level of E&G funding distributed to each academic unit.

c. Rationale: Appropriate resource distribution requires both comprehensive and accurate data concerning unit productivity, quality, market forces, equity, etc., to inform administrative judgements on these matters. Such data are not consistently available at present. This need is part of the rationale for the SPC's revised 3AP.07 recommendation (Academic Structure) for revised and greatly improved academic program reviews, and concurrence with 3AP.10 (University Statistics). Based on good data, resource allocations and reallocations can be presented, justified and budgeted through the annual strategic planning and budgeting process.

d. President's Response to SPC Recommendation: Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the other Vice Presidents, with implementation.

e. Current Status: SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR & ENROLLMENT (3AP.09)

a. Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995): *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the University deal with pressing and related enrollment issues as follows:*

1. *Academic Calendar*

   The Provost, through the Council of Deans, should address issues relating to the academic calendar and scheduling of classes. Issues include increasing the number of times that courses are offered, offering courses during non-traditional times, increasing the number of courses offered in concentrated blocks of time, evaluating summer session, exploring alternative calendars (such as a trimester system), and modifying course scheduling to utilize new delivery technologies.

2. *Minimum Course and Program Enrollment*

   The University should adopt a minimum enrollment policy (for example, the CCHE guidelines set a minimum of 15 students for lower-division courses; 10 students for upper-division courses; and 5 students for graduate courses).

The Provost, through the Council of Deans, should create and enact a plan to address continuation of courses and programs with a history of low enrollment.

3. *Unmet Student Demand*

    The Provost, through the Council of Deans, should obtain and interpret data regarding unmet student demand and develop a long-range strategic plan for dealing with existing and projected problems.

4. *Classroom Capacities*

    The Facilities Services staff should determine the maximum capacity of each classroom (no greater than that dictated by local fire code) and post this number by the door of each room.

    Facilities Services staff should be responsible for maintaining the appropriate number of functional seats in each room.

    Room scheduling personnel should be responsible for oversight of course enrollment, allowing no more students in any section than the specified maximum capacity of each room.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Generally concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** The university must be prepared to meet the changing needs of students and projected enrollment increases through an efficient use of the academic calendar and class scheduling. The university should conduct appropriate student surveys to determine need and demand, and should be prepared to experiment offering classes during non-traditional times (e.g., evenings, Saturdays). It may be necessary to more fully utilize the Summer Session to meet student demand in some academic programs. It also may be necessary to eliminate some academic programs and courses so that the associated resources can be reallocated to areas of higher priority and demand. Facilities Services has difficulty assuring the appropriate number of seats exist in the classroom since students often move seats between classrooms.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans, Vice President for Administrative Services and Vice President for Student Affairs, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

UNIVERSITY STATISTICS (3AP.10)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the Provost, through the Council of Deans:*

   • *should evaluate University policies and practices regarding record-keeping and statistics in order to determine what information would be helpful in carrying out administrative functions and*

   • *should work with the Office of Budgets and Institutional Analysis (OBIA) as well as other academic support units to develop methods for gathering and reporting such data.*

   The Subcommittee further recommends that the following addition data should be recorded and reported:

- *Second majors, minors, and licensure or certificate program enrollments;*

- *Enrollments in off-campus programs by departments.*

- *Interdepartmental majors by colleges and by departments advising them.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Accurate and complete statistical data are important to a variety of administrative functions to implement the recommendation. The procedures to collect and track advising assignments associated with interdepartmental majors will have to be developed.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and OBIA, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

   Work on collecting and reporting better or additional information is underway. For example, the Fall Semester enrollment report by OBIA included second majors.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATION:

1AP.04 Faculty Governance

The SPC encourages the Faculty Council to examine its organization and operation in response to numerous individuals who spoke to the desirability of significant change to the structure and size of the Faculty Council.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE (1AP.04)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the structure of faculty governance be reorganized and enhanced in relationship to the following considerations:*

- *That the pursuit of practical, operational values such as effective, deliberative action, timely responsiveness, policy coherence, and functional efficiency should have the highest priority in the formation of faculty governance structures and procedures;*

- *That Faculty Council be reorganized to more closely resemble a Faculty Senate model of faculty governance, with two representatives from each college and a limited number of university-at-large representatives for a total Faculty Senate of 24 to 32 members;*

- *That the Faculty Senate should be an exclusively faculty body, representing only members of the regular faculty;*

- *That the new Faculty Senate's committee structure be substantially streamlined into fewer committees with less specifically specialized responsibilities to encourage committees to focus their efforts on broad, policy issues rather than on changing details of implementation; and*

- *That the practical details of "shared governance" be articulated to clarify differentiations of responsibilities between the Faculty Senate and the administrative structure and to coordinate these differentiated roles.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Supports the recommendation that the structure of faculty governance be reorganized and encourages expeditious Faculty Council consideration.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and requests Faculty Council consideration.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Chair, Faculty Council, for consideration through their normal processes.

The Executive Committee of Faculty Council developed a survey on the structure of Faculty Council that was sent to all academic faculty. Data from the survey have been tabulated and sent to the Code Committee of Faculty Council for their deliberation. Faculty Council expects to consider a recommendation on its organization, including its committees, during the 1995-96 academic year.

GRADUATE EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS:

1AP.05   Graduate School
1AP.06   Graduate Student Enrollment

The SPC encourages the Provost/Academic Vice President to work with the Council of Deans to: recommend the most appropriate organizational structure for the Graduate School; and to develop policies and procedures for the continuous registration of graduate students.

GRADUATE SCHOOL (1AP.05)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the current structure of the Graduate School should be replaced by an organizational arrangement that:*

- *Places primary administrative leadership in a staff position in the Office of the Provost, e.g., Associate Provost for Graduate Studies;*

- *Emphasizes that the primary administrative responsibilities for academic standards of graduate programs rest with college deans and department heads;*

- *Creates an administrative framework for graduate education that parallels the administrative structures and processes for undergraduate education as much as possible and appropriate; and*

- *Preserves and enhances current services, record-keeping functions, and monitoring procedures and places them within the responsibilities of appropriate central administrative services.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):   Recommends that the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President to study the specific functions and organizational structure of the Graduate School and make specific recommendations concerning modification or elimination.**

c: **Rationale:** The organizational structure and administrative responsibilities of the Graduate School are the administrative prerogative of the Provost/Academic Vice President.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

The subcommittee recommendations are under consideration by the Provost/Academic Vice President who is doing a comprehensive analysis of alternative structures and the functions of graduate schools. Extensive input on the subcommittee recommendation was received by the SPC on this subject, providing a rationale supporting the continuation of a Graduate School and its current functions associated with enrollment and standards. The Provost/Academic Vice President's recommendations and analysis will be provided to the SPC and Faculty Council Executive Committee.

GRADUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENT (1AP.06)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that Colorado State University require graduate student registration during any term in which the student is using university resources, including the time of faculty or other university personnel, the Library, laboratories, studios, or other university facilities.*

Each term, a graduate student using university resources must enroll in and complete an appropriate number of credits, to be determined by the student's department. Implementation by department heads and chairs will be reviewed regularly by academic deans and the administrator for graduate education.

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Recommends that the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council Committees, to develop and implement policies and procedures for the continuous registration of graduate students.**

c. **Rationale:** Continuous registration of graduate students is the norm at research universities to accurately account for: all graduate student activity; level of effort by faculty relative to graduate education; usage of university resources by graduate students; and to assure students have access to appropriate medical coverage.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

The Provost/Academic Vice President is drafting a proposal for all graduate students to be continuously registered following the completion of their formal course work until graduation. This proposal will go to the Graduate Council for consideration.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACADEMIC SUPPORT REFORM

January 1995 Report/May 1995 SPC Recommendations: 1AP.xx or 1AS.xx
May 1995 Report/October 1995 SPC Recommendations: 2AP.xx, 2AS.xx, or 2AP/AS.xx
September 1995 Report/December 1995 SPC Recommendations: 3AP.xx or 3AS.xx

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES RECOMMENDATIONS:

3AS.01   **Responsibilities of Provost**
3AS.02   **Executive Budget Committee**
3AS.03   **Follow-up Report on C&R Recommendations**
1AS.01   **Refilling Vacant Positions**
1AS.06   **Resource Enhancement**
3AS.25   **Organization of International Programs**

The appointment and the designation of responsibilities of the Provost/Academic Vice President are the prerogative of the President. The SPC concurs that the composition and functions of the Executive Budget Committee be communicated to the university. Also, that the activities and results of the Change & Reform initiatives be clearly communicated to the university along with the rationale for adopting any alternative recommendations. The SPC also agrees that the university needs to continue to examine ways to enhance resources and assure that the filling of vacant positions is consistent with the C&R recommendations and priorities established through the strategic planning process. Finally, the SPC supports the continuation of the current organization of International Programs for the next two years, followed by a review made by the Vice Presidents having administrative responsibility.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROVOST (3AS.01)

a.   **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Provost/Academic Vice President title should be changed to Provost. The Provost's responsibilities and authority should be expanded to fully reflect the primacy of the academic mission of the University.*

   The Provost should have full authority and responsibility for University strategic planning. The Provost should work with Deans and Vice Presidents to develop a plan which defines the long-range vision of the University. The plan should provide clear direction for long-range decision making and resource allocation.

b.   **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): The appointment of the Provost/Academic Vice President is the prerogative of the President.**

   Also, no additional change in the university strategic planning process is recommended beyond the changes made in Spring 1995 incorporating the recommendation in 1AP.03 as amended by 2AP.01.

c.   **Rationale:** The academic activities of the university demand primacy among all the university's activities. To achieve this end, each of the five Vice Presidents is charged by the President to oversee specific areas of the university, all of which support academic programs while taking an all-university perspective in the performance of their duties. The current organizational structure is working and provides coherence to all university decisions and actions. "Provost" is added to the title of "Academic Vice President" to clearly indicate that the individual occupying this position acts for the President in his absence by virtue of the primacy of the academic mission.

   Changes made in the planning process call for the Provost/Academic Vice President and the Vice Presidents to work with the Council of Deans to provide a vision for plans to direct long-range decision making and resource allocation, which increases the role of the academic leadership in strategic planning.

d.   **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** At this time no change is being made in the title or scope of activities of the Provost/Academic Vice President.

e.   **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response transmitted to the SPC.

EXECUTIVE BUDGET COMMITTEE (3AS.02)

a.   **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The composition and functions of the Executive Budget Committee (EBC) should be communicated to the campus community via appropriate means and included in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual.*

b.   **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs with the modification that the composition and functions be appropriately communicated to the university through such mechanisms as the *Campus Administrative Manual* (currently under development) and not the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual*.**

c.   **Rationale:** The EBC is appointed by the President, who has full discretion to make changes to this group at any time. Inclusion in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* would require action by the Faculty Council, as would any further changes made by the President. This approval requirement is contrary to the authority of the President, and could lead to awkward situations (e.g., the President wishes to abolish the EBC but, since it is in the manual, changes must be approved by Faculty Council)

d.   **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e.   **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Administrative Services for implementation.

A description of the composition and function of the EBC has been drafted and will be presented to the President in the near future for consideration and communication to the university.

FOLLOW-UP REPORT ON C&R RECOMMENDATIONS (3AS.03)

a.   **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *A report should be distributed to the University community, within one year, which notes the Subcommittee's recommendations which have been implemented and those which are in process. A rationale for those recommendations which are rejected or modified should be provided. The Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee should coordinate the compilation of the report.*

b.   **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c.   **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d.   **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Strategic Planning Committee with implementation.

e.   **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee (Vice President for Research), for implementation.

This report contains the recommendations of the SPC to the President, including the rationale for any changes in the subcommittees' recommendations. It is anticipated that the President's response on the SPC recommendations, with specific instructions for actions by certain unit administrators, will be made to the university community in December 1995. The information will be posted on the Colorado State University World Wide Web home page (http://www.colostate.edu), under resource locator *Administrative Information/University Strategic Planning*, and updated periodically. Final reporting (hard copy, written report as well as electronic) on the outcome of these actions will follow approximately one year later.

REFILLING VACANT POSITIONS (1AS.01)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *In the short run, the Subcommittee submits one general recommendation. In order to facilitate the process of Change and Reform, where reasonable, the university should consider leaving vacant or filling on an interim basis all current and newly vacated positions which are in areas identified for potential change and reform.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Concurs that vacant academic faculty, administrative professional and state classified positions be carefully reviewed to determine if filling them is consistent with the University Strategic Plan and the best use of university resources. Further, that all searches to fill new or vacant positions be approved by the appropriate Vice President before searches are initiated.**

c. **Rationale:** Since all areas of the university are potential candidates for C&R, this recommendation reflects the type of position review and management needed to assure that the university focuses the reallocation of resources on its highest priorities.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the each Vice President and the Provost/Academic Vice President with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to each Vice President and the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

   On-going.

RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT (1AS.06)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The subcommittee recommends that the university develop specific plans for examining resource enhancement.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Supports the recommendation for developing plans for resource enhancement within the context of the University Strategic Planning process.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges each Vice President and the Provost/Academic Vice President with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to each Vice President and the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

On-going.

ORGANIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS (3AS.25)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The current structure for international programs should remain in place for an additional two years, and at the end of two years the Faculty Council International Committee should evaluate the current structure and make appropriate recommendations.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): The current organizational structure for International Programs should remain in place for an additional two years, until June 30, 1998. Then, after a total of five years with the current structure, an evaluation should be made by the three vice presidents involved: Provost/Academic Vice President, Vice President for Research, and Vice President for Student Affairs. Following the organizational evaluation, changes may be recommended.**

c. **Rationale:** The SPC concurs that the current structure should remain in place two more years. Currently, each program (International Education, International R&D, and International Student Services) is enhancing services to the campus.

The Change & Reform response process recommended that evaluation of the structure should be conducted by the Faculty Council International Committee. The SPC recommendation modified this process, to be accomplished by an administrative review team, noting that university organizational structure is an administrative issue.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Vice President for Research and Vice President for Student Affairs, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

STUDENT ACADEMIC SUCCESS RECOMMENDATIONS:

2AS.01   Student Services - University Counseling Center
3AS.05   HELP/Success Center
3AS.06   Advocacy Offices

The SPC concurs with the recommendations for: continuation of the activities of the University Counseling Center and the HELP/Success Center, along with their closer working relationship with academic units and the improvement of administrative procedures affecting students; and increasing the impact and effectiveness of the Advocacy Offices and Women's Programs Office.

STUDENT SERVICES - UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTER (2AS.01)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (May 1995):** *The University Counseling Center was established to serve students working toward successful completion of academic work while attempting to manage emotional problems and crisis situations. After examining the need for these services and the funding source, the Academic Support Subcommittee makes two recommendations:*

- *The services offered by the Counseling Center should be continued because a significant number of the students who attend Colorado State avail themselves of cost-effective counseling help during their matriculation.*

- *An alternative method for funding the Faculty Testing Service should be established because test scoring services provided to academic departments are subsidized by student fees.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (October 1995): The SPC concurs with the recommendation that the Counseling Center be continued using student fees as the principal source of support. Further, the SPC recommends that the Faculty Testing Service continue scoring answer sheets on classroom examinations but the costs be covered from E&G sources rather than student fees.**

c. **Rationale:** The University Counseling Center is performing an essential service in a cost effective manner. The Testing Service has developed the capability to score many types of tests for the Counseling Center, national entrance and aptitude tests and examinations and it is cost effective to continue this service at a single location. However, student fees should not be paying for the scoring of classroom examinations, making it appropriate to move these costs to E&G sources. The impact of moving these costs from student fee funding should be considered by the Vice President for Student Affairs when the fee and budget for the Counseling Center are evaluated annually.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Student Affairs with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Student Affairs for implementation.

HELP/SUCCESS CENTER (3AS.05)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Subcommittee endorses the work of the HELP/Success Center (HSC). The HSC fulfills a role in the University that would not be accomplished as effectively or with the same level of student service by other units. Specific recommendations to enhance the impact and efficiency of the HSC follow.*

Because the recommendations in the change and reform process indicate an on-going tension between decentralized and centralized advising functions, the HSC Advisory Board should develop a plan to foster new and innovative opportunities to enhance the advising connections between academic faculty and the HELP Center. The plan should be implemented jointly by the HELP Center, the Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs.

The HSC should have a presence in the Student Center. The HSC currently serves students and faculty at two locations, Aylesworth Hall and the Durrell Center. The Aylesworth location manages withdrawals and faculty referrals. The Durrell Center works mainly with freshmen and sophomore students living in the residence halls. Close coordination with the Career Center and the Advocacy Offices can best be maintained with an office in Lory Student Center which provides easier access for students and faculty and better serves the advising needs of students.

The HSC and Enrollment Services should develop a systematic method for collecting and disseminating student data to facilitate student procedures. For example, when the HSC receives reports on students with scholastic standards problems, there is no indication of grade points from the ISIS records. Registration for Continuing Education students is done by hand which delays entry into ISIS. Determining scholastic standing for Continuing Education students has been difficult. Consistent classification of students across the University would enhance the advising role of faculty and help students graduate.

In order to increase the retention rate of transfer students, the HSC should work with the Council of Associate and Assistant Deans to develop a more effective orientation program for transfer students.

HSC, Admissions, the Career Center, the School of Education and other appropriate units should develop a plan to work more closely with public schools to prepare students for selecting a major and to be well grounded in the core subjects needed for a successful experience in higher education.

HSC and key college advisors should develop a training package that offers advising training for new faculty to be included in a new faculty orientation program and in a faculty seminar shortly after classes begin.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Student Affairs, in conjunction with the Provost/Academic Vice President, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Student Affairs for implementation.

The Provost/Academic Vice President and the Vice President for Student Affairs are working together to see that the recommendation is implemented. The HSC Advisory Board is being requested to recommend new and innovative initiatives to enhance the advising connections between the HSC and academic faculty. Given space limitations, alternatives are being examined to allow a HSC presence in the Lory Student Center. Efforts are being made to coordinate the HSC more closely with the Advocacy Offices.

The HSC and Enrollment Services will coordinate the future collection and dissemination of student data from ISIS to ensure consistency and accuracy.

The HSC, working with the Council of Assistant and Associate Deans, will aggressively address the issue of retention of transfer students. Along with this, HSC will be offering professional development opportunities for new faculty to enhance their advising skills.

ADVOCACY OFFICES (3AS.06)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Subcommittee endorses the work of the advocacy units and the ethnic and cultural diversity which these programs support. Specific recommendations to improve the impact and efficiency of the advocacy groups on the campus community follow:*

The Vice President for Student Affairs, in conjunction with a committee from the advocacy offices, should develop an annual reporting process for the various Advocacy groups which is consistent across the various units, and which includes the following information: the number of students recruited, retained and graduated from each constituency group, the number of students served within the programs and by the various activities of each advocacy unit, time effort for professional staff across their various responsibilities, and comparative data from other universities. The committee understands that tasks and responsibilities of the advocacy units are diverse and therefore difficult to document. Yet the current reporting process appears highly variable across groups, and does not adequately inform the university of the many services offered by the advocacy offices. This reporting should then facilitate funding and planning decisions.

Programs should be developed which increase the contact of the advocacy offices with academic departments.

Closer working relationships should be developed between the ethnic advocacy offices and CASAE.

The Women's Studies Advisory Board, in conjunction with a representative from the Provost's office, should evaluate the current organizational structure given the academic nature of this interdisciplinary program and make relevant recommendations. Specifically it should consider whether the responsibilities for the Women's Studies Program reside with the Provost's office.

The Women's Programs Office does an excellent job of meeting the needs of sexual assault victims on the CSU campus. However, the committee is unclear how these programs interface with programs offered by the University Counseling Center. The Vice President for Student Affairs should evaluate potential redundancy across these units and make appropriate recommendations.

Increased efforts should be made to find external financial support for the advocacy offices through agency grants, private foundations, and businesses throughout the state of Colorado.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Student Affairs, in conjunction with the Provost/Academic Vice President, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Student Affairs for implementation.

By July 1, 1996, the Advocacy Offices will develop a standard method of collecting comparative use data. This will be done within the context of the differences between offices. This common data reporting method will be used as a basis for an annual report to the campus. A pilot report will be done

for the 1995-96 academic year, and a report using the new data system will be developed for the 1996-97 academic year.

The Advocacy Offices are continuing to enhance their contact and have closer working relationships with academic departments and the Center for Applied Studies in American Ethnicity (CASAE).

During the 1995-96 academic year, the Women's Studies Advisory Board, working with the Provost/Academic Vice President's Office, is evaluating the current organizational structure of the program. The Women's Programs and Studies Office will assess on a continuing basis its coordination of services for sexual assault victims with offices such as the Colorado State University Police Department, University Counseling Center, and the University Health Center. If any changes are needed, they will be made immediately.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RECOMMENDATIONS:

3AS.07   **Responsibility for Information Technology**
3AS.08   **Information Technology Principles**
3AS.09   **Strategic Plan for Information Technology**
3AS.10   **Technology Units - Reorganization (supersedes 1AS.07, Director - Office of Telecommunications)**
3AS.11   **University-wide Electronic Communication**
3AS.12   **Networking Infrastructure**
3AS.13   **Campus Information System**
3AS.14   **Central Support of Computer Applications**
1AS.03   **Electronic Information Distribution**

The SPC concurs that: the leadership and management of information technology should be consolidated under the Vice President for Research & Information Technology; based on agreed upon principles, a long-range plan for information technology be formulated to guide the development, management and utilization of information technologies in support of the university mission; hardware, software and infrastructure associated with networking be developed and supported centrally; and the Campus Information System should be implemented expeditiously.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (3AS.07)

     a.   **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The President should charge the Vice President for Research to provide leadership, management and coordination of information technology as a means to further the mission and goals of the University. To reflect this as a primary area of the Vice President's responsibilities, the Subcommittee recommends that the Vice President's title be changed to Vice President for Research and Technology.*

     b.   **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs with the one change that the Vice President for Research's title be changed to Vice President for Research & Information Technology.**

     c.   **Rationale:** The use of the word "technology" was seen as being too broad and, therefore, confusing. The recommended title change for the Vice President highlights the added responsibility for information technology and importance of this area to the university's success in achieving its mission.

     d.   **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation that the position's responsibilities be formally enlarged to include leadership, management, and coordination of

information technology, and will formally seek change in the title of Vice President for Research to Vice President for Research & Information Technology through appropriate channels.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation is being forwarded by the President through appropriate channels for approval of the title change, and has been forwarded to the Vice President for Research for consideration and implementation upon approval.

Currently, the Vice President for Research has responsibility for a number of areas dealing with information technology: Academic Computing & Networking Services (ACNS), which is responsible for the campus backbone network, training and operation of central computing systems; the Office of Telecommunications (OTC), which is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the university telephone system; and Information Systems (IS), which is responsible for central administrative software. Broadening this position's responsibility to include the leadership, management and coordination of information technology for all university activities is an appropriate extension of current responsibilities that will assure and speed progress in this important area.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PRINCIPLES (3AS.08)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Research and Technology should develop a set of specific principles that will govern decisions regarding information technology infrastructure, applications, training, and support issues. Procedures should be established for the adoption and implementation of the principles on a university-wide basis.*

Specific Objective: Develop a set of basic underlying principles on which individual technology decisions can be made that are in conformity with university-wide technology objectives. The ultimate aim is to guide the university toward the utilization of technology as a means to create administrative operating efficiencies. It may be useful to direct these underlying principles toward three specific areas:

1. Infrastructure, which describes the type of equipment the university uses, the operating software that runs on them, and the communications networks that provide connectivity between individual pieces of equipment.

2. Applications, are the specific computer programs used to organize data and provide management information to assist in the administration of the university.

3. Training and Support, encompasses the methods used to train users of information technology and provide ongoing support.

The development of principles should be a community activity reflecting broad university representation. To facilitate a more effective use of technology to achieve institutional goals, local technology decisions must be made consistent with university-wide principles.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs with the addition that the underlying principles need to be broadened to include applications associated with the teaching, research and outreach activities of the university and not be confined only to administrative functions.**

c. **Rationale:** The role and importance of information technology affects the entire university, making it necessary that the principles include all aspects of the university mission.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.

Work has begun at defining principles to provide the context for a long-term strategic plan for information technology at Colorado State University envisioned in 3AS.09. These principles will be shared with the university community for input and comment before finalization and adoption early in calendar year 1996.

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (3AS.09)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Based on the established principles, the Vice President for Research and Technology should design and implement a long-term strategic plan for the use of technology on a University-wide basis. Such a plan should guide the leadership, management and coordination of information technology to further the mission and goals of the University.*

The plan should include:

Recommendations for realignment of current administrative structures, including lines of reporting and scope of responsibilities, to facilitate institution-wide policy-making and guidance in the strategic use of technology;

Identification of the Vice President for Research and Technology as the person responsible for providing leadership in technological planning;

A focus on technology as a tool for or means of achieving institutional goals, rather than an end in and of itself;

The integration of instructional technology as a tool for meeting the instructional goals of the University;

Specific identification of the extent to which decisions and guidelines should be made on a centralized v. decentralized basis;

Broad-based input and participation on the college and unit level;

A plan for funding and allocation of resources to support University-wide technology goals;

A plan for providing ongoing training and support.

In the development of such a plan, it is critical to obtain broad-based academic and administrative participation and input, including at least the Council of Deans from an academic standpoint and the Technology Area Directors for technical expertise. The plan should be prepared in a time-frame that will permit it to be implemented for Fiscal Year 1997-98.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.

In this expanded role, the Vice President for Research (& Information Technology) will utilize the Information Technology Executive Committee (ITEC), formerly the Office of Information Technology (OIT) Executive Committee, to enhance and integrate information technologies to support the mission of Colorado State University. ITEC members are Vice President for Research (chair), Provost/Academic Vice President, Vice President for Administrative Services, and one representative from the Council of Deans. The information technology area directors (Director, Academic Computing & Networking Services; Director, Information Systems; Director, Office of Telecommunications; Dean, University Libraries; Director, Instructional Services) also meet regularly to address information technology issues, including planning, and are non-voting *ex-officio* members of ITEC. 3AS.09 would provide direction for these bodies and, with the increased participation of a broad segment of the academic and administrative community, a comprehensive plan can be completed within the timeframe of the recommendation.

TECHNOLOGY UNITS - REORGANIZATION (3AS.10, which supersedes 1AS.07)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The video communications infrastructure of Instructional Services, and the Departments of Telecommunications, Academic Computing and Network Services, and Information Systems should be reorganized to support two primary functions: 1) applications and 2) infrastructure. Names of the reorganized units should clearly reflect their functions. The technology functions of the Libraries should be included in planning and coordination efforts.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.

As part of a comprehensive review of the four named units, reorganization options and opportunities will be carefully considered. Reorganization of units along functional lines, considering the separate roles and needs of applications and infrastructure, will assist the university to make continued progress in the deployment and utilization of high speed broad band width telecommunications networks for voice, video and data.

In action related to this review, the SPC had previously concurred with recommendation 1AS.07 (Director - Office of Telecommunications) that the position of Director of the Office of Telecommunications be filled with an interim appointment. An Interim Director has been appointed pending outcome of the comprehensive review.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION (3AS.11)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Research and Technology should develop a set of University-wide standards that would enable the following:*

Send e-mail easily to any person on campus including the ability to attach and retrieve attachments to e-mail with ease and determine addresses easily.

Access central computing resources in a seamless fashion. This would include resources such as Gopher, Integrated Student Information System (ISIS), Financial Records System (FRS), Human Resource Management System (HRMS), Campus Information System (CIS).

Provide a high quality electronic, campus-wide, one-way distribution system for general university announcements.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.

Academic Computing & Networking Services and Information Systems are making the implementation of the recommendation a high priority. Successful implementation will require establishing university-wide standards for hardware and software capabilities and the assurance that they are implemented at the local area network (LAN) and workstation level.

NETWORKING INFRASTRUCTURE (3AS.12)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Research and Technology should implement the concept of a University infrastructure for networking in which the basic functions of networking (such as physical wiring, basic network transport and mail services) would be centrally provided and funded.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.

Addressing network infrastructure starts with defining wiring, hardware, software and management standards. Wiring standards for buildings have been agreed upon that will support future network requirements. A plan is being developed to rewire all buildings that currently do not meet standards (Category 3 for voice; Category 5 for data). The implementation will depend upon the priority of this activity accorded by the strategic planning process and availability of funds. Once LANs, associated hardware and software conform to acceptable standards, central management of LAN operations will become feasible and will free individual area computer support personnel to focus on assistance to users on the LAN and improved applications. The issues having to do with e-mail service will be addressed in the plan called for in 3AS.09.

CAMPUS INFORMATION SYSTEM (3AS.13)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Campus Information System (CIS) should be completed and implemented as soon as possible.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.

   Information Systems is making completion and implementation of CIS a high priority. This is a very large undertaking that involves the updating of the majority of administrative automated systems. In recognition of the high level of university-wide interest in CIS implementation and the need to communicate the full range of CIS modules, Information Systems will distribute a quarterly status report on CIS, including information on current availability, scheduled release dates for portions not yet released, and training information. Training on the utilization of CIS is being implemented through special classes provided by Information Systems and Computer Training & Support Services (CTSS).

CENTRAL SUPPORT OF COMPUTER APPLICATIONS (3AS.14)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Information Systems, or its successor, should support the use of computer applications that have been developed and exist in local units by providing coordination and a clearing house function.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): The recommendation is supported with the modification: "to the extent that it does not compromise the continued maintenance and upgrading of critical central software systems."**

c. **Rationale:** Information Systems has limited staff resources.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.

   As part of CIS, Information Systems has been working with college deans and administrative officers and administrative service functions to create improved computer applications and information and management systems. Many of these units have and continue to develop computer applications of potential utility to other university units. A number of locally developed computer applications have been identified, some of which have been incorporated into CIS, where they will be centrally supported. Others can be made available through a bulletin board without central support for those who find them useful.

ELECTRONIC INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION (1AS.03)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The university should move toward utilizing electronic means of distributing information to the campus-at-large, eliminating the volume and expense of informational mass mailings to the greatest extent possible. Such action should include reducing or eliminating distribution of multiple copies of reports, mailings, and other communications, by posting such information electronically. Where it is necessary to distribute hard copy, the subcommittee recommends doing so by distribution to a central departmental or college resource point.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Concurs with the thrust of the recommendation; however, before it can be implemented, a number of technical and procedural issues need to be resolved. Once the specifics of the process(es) and procedures are known, they should be forwarded to the Information Technology Executive Committee (ITEC) for review and action.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.

The technical and procedural issues associated with electronic distribution of information has been under study for some time by representatives of Academic Computing & Networking Services, Information Systems, and Mail Service. One significant aspect involves developing current lists of e-mail and hard copy addresses from the HRS database and knowing each individual's preference on receipt of mailings: electronically or via hard copy. One result of on-going efforts to implement an electronic distribution process with its many potential benefits has been the elimination of the charge Mail Service had initially recommended for use of electronic distribution services. Currently, Mail Service does not charge for the hard copy distributions, although there is a charge for addressing services.

PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW & EFFICIENCY RECOMMENDATIONS:

3AS.04	**Review of Vice Presidents' Units (supersedes 1AS.02 Programmatic Review)**
3AS.17	**Cost/Quality Comparisons with Peers - Benchmarking**
3AS.18	**Service Units - Six-year Reviews**
3AS.19	**Opportunities for Service Efficiencies**
3AS.20	**Contracting Services**
1AS.04	**Once-a-Day Mail Delivery**
1AS.05	**Copy Center Consolidation**

The SPC supports the implementation of comprehensive and on-going reviews of all administrative units, which include appropriate comparisons with peers and the identification of opportunities for improvements in service efficiencies. The SPC did not feel it feasible for the university to pursue constitutional change allowing contracting for services at this time. Further, the SPC supports changes that would reduce the costs and improve the efficiency of mail delivery and Copy Center operations.

REVIEW OF VICE PRESIDENTS' UNITS (3AS.04 which supersedes 1AS.02)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Each Vice President should develop a meaningful review process for their units. Unit reviews should include comparisons with peer units at other universities and specific action plans to improve quality and efficiency. Reviews would be analyzed and critiqued by individuals with relevant expertise. This analysis may be done by a Colorado State team of experts or may require review by outside consultants. The responsibility for correcting any deficiencies uncovered or implementing any improvements called for in the self assessments shall be assigned to the appropriate Vice President.*

   The following units are perceived by campus response (the change and reform process, and a survey of deans, heads and vice presidents) as being essential units which need improved responsiveness. They should be reviewed as soon as possible.

   Office of Budgets and Institutional Analysis
   Facilities Management
   Environmental Health Services
   Human Resource Services
   Business & Financial Services

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs with the modification that the timetable, general guidelines, and review order should be determined by the Vice Presidents, working together, as part of their development of a meaningful review process.**

c. **Rationale:** By working together, the Vice Presidents will be able to develop comprehensive review processes that will best serve the university. It is expected that every unit will be reviewed at least once every five years, with the order of rotation developed to facilitate the reviews and minimize disruption of on-going services and activities.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice Presidents and Provost/Academic Vice President, working together, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice Presidents and Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

As part of the C&R process, each Vice President prepared a review of the administrative units reporting to them that was given to the Change & Reform subcommittee on Academic Support. This initial effort will serve as the basis for the Vice Presidents to meet and develop meaningful review processes for their units and a timeline for these activities.

Relevant comparisons of unit activities with similar units in universities and, where appropriate, in the private sector of the type called for in 3AS.17 (Cost/Quality Comparisons with Peers - Benchmarking) and 3AS.18 (Service Units - Six-year Reviews) are anticipated as part of the review process. Also, opportunities for improving the quality and efficiency of our service delivery as discussed in 3AS.19 (Opportunities for Service Efficiencies) would be identified and considered during the reviews.

COST/QUALITY COMPARISONS WITH PEERS - BENCHMARKING (3AS.17)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The University should participate in the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) benchmarking project in order to make appropriate cost/quality comparisons with peer institutions.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): The Vice President for Administrative Services carefully and formally review the benefits and costs associated with participation in the NACUBO benchmarking project as one option to collect such data. Upon completion of this review, a recommendation will be made to the EBC for action.**

c. **Rationale:** This recommendation is an important step in implementing 3AS.04, calling for regular, formal reviews of all administrative units. It is very important for the university to gather data for cost and quality of service comparisons with peers, as well as other providers (public or private) of similar services. In addition to NACUBO, other options to collect comparative performance data (AAU data exchange program, individual professional association data exchanges, local associations where the alliance includes public and private sector suppliers of the services, etc.) should also be examined. The Vice President for Administrative Services should take the lead in following-up on this recommendation and involving other campus entities as appropriate. The data gathered here will, hopefully, provide valuable comparative data for implementing 3AS.04.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Administrative Services for implementation.

Colorado State University has already received a full set of NACUBO benchmarking manuals and OBIA is currently reviewing them.

SERVICE UNITS - SIX-YEAR REVIEWS (3AS.18)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *For units where services may be provided by the private sector, six-year reviews should include both peer comparisons at other universities and comparisons with the private sector. Reviews must also show quality of service as indicated by customer evaluation, cost, and centrality to the University's mission. Reviews would be analyzed by individuals with expertise in delivering services. This analysis may be done by a Colorado State team of experts or may require outside review by consultants. The responsibility for correcting any deficiencies uncovered or implementing any improvements called for in the self assessments shall be assigned to the appropriate Vice President.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs, with the change that all administrative units be reviewed as recommended by 3AS.04 and the reviews contain peer comparisons.**

c. **Rationale:** This recommendation is an important part of 3AS.04, and should be incorporated into a complete set of review parameters and guidelines that are established for campus service units.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice Presidents and Provost/Academic Vice President, working together, with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice Presidents and Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE EFFICIENCIES (3AS.19)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Opportunities should be pursued with public and private entities to explore possibilities of cost sharing, consortium purchasing, shared services, and similar efficiencies.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs that the recommendation should be done as part of the reviews recommended in 3AS.04. Options such as those suggested should be routinely examined by Colorado State University, and the 3AS.04 review process should include them on a formal basis.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges each of the Vice Presidents and the Provost/Academic Vice President with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice Presidents and Provost/Academic Vice President for implementation.

CONTRACTING SERVICES (3AS.20)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Legislative or constitutional change should be pursued to allow contracting for services where cost and quality is better than what is currently provided. Decisions for implementation must be consistent with University values regarding employees.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs, excluding the recommendation for constitutional change.**

c. **Rationale:** The constitutional changes suggested in the C&R recommendation are not deemed feasible at this time. However, one aspect of program review as recommended in 3AS.04 should be a cost and level of service comparison with private service providers, which is included in recommendation 3AS.18. The data collected from such comparisons should be carefully studied and if private providers can offer superior service at lower costs, specific reasons for this occurrence need to be identified. The results of this review need to be communicated to the staff involved in delivery of the service, and discussions initiated to identify changes where appropriate. If private service providers can clearly offer a superior service, for lower or equal cost, and the employees of these firms are treated fairly relative to institutional values, this analysis should be shared with legislators as the potential basis for legislative changes allowing flexibility in contracting for services.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Administrative Services for implementation.

ONCE-A-DAY MAIL DELIVERY (1AS.04)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The university should institute a once-a-day mail system.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Recommends that the impact and cost benefit of once-a-day mail service be fully defined before implementation. The Vice President for Administrative Services should be charged with the task of analyzing once-a-day mail delivery and making a recommendation regarding implementation.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Administrative Services for implementation.

The Vice President for Administrative Services has conducted a cost/benefit analysis of this service. The review identified concerns that cancellation of the second delivery and pick-up of mail will lead to increased costs campus-wide, with many departments indicating they would have to use their own staff to walk items to and from Mail Services to assure that the mail was delivered off campus or to campus departments to meet timing requirements.

This review of the once-a-day mail service led to better tracking and improved service through the use of the four digit add-on zip codes, which is providing time and effort savings now, and will provide more savings in the future (as departments use the codes and as auto-sorting devices are purchased over the next 18 months).

Additionally, 1AS.03 makes recommendations relative to the electronic distribution of information via the data network. As this item is implemented, it might impact the mail delivery schedule and the recommendation should be re-evaluated at that time.

COPY CENTER CONSOLIDATION (1AS.05)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The university should consider consolidation of the various copy center activities on campus. The Subcommittee requests that the Vice President of Administrative Services evaluate and report on the costs and benefits of such potential action.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Concurs. The findings and recommendations of the Vice President for Administrative Services should be forwarded to the EBC for its consideration.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Administrative Services for implementation.

An Ad Hoc Committee to Review Campus Copy Services was appointed and a report was submitted to the Executive Budget Committee, which approved all primary recommendations. In addition, the EBC agreed to monitor progress of the current system and formally evaluate the question of centralizing management of all copy centers in one year. The EBC also charged the ad hoc committee to review and define the situation regarding independent copiers owned by departments and make recommendations for future directions.

HUMAN RESOURCE SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS:

3AS.15   **State Personnel System for Higher Education**
3AS.16   **Administrative Professional Employment Issues**
3AS.21   **Training Needs**
3AS.22   **Human Resource Efficiencies**

The SPC supports recommendations which would improve the flexibility of the State Classified Personnel System (SCPS), define and enhance training, and improve the processes and services provided by the Human Resources Office. The SPC did not feel it feasible for the university to pursue constitutional changes to the SCPS. Further, the SPC agrees that sound personnel practices should be defined and implemented which enhance trust and, to the extent possible, protect the rights of at-will employees.

STATE PERSONNEL SYSTEM FOR HIGHER EDUCATION (3AS.15)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Legislative or constitutional change should be pursued to change rules governing the state personnel system for higher education in order to*

provide greater opportunities for institutional flexibility, including the ability to reward excellence and to deal effectively with marginal employees.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Legislative and other changes of the rules governing the State Classified Personnel System and other options under current rules should be carefully studied to provide greater opportunities for institutional flexibility, including the ability to reward excellence and to deal effectively with marginal employees.**

c. **Rationale:** The recommendation is a very important priority for Colorado State University. The first step in addressing it should be the preparation of a detailed plan outlining institutional priorities relative to the State Classified Personnel System. This plan should take into consideration the report from the State Personnel System Working Group, as well as other university priorities. The responsibility for putting this report together should be designated to the Vice President for Administrative Services, who will involve individuals and organizations on the campus as appropriate (e.g., Council of Deans, Classified Personnel Council, Administrative Professional Council, EBC, etc.). While legislative and other change must be carefully studied, constitutional changes do not appear to be a feasible alternative to pursue at this time.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Administrative Services for implementation.

An initial draft document from the State Personnel System Working Group has been prepared. The Vice President for Administrative Services and the Director of Human Resources is preparing a draft institutional plan relative to the State Classified system that will be shared with the campus early in calendar year 1996. When completed, it will be forwarded to the President.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT ISSUES (3AS.16)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Administrative Services should design and communicate procedures for dealing with employee issues involving administrative professionals to facilitate sound personnel practices, enhance trust and protect rights of such employees to the extent consistent with "at will" status.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs.**

c. **Rationale:** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Administrative Services for implementation.

The Administrative Professional Council reports directly to the Provost/Academic Vice President; however, the Vice President for Administrative Services has been working with this group to finalize procedures relative to "at will" employees. The procedure is intended to reflect the university administration's philosophy concerning the value of its staff members who are statutorily "at will" and

the protocol to be followed should termination of such "at will" employees become necessary. A draft procedure has been developed by the Vice President for Administrative Services with the assistance of the Administrative Professional Council, the Human Resource Services Department, and the Office of the General Counsel. The draft statement has already been reviewed by the Administrative Professional Council, and will be discussed by the President's Cabinet in the near future.

TRAINING NEEDS (3AS.21)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Administrative Services should evaluate campus training needs and design a training program to meet the most critical and pressing needs of the University. Identified training needs include:*

 a) *management and supervisory training;*

 b) *expansion of new employee orientation to include formalized training for job duties;*

 c) *mandatory financial and management training programs;*

 d) *computer literacy;*

 e) *legal and ethical issues; and*

 f) *professional development.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): This recommendation is supported, including the specific requirement that some training be mandatory.**

c. **Rationale:** While it is believed that training programs can do much to improve efficiency and effectiveness of staff, it will be very important that a clear listing of training priorities be developed and agreed upon by the campus. The campus basically has no central training program at this point in time. Therefore, the programs implemented must be very strong and of high quality, so as to form an effective foundation for the evolution of additional programs.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Administrative Services for implementation.

 Given that this recommendation is very similar to the training initiatives coming out of the President's Task Force on Financial Management, significant work has already been done to identify training priorities, including the following:

 1. An "Asset Manager" manual has been drafted, which includes assumptions and expectations for campus managers, as well as other written information that would be very useful as part of a campus training program.

 2. Work is underway on developing a proposal for a new employee orientation program for the campus.

 3. A basic draft for campus training priorities has been developed and will be shared more broadly with the campus in the near future.

4.   The Division of Administrative Services has pilot tested a "customer service" training program, using faculty and staff in the Design, Merchandising & Consumer Science.

HUMAN RESOURCE EFFICIENCIES (3AS.22)

a.   **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Administrative Services should identify issues and create a plan to implement strategies to improve human resource efficiencies. Areas to be addressed first are coordination and consumer oriented provision of information concerning employee benefits and appointment/employment processes.*

b.   **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs. Given the overlap among 3AS.15, 3AS.21 and 3AS.22, it is further recommended that the Vice President for Administrative Services prepare a detailed plan for overall campus human resource service programs, which would address classification and compensation for state classified and administrative professionals, training needs, and other personnel and payroll changes that would increase service effectiveness (including automation needs and options). The report should recommend a level of priority for each new/enhanced service and associated resource requirements, and be ready for the FY 97 planning and budget cycle, requiring campus review prior to March 1, 1996.**

c.   **Rationale:** "Human resource" programs at Colorado State University have not been centralized in one office, neither has there been a rich array of personnel/human resource opportunities available to the campus in the past. The Human Resources Office has focused on payroll, personnel file maintenance, maintenance of the current automated personnel data base, procedural issues in meeting State Classified Personnel System requirements (classification, compensation, recruitment, hiring, termination, and grievances), and providing basic support in benefit management for all employees (which includes overall management of the campus self-funded health care program). The training program within this office, although small, was eliminated in previous reallocation exercises. The Office of Equal Opportunity currently provides some human resource services for faculty and administrative professional staff (recruitment, conflict intervention, etc.); the Office of Instructional Services has historically offered some campus training programs (PDI training program each January, and the new general faculty orientation program each fall); the campus Ombudsman's office has provided support for employee conflict resolution; and the half-time faculty/staff coordinator, currently staffed in the University counseling center, who has provided "employee assistance program" support to the campus staff.

d.   **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e.   **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Administrative Services for implementation.

An initial draft Human Resource Plan has been prepared. The Vice President for Administrative Services and the Director of Human Resources will finalize a draft to share with the campus early in calendar year 1996.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS RECOMMENDATIONS:

3AS.23   Intercollegiate Athletics Reporting Line
3AS.24   Review of Intercollegiate Athletics and E&G Support

The reporting assignment of Intercollegiate Athletics is the prerogative of the President. The SPC supports the continuation of Intercollegiate Athletics' direct reporting to the President, with daily administrative oversight for the program charged to the Vice President for Research. The SPC also recommends that the comprehensive and on-going reviews of Intercollegiate Athletics continue to examine levels and sources of financial support, program compliance, and relationship with the university.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS REPORTING LINE (3AS.23)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Director of Intercollegiate Athletics should report directly to the Vice President for University Advancement.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): The SPC supports the continuation of Intercollegiate Athletics' direct reporting to the President, with responsibility for daily oversight for Intercollegiate Athletics given to the Vice President for Research.**

c. **Rationale:** Given the nature of athletics, its relationship to the university and the NCAA, whose Council of Presidents plays a significant role in national athletic policy, the direct reporting relationship to the President is essential and must be continued. Assigning responsibility for the daily operations of athletics to a Vice President provides the necessary oversight of this large and complex activity without it taking a disproportionate part of the President's time and attention. After considering the distribution of responsibilities among the Vice Presidents, the President has asked the Vice President for Research to provide daily administrative oversight of athletics given the latter's personal experience at the university, which provides an understanding of the demands placed upon the President by NCAA and related responsibilities, in addition to the university-wide perspectives shared by the Vice Presidents.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.

REVIEW OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AND E&G SUPPORT (3AS.24)

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The President should request an external review of the Intercollegiate Athletics program with specific attention to the trade-offs between the use of E&G funds in athletics versus other high priority academic programs. If warranted by the review, a plan for reducing the amount of E&G funds to support Intercollegiate Athletics should be developed.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995): The comprehensive, on-going reviews of the athletics program should continue to assure that Intercollegiate Athletics fulfills its role and mission in appropriate relationship to the other activities of the university. These reviews need to examine the levels and sources of financial support, program integrity, compliance with NCAA and federal regulations, and programmatic relationship with the university.**

c. **Rationale:** On-going reviews of Intercollegiate Athletics are:

    1. Monthly reviews of income and expense budgets by the Vice President for Research with the Director and Business Manager of Athletics;

    2. OBIA staff and the Vice President for Research meet with Intercollegiate Athletics on a quarterly basis to review budgets and financial conditions;

    3. Intercollegiate Athletics' budgets are updated, reviewed and approved by the SBA;

    4. Internal Auditing conducts an annual NCAA financial and compliance audit;

    5. The NCAA requires a 5-year Athletic Certification consisting of an extensive self-evaluation and external review. This review is underway and is chaired by Dr. Elnora M. Gilfoyle.

    6. The Office of Equal Opportunity and Office of Civil Rights perform an extensive annual Title IX compliance review.

    7. Comparative financial data from Conference and College Football Association members are collected and reviewed annually.

These reviews provide input to the university administration and the State Board of Agriculture, which look carefully at Intercollegiate Athletics in terms of programmatic integrity and the balance of expenditures against other programmatic requirements to assure that Intercollegiate Athletics is pursuing excellence along with all other segments of the university.

Precise comparisons of athletic's budgets with other universities are difficult because of differences in accounting and reporting practices. Unlike many universities, Colorado State University pays for facilities, debt retirement, public safety costs at games, conference dues, etc. Given these differences, it appears the Colorado State University Intercollegiate Athletics receives E&G support at a level that is essentially the average of WAC schools.

The increases in the athletics budget over the past five years were largely provided to cover increased tuition costs associated with athletic scholarships, supporting some additional women's scholarships to meet Title IX compliance requirements, and providing additional academic support service personnel to assist student athletes' progress to the goal of obtaining a degree. Currently, athletic scholarships are

paid from E&G and donations. Athletics' strategy of enhancing donations and revenues from marketing should lead to reducing the percentage of E&G support to their overall budget in the future.

Variations in the percent of the total budget covered from E&G and student fee sources are a function of the total budget level of Intercollegiate Athletics. In FY 95, revenues and expenditures increased significantly because of the Holiday Bowl, which allowed athletics to repay a long-standing obligation of $475,000 to the university. The increase, over the previous year, in the percentage of the athletic budget coming from E&G sources in FY 96 reflects the fact that initial budget estimates of total revenue from all sources are conservative.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status:** SPC recommendation with President's response forwarded to the Vice President for Research for implementation.